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Sepulchral monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner (1663-1680), St Johns Co-Cathedral Valletta. Assembled in 1686, the gilt bronze bust of the Grand Master is carried by two Muslim slaves representing Asia and Africa.1

Abstract

This thesis reassesses the relationship between the Knights Hospitaller and enslaved peoples. The Hospitallers held slaves in the Mediterranean for centuries and their use of slaves was widespread and significant; the Order undertook raids to capture slaves, members of the Order were served by personal slaves and slaves rowed the Order’s ships. Almost every part of the Order was in some way influenced by slaves, from building defences, to baking bread and maintaining weapons. However, the importance of slaves to the Order has been underestimated; this thesis argues that slaves were more than a by-product of the Order’s naval warfare but were fundamental to their operations and that the desire to gain slaves actually motivated the Order to undertake raids against non-military targets. Through the use of a holistic approach to Hospitaller slaveholding, this thesis highlights the fluid and varied nature of Hospitaller interactions with enslaved and servile peoples. This approach seeks to counter the homogenised view of slaves as one group with a collective identity and shared motivations; each slave’s individual situation was different, which resulted in different interactions with each other and with the Order. Focusing on the variety of these interactions provides a fuller and more detailed picture of the slave system on Rhodes and Malta and the Order’s slaveholding behaviours. Crucially the Order’s slaveholding did not occur in isolation, as the Order interacted with other slaveholding powers and engaged in many of the same slaveholding behaviours. Additionally, this thesis critically assesses the existing scholarship which has sought to present the Order’s slaveholding as more limited and humane. The thesis questions the pre-existing interpretations within the current scholarship and discourse and through this engages with the wider slavery and crusades discourses.
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Introduction

Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner led the Order of St John from 1663 to 1680; Philip Skippon during his 1663 trip to Malta visited the Grand Master in his palace and ‘...pass’d th’o a hall where were pictures of all the famous sea-fights the Maltese Knights have been masters in...’, the Grand Master then spoke kindly with him. ¹ During his stay on Malta Skippon visited the slave prison, he noted that ‘There are about 2000 that belong to the order... This place being an island, and difficult to escape out of, they wear only an iron ring or foot-lock.’² These two observations highlight the Order’s members as both gentlemen knights and slaveholders; this was the situation as it appeared to Philip Skippon and he passed no value judgement on the Order’s slave ownership, it is simply noted alongside the number of horses in the Grand Master’s stable and the price of cotton on the island. Within the modern perception, both scholarly and public, the role of the Order as gentlemen knights fighting on the seas is given far more prominence than their role as slaveholders. Although slaves were included on Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner’s sepulchral monument which in 1686 was assembled in St John’s Co-Cathedral in Valletta; on it the bust of the Grand Master is carried by two slaves representing racialised stereotypes of Africa and Asia.³ Clearly, the Order was aware of the importance of its slave ownership and chose to display its power over its slaves prominently. There are similarities to the earlier, 1626, monument of the four moors in Livorno, which Robert Davis described as ‘...a monument to an aggressive slave-taking culture.’⁴ Additionally, the monument depicts Livorno’s founder, Duke Ferdinando I de’ Medici dressed in the military regalia of the Knights of St. Stephen.⁵ The Order of St. Stephen was founded in 1561 in imitation of the Order of Malta.⁶ Both monuments were placed in public locations, both are of the baroque style and in both the

¹ Philip Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, A Collection of voyages and travels: some now first printed from original manuscripts, others now first published in English : in six volumes with a general preface giving an account of the progress of navigation from its first beginning, Edited by Awnsham and John Churchill, Volume 4 (Walthoe, 1732), p. 618.
² Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 621.
³ Giovanni Bonello, Histories of Malta; Versions and Diversions, Volume 3 (Patrimonju Publishing, 2002), p. 56 ‘The negro and the Cossack, featured on the Cotoner cenotaph, represent stereotypes of Africa and Asia...’
⁵ See appendix 4 for the monument of the four moors; Nadalo, ‘Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier’, pp. 275-324.
slaves are in similar positions; hands behind their backs, hunched over, barely clothed. The slaves depicted in the sepulchral monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner, and the Order’s engagement with slaveholding influenced and were influenced by a larger Mediterranean context. This thesis seeks to reveal the importance of slaveholding to the Order, something that has been often overlooked within the academic discourse, and within that to highlight the similarities between the Order’s slaveholding and that of other slaveholding powers. This introduction will present the area of study, namely the Knights Hospitaller, with an outline of the Order’s relationship with slavery prior to the conquest of Rhodes, in 1306, and a discussion of the significance of the Order’s slaveholding on Rhodes and Malta. Next, the research aims of the thesis will be laid out and its overall chapter structure will be presented.

A slaveholding Order

The Order of Knights of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem have been known by many names over its long history: The Knights Hospitaller, the Order of St John, the Knights of Rhodes, the Knights of Malta and more recently The Sovereign Military Hospital Order of Saint John of Jerusalem of Rhodes and of Malta. The Order was founded in the eleventh century in Jerusalem by Amalfi merchants; a hospice was built for the care of pilgrims and dedicated to St John the Baptist. In 1113 Pope Pascal II issued a Papal Bull, *Pie postulatio voluntatis*, which formally recognised the Order and granted it a variety of rights and privileges. During the twelfth century, the Order began to participate in military activities which became a key part of the Order’s mission. With the fall of Acre in 1291, the Order moved to Cyprus, and then conquered the island of Rhodes between 1306 and 1309. The Order redirected its military activities from being land-based to primarily naval. In 1446 Pope Nicholas V officially recognised the Grand Master as the sovereign prince of Rhodes. After Rhodes fell to Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent in 1522, the Order was given the island of Malta, in 1530, by the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V in return for an annual tribute of one falcon. In 1565 Suleiman the Magnificent attempted to conquer Malta but the Ottoman forces were routed from the island. The Order remained on Malta through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries building fortifications and continuing their naval activities. Malta fell to Napoleon in 1798 who proclaimed to the Egyptians on the 2nd of July 1798, ‘Was it not us who destroyed the chevaliers of Malta, because

---

9 Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem*, p. 45.
those fools believed that God wanted them to wage war against the Muslims?" Since 1798 the Order has given up its ostensibly military role and is now solely a charitable Order. The Order’s survival was due to its ability to adapt to changing circumstances, from charitable Order to Military Order and to sovereign power.

The Hospitallers were not the only Military Order to have had slaves; the Templars in Spain had numerous slaves as did the Sword Brethren in Livonia. It has been argued that, "Military Orders had slave manpower in their lands since their foundation." Of all the Military Orders, however, the engagement with slavery by the Hospitallers was the most significant in its scope and longevity; the Order’s first statutes regulating slavery are from 1262, they held slaves in the Holy Land, the Mediterranean, became briefly involved in New World slavery owning several Caribbean islands and continued to use slaves until the fall of Malta to Napoleon in 1798. For over 500 years the Order held slaves, slavery was not minor or trivial but increased over time and continued while European slaveholding declined. The focus of this thesis is the Order’s interactions with slaves and servile peoples from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, primarily while the Hospitallers ruled Rhodes and then Malta. It was only after the conquest of Rhodes that the Order became the sovereign ruler of its territory and began to create what Luttrell termed as ‘...the island order state...’ as a result the Order could then shape and regulate its system of slavery.

---


This thesis seeks to highlight the continuation of the Order’s engagement with slaveholding after the fall of Rhodes on Malta. The Order was not simply adopting native Rhodiot and Maltese systems of slavery, they transferred their system between the islands and implemented it; as Joan Abela notes ‘...almost immediately upon their arrival turned the island into an important centre for human trafficking.’\(^\text{19}\) It was a system that the Order grew and developed throughout the seventeenth century until thousands of slaves were serving the Order and slaves were included on the sepulchral monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner. As a consequence Malta had more slaves as a percentage of the population of any other European country and Valletta has been compared to Livorno and the North African Corsair cities.\(^\text{20}\) Additionally, the number of slaves the Order itself held far exceeded the number of Hospitallers; the number of slaves can be estimated to be in the thousands and while the number of Hospitallers varied they are only to be estimated in the hundreds.\(^\text{21}\) The Hospitallers of course ruled over a large free population, and when considering the number of slaves on Rhodes or Malta in regard to the total population it is clear that the slaves were in the minority.\(^\text{22}\) Often however the Hospitallers encountered situations where slaves were more numerous than free people, which is especially true at sea when the majority of the ship’s crew were slaves. Slaves provided the Order with a vast amount of labour that was needed for their operations and survival; in 1836 William Henry Thornton wrote a report on the finances of the Order in their

---


---
final years for the British government and concerning slaves noted that: ‘...where severe bodily labour, independent of skill, was to be employed, the Order gave preference to such individuals as might be compelled by stripes and blows to work to the extremity of their animal strength like mere brutes, and who had thus no alternative but to submit with patience to a degree of toil which no free labourer could be persuaded to undergo...in this way alone, it may be comprehended how the stupendous works undertaken by the Knights for fortifying their strong-hold were accomplished.’

It is the impact and importance of this widespread use of slaves that this thesis seeks to draw attention to.

Fighting for the faith and caring for the sick; this is emphasized within the Military Orders discourse as the double vocation of the Military Orders. The Hospitallers were also slaveholders and the importance of this was such that at times it overruled the double vocation and this can be seen as early as the thirteenth century; in 1237 a Papal Bull of Gregory IX had commanded the Order to permit the baptism of their slaves who were prepared to remain in slavery. The Pope appears to have been addressing the concern that slaves were seeking baptism solely to be freed and is stating that baptised slaves would remain enslaved. Prior to this, there had been a twelfth century custom of freeing baptised slaves, which was intended to facilitate conversion but had resulted in slaves not being permitted baptism. Such actions by slaveholders reveal the fear, whether real or imagined, that slaves would manipulate their religious identity to escape slavery. More importantly, the 1237 Papal Bull shows that the Order was willing to prevent its slaves from becoming Christian because of these fears. Despite this in 1262, Grand Master Hugh Revel issued the Order’s first statutes regarding slavery, and specifically addressed baptism; slaves were only allowed to be baptised with a

---

23 William Henry Thornton, *Memoir on the finances of Malta, under the Government of The Order of St John Of Jerusalem, during the last years of its dominion, and as compared with those of the present time* (Malta Government Press, 1836), p. 51.


26 Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp. 48, 77-79; ‘...in the Holy Land in the early thirteenth century it was the custom that emancipation should accompany baptism, lords – including the military orders – often refused to allow slaves to convert, partly because conversion was viewed by some slaves merely as a means to secure freedom...’, Alan Forey, ‘The military orders and the conversion of Muslims in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries’, *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002), p. 7; ‘In transmarinis partibus sepe sepius accidisse dicitur quod multi sclavorum, qui habentur ibidem, amorem catholice fidei pretendentes, ad hoc solum sacramentum baptismatis perceperunt ut, obtenta libertate...’,Document 2168 ‘Le même invite les Hospitallers à ne pas interdire le baptême des esclaves en Orient’, in *Cartulaire général de l’Ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem 1100-1310*, Volume 2 (1201-1261), edited by Delaville Le Roulx (E. Leroux, 1894), p. 513.
special licence from the Grand Master, actively making it more difficult for slaves to become Christian.\textsuperscript{27} Another statute from 1262 placed conditions on when a slave can be freed by a Brother: if the slave is old, sick, or can provide the funds to buy two or three slaves.\textsuperscript{28} This statute by outlining the situations in which a Brother can free a slave further ends the link between baptism and manumission by omitting baptism. This statute may explain why several manumission documents allow slaves to be freed without payment due to long service, as this could indicate they were elderly.\textsuperscript{29} These conditions made it more difficult for Brothers to free their slaves and ensured that a slave was freed for the benefit of the Order as it meant that the Order did not have to maintain sick or elderly slaves, it appears that the Order’s remit of caring for the sick did not extend to its slaves.\textsuperscript{30} In 1789 Trinidad slave owners were specifically banned from freeing slaves for these reasons, to protect the welfare of the slaves.\textsuperscript{31}

That regulation of the Order’s slaves was included in the statutes of 1262 demonstrates the centrality of slavery to the Order’s worldview and organization. These statutes required members of the Order to obtain a licence from the Grand Master to baptise their slaves and placed limitations on when a slave could be freed. Reading against the grain of this material, this is evidence of how the Order sought to control the number of slaves being baptised and limit the number of slaves being freed. Furthermore, the Templar of Tyre reported that when in 1263 the Sultan Baibars sent messengers to Acre expressing the wish to exchange Christian slaves he held for Saracen slaves held by the Christians, the Templars and Hospitallers refused, ‘...saying that their slaves brought them great profit, since they were all craftsmen, and that it would cost too much to hire on other craftsmen, and therefore they did not wish to agree to this.’\textsuperscript{32} This decision by the Military Orders to value their slave ownership over the freeing of Christians was condemned by the author, ‘Although what they said was true, nonetheless they ought to have made the exchange, for the sake of God


\textsuperscript{28} ‘Statutum est quod baylivus, nec alius quisquam frater, non vendat nec det extra domum ullum sclavum, nisi sclavus sit senex aut machatus, seu aliquis velit redimere se, de cujus precio duo aut tres possint haberi slavi...’, Document 3039 ‘Statuts promulgués par le chapitre general de l’ordre sous le magistere d’Hugues Revel’, in Delaville Le Roulx, Cartulaire général de l’Ordre des Hospitaliers, Volume 3, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{29} Luttrell, Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440, pp. 81-100.


and the deliverance of the poor Christian slaves.' It would appear that the Order valued its slaves, perhaps literally given the reference to cost, to such an extent that this overrode its duty to protect fellow Christians. This shows that as early as the thirteenth century the Order's slaveholding was overruling its mission of fighting for the faith.

The Order’s system of slavery did not exist in isolation but was part of a far larger slaving zone fed by broader conflicts that stretched across the Mediterranean. Debra Blumenthal in her study of fifteenth century slavery in Valencia has observed that ‘...the bulk of the captives entering the kingdom of Valencia in the fifteenth century were the victims of a rather amorphous and loosely defined war taking place on the high seas and along the coasts of the Mediterranean Sea.’ It was in this loosely defined war that the Hospitallers operated and captured many of its slaves. Salvatore Bono viewed this as the passage of people between two worlds, one Christian and one Muslim. For those brought by the Knights to Rhodes and Malta, this was also a passage between two different states, from free to unfree, for some their captivity would be short-lived as they would be ransomed and freed, but for others, they would never again see their homelands and never again be free.

Despite the significance of this transition, the distances involved were short; from Ottoman Tunis to Christian Sicily was only around 110 miles. For many Mediterranean slaves gaining freedom through ransom was a real possibility and they were able to maintain some contact through letters with their communities, this was even encouraged by the slaveholders as it facilitated the ransom process. A slave’s ransom value often exceeded their market value; their market value typically reflected the value of their labour, while their ransom value reflected their status and worth to their community as a specific individual. As a result, many slaves were taken with the expectation they would be ransomed, as that provided their captor with more profit.

Slave ownership was far more than a secluded aspect of the Order but was intrinsic to the activities of the Order and the daily lives of the Brothers; there was no clean separation between the

---

36 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, p. 45.
39 This is explored further in chapter 7; Yvonne Friedman, Encounter between enemies: captivity and ransom in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (Brill, 2002), p. 148; With regard to the Baltic context David Wyatt, ‘Reading between the lines: Tracking slaves and slavery in the early middle ages’ in Viking Age Trade: Silver, Slaves and Gotland, edited by J. Shepard, (Abingdon, 2021), pp. 17-33.
gentleman knight and the slaveholder. The Order on Rhodes and Malta was a sovereign power with a mission of naval warfare, and slavery was fundamental to their military operations but also impacted their everyday lives. Yet, the importance of slaveholding to the Order is frequently overlooked or given very little attention within the modern scholarly discourses on either the Hospitallers or Medieval slavery more broadly. In regard to the Hospitaller discourse, much of what has been written on slavery is from historians who are primarily interested in the activities of the Order from a top-down perspective, highlighting individual members of the Order with slaves and slavery being entirely almost absent; for example in Stephen C. Spiteri’s *Fortresses of the Knights*, slaves are entirely absent despite construction being one of the largest uses of slave labour by the Order, rather the focus is on the decisions of individual Brothers who are overseeing the construction of fortifications.\(^{40}\) Additionally, Jonathan Riley-Smith in his magisterial study *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem and Cyprus 1050-1310* (1967), refers to the Order’s slaveholding in a single footnote that consists of two sentences.\(^{41}\) More recently, Jürgen Sarnowsky’s *Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15. Jahrhunderts. Verfassung und Verwaltung der Johanniter auf Rhodos (1421-1522)* (2001), contains no extensive discussion on slavery and the topic is only covered indirectly under his analysis of ‘Greeks, Jews and other inhabitants of Rhodes.’\(^{42}\) Similarly, the volume *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798, studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes (1993), contains 16 different articles which cover various aspects of Hospitaller Malta. Despite the significant evidence for Hospitaller slaveholding on the island, none of these papers specifically addresses the subject, and while several do refer to slavery on Malta, they do so only in passing. For example, John Gash’s article, ‘Painting and Sculpture in Early Modern Malta’ notes that in the seventeenth century the Italian artist Mattia Preti worked with a manumitted slave who acted as a model, Giuseppe Gianferli, and had an assistant who was the son of a slave.\(^{43}\) The following chapter will address this lack of scholarship in more detail and consider the reasons for this gap in the academic discourse.

---

\(^{40}\) Stephen C. Spiteri, *Fortresses of the Knights* (Book Distributors limited, 2001); Use of slaves in construction is outlined in Chapter 4.

\(^{41}\) Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem*, p. 261 note 4 references the 1237 Bull ordering the baptism of slaves, p. 343 ‘They could not give away or sell slaves unless they were old and sick, but could accept payment for enfranchisement, the charge being the price of two or three slaves. They could not have slaves baptised without the permission of the Master.’


Thesis Aims and Structure

This thesis seeks to take a new approach to Hospitaller slaveholding, by focusing on the breadth of the Order’s slaveholding and emphasizing the range of different interactions the Order had with enslaved peoples. This approach will highlight and address some of the issues in the existing scholarship, where the focus on slaves has often been narrow and underestimated their significance to the Order. Overall, this approach will provide a better understanding of the significance of slavery to the Order and encourage further study of this topic. This has been broken down into three main areas which will be addressed to varying degrees in each chapter.

Thesis aims:

To provide a critical assessment of the existing scholarship. The new approach will highlight some of the flaws in the existing scholarship where the approach to slaveholding has sometimes been underdeveloped, leading to problematic assumptions and a lack of engagement with the wider slavery discourse. As a result of the lack of critical assessment the scholarship has stagnated and remains isolated, neither engaging with nor being engaged with by the wider slavery or crusader discourses. The thesis will question the pre-existing interpretations within the current scholarship and discourse and through this engagement with the wider slavery and crusades discourses.

To focus on the variety of interactions between the Order and their enslaved peoples. This approach seeks to counter the homogenised view of slaves as one group with a collective identity and shared motivations; each slave’s individual situation was different, which resulted in different interactions with each other and with the Order. Additionally, the interactions between members of the Order and their enslaved peoples could vary considerably depending on the context; a Brother would have a far more developed and complex relationship with their domestic slave than with a galley slave. Focusing on the variety of these interactions provides a fuller and more detailed picture of the slave system on Rhodes and Malta. This is significant to understanding the Order’s slave system, what situations occurred, what actions were acceptable, and how this relates to the wider context of slavery in general, and medieval slavery more specifically.

To highlight the significance of slaveholding to the Order. The Order’s use of slaves was widespread and significant; the Order undertook raids to capture slaves, Brothers were served by personal slaves and slaves rowed the Order’s ships. Almost every part of the Order was in some way influenced by

---

44 The works of Luttrell, Coureas and Wettinger will be discussed further in Chapter 1, The study of Hospitaller slaveholding.

45 Moses Finley, *Ancient slavery and modern ideology* (Markus Wiener, 1998), pp. 302-308; Anthony Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes 1306-1462’, in *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the west 1291-1440* (Variorum, 1979), (IV) p. 54 Luttrell argues that galley-slaves were unknown because slaves were untrustworthy. Discussed further in Chapter 2, The Servitudo Marina.
slaves, from building defences, to baking bread and maintaining weapons.46 However the importance of slaves to the Order has been underestimated; this thesis will argue that slaves were more than a by-product of the Order’s naval warfare, and that the desire to gain slaves motivated the Order to undertake raids against non-military targets and was built into the structure of the Order.

**Thesis Structure:**
The thesis is divided into seven chapters and within each chapter the aims of the thesis will be addressed to varying degrees. The first chapter will provide an overview of the current study of Hospitaller slaveholding; providing an overview of the works which do consider Hospitaller slaveholding and addressing the question of why slaveholding has been underestimated. The thesis is then divided into two parts focusing on different servile contexts. Part 1 focuses on Hospitaller interactions with servile and enslaved peoples at sea and contains two chapters, the first addresses the *Servitudo Marina* while the second focuses on the use of slaves, debtors, and convicts on the Order’s galleys. Part 2 focuses on land-based interactions and is made up of three chapters which outline urban slavery, domestic slavery, and agricultural slavery in turn. The final chapter provides an overview of the system of ransom that existed on Rhodes and Malta. This approach seeks to address Hospitaller slaveholding in a range of different contexts to highlight recurring themes and in contrast to the existing historiography which typically deals with slaves within specific contexts, usually in relation to galley slavery, which diminishes the importance of slave labour to the Order’s operation overall and hinders consideration of how the interactions of the slaves in these different contexts vary.

The first chapter will focus on the existing scholarship, addressing what has been written about Hospitaller slavery and examining several key works from the existing scholarship; the recent work, *The countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423*, by Anthony Luttrell and Gregory O’Malley (2019) will be a starting point to highlight the lack of attention given to Hospitaller slaveholding within the wider Hospitaller discourse. Godfrey Wettinger’s work *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo* (2002) will be examined in detail, as it has been relatively isolated from the discourse but is the only dedicated monograph on the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding. Much of the existing scholarship has sought to downplay the significance of slaves to the Order or sanitise the Order’s slaveholding. This chapter will outline how these arguments have been framed, such as the assertion that the Order

due to its Christian identity was kinder to its slaves than other slaveholders, or more likely to free its slaves, which is based on the problematic view that the Christian church was opposed to slavery. As a result of the lack of study on this topic, the few articles and works that do actively address these issues are isolated and have been unable to develop the subject meaningfully. The question of why the significance of slavery to the Order has been overlooked will be addressed focusing on a range of different factors such as possible bias and the available sources.

The existing scholarship will continue to be a key focus of Chapter 2, this chapter will outline the way the servile status known as the Servitudo Marina, has been interpreted within the discourse; in what remains the only dedicated article on the topic of the Servitudo Marina Luttrell actively distances the Servitudo Marina from slavery by suggesting that galley slavery could not have existed alongside the Servitudo Marina, based on several problematic assertions. The discussion will then outline some key aspects of the Servitudo Marina, estimating the number of people who had this servile status, and the effect of the Servitudo Marina as an inherited status. From this, it will be clear that the Servitudo Marina affected a large portion of the population of Rhodes, which makes its abolition and replacement with slave exploitation on galleys even more significant. This chapter will also argue that there was not a dramatic shift from one system to the other but that the change evolved more gradually; slaves and those who owed the Servitudo Marina would have worked side by side.

The third chapter will further reveal the importance of slaves to the operation of the Order’s galleys. This chapter will begin by outlining the size of the Order’s navy and the numbers of oarsmen that were required. The cost of the Order’s naval operations will then be examined; the fact that the Order did not make a profit from its naval activity has been emphasized in the historiography as evidence that members of the Order were not pirates and seeks to characterise the Order’s naval activity as more legitimate. This view will be critiqued, as it is based on problematic comparisons between the Order and corsairs. There will be a focus on the Order’s military targets, which were at times chosen to maximise the number of slaves taken rather than as part of a crusading military strategy. Undertaking tours on the Order’s galleys was required for Brothers for promotion in the Order, as slavery and slave taking was key to the operation of the galleys this linked engagement with slave-raiding to advancement. The treatment of the Order’s other servile oarsmen will then be examined, the Forzati and the Buonavoglia; overall the Forzati were treated as slaves and while the Buonavoglia had more freedoms they all had to endure the same horrific conditions on board the Order’s galleys. Naval defeat for the Order could result in members of the Order being enslaved; this final point will focus on the fear of enslavement that members of the Order faced.

The Order’s use of slaves on land will then be addressed; chapter 4 will focus on urban slavery in Malta. This chapter will primarily deal with Malta as slaves on Rhodes were kept outside of the town of Rhodes. This chapter will first outline the number of slaves that were kept on Malta. Unlike the slaves on the Order’s galleys that rowed the Order’s galleys, the Order’s slaves that were based on land had far more varied uses; this is most evident in the urban context where slaves would perform a wide range of different labours. The Order had a large number of slaves involved in construction and building defences on both Rhodes and Malta. The Order enforced controls on the movement and activities of slaves, such as confining the slaves to underground prisons at night, this was intended to prevent escape and revolt. Despite these restrictions and the poor conditions within the slave prisons, within the existing discourse the Order’s treatment of its slaves on Malta has often been sanitised and presented as kind.\textsuperscript{48} From the number of slaves kept on Malta by the Order and the wide range of uses it will be apparent that slaves were involved in almost every aspect of the Order’s operations and were significant to the Order’s operations.

The Order made use of personal and domestic slaves; this will be explored in chapter 5. Slave ownership was linked to status within the Order, with the Grand Master owning the most slaves, and bestowing enslaved people as gifts to reward followers and flatter superiors; this is comparable with the behaviours in other slaveholding societies.\textsuperscript{49} Additionally, like other slaveholding societies, the Order’s domestic slavery probably involved sexual exploitation of their slaves. Many of the domestic slaves were purchased by individual Brothers and rarely appear in the Order’s archives, except with regard to manumission documents. As a result of their ties to specific members of the Order many of these slaves were freed through testamentary manumission which is significant within the wider slavery discourse as a means of controlling slaves for all of the slaveholder’s life but also as an act of charity meant to benefit the slaveholder’s soul.\textsuperscript{50} The Order’s use of domestic slaves has received very limited attention within the existing discourse but this is significant as the relationship between slave ownership and status provides an insight into how intrinsic slavery was to the Order and the extent to which the Order’s slaveholding overlapped with other slaveholding groups. Additionally, this highlights that the Order’s slaves were not simply used to row galleys or for construction but were involved in tasks that were not essential to the operation of the Order and the Brothers were choosing to purchase slaves as servants, likely because of the link between slave ownership and

\textsuperscript{49} Orlando Patterson, \textit{Slavery and Social Death}, (Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 79 ‘...in all slave societies... the honor of the master was enhanced by the subjection of his slave...’; Barker and Karras, \textit{That Most Precious Merchandise}, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{50} Marc Kleijwegt, ‘Freedpeople: A Brief Cross-cultural History’, in \textit{The Face of Freedom, Volume 1; The manumission and emancipation of slaves in old world and new world slavery}, Edited by Marc Kleijwegt (Brill, 2006), pp. 20-1.
status within the Order. As such, slaveholding was far more than an economic necessity for the Order but part of the way power and success were conceived of in the Order, which is no doubt why slaves were included on the monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner.

The Order’s engagement with agriculture varied considerably between the different islands, highlighting the Order’s versatility. The next chapter will examine the use of slaves in agriculture, comparing the situations in Cyprus, Rhodes, and Malta. On Rhodes agricultural land was granted to individual Brothers and the Order took steps to bring more land into cultivation, however on Malta the Order was far less involved in agriculture. The Order was actively involved with sugar production on Cyprus; this industry made use of a large number of slaves and the Order’s lands on Cyprus produced a substantial portion of the Order’s income. Additionally, the situation for slaves on Cyprus was notably different to that of the urban slaves on Malta, ransom appears to have been less common and there was an expectation that the slaves would marry and raise a family, which was unheard of on Malta where the slave population was overwhelmingly male. This demonstrates that the Order’s involvement with slavery changed as it was reshaped by social, logistical, and operational contexts.

The final chapter addresses the ransom process. The ransom process was significant to the system of Hospitaller slaveholding; it was a means of gaining income from captured slaves but required engaging in communication with the Order’s enemies and the Order took steps to facilitate that communication through the issuing of licences of safe conduct. The Order by allowing its slaves to continue to practise their faith further encouraged the ransom, as converted slaves were less likely to be ransomed. The account of Ma’gangu-zade Mustafa Efendi, a judge, details his experience of the ransom process, which led to his eventual release in 1599; this account will be employed as a case study throughout this chapter to provide an insight into the ransom process from the slave’s perspective.

Collectively, these chapters come together to present a holistic perspective of the Order’s slaveholding operations and behaviours across the period, analysing their servile and enslaved peoples in a range of different contexts. The focus on the broad involvement of slaves in the operations of the Order reveals the overall significance of slaveholding to the Order. By highlighting the extent of the Order’s engagement with slavery this thesis seeks to counter the attempts within the existing scholarship to sanitise and minimise the Order’s involvement with slavery.

Conclusion
This introduction has provided a brief overview of the Hospitallers and a broad summary of the Order’s relationship with slavery prior to the conquest of Rhodes, in 1306. The aims and structure of
this thesis have been outlined so that the route of this investigation and key aspects are clear. Members of the Order were Christian slaveholders, slaves were involved in all aspects of the Order’s operations and slavery was key to the Order’s structure. Brothers enslaved their enemies as part of the requirements to progress, slaveholding was linked to status. These points will be expanded upon in the following chapters which will, for a range of different settings, address: the wide array of uses of slaves, the variable interactions the Order had with their slaves, the way that slaves have been addressed within the existing scholarship, and that slavery was significant to the activities and operation of the Order.

The approach of this thesis is to focus on the Order’s slave system as varied rather than homogenised, to address that slaves were used by the Order in a huge range of areas, but within the existing scholarship are often compartmentalised as simply manual labour rowing the Order’s galleys and given little consideration. By highlighting the range of ways the Order used slaves, and the Order’s relationship with slavery, the importance of slavery to the Order becomes more apparent. As a result, this approach highlights flaws in the existing scholarship and allows for a critical reassessment of the existing discourse. This will allow the scholarly discourse to engage more meaningfully with Hospitaller slaveholding moving forward.
Chapter 1, The study of Hospitaller slaveholding

The study of the Hospitallers has a long history. The Order’s historians produced detailed works, most notably Giacomo Bosio and Bartolomeo dal Pozzo, who produced histories of the Order from its origins into the seventeenth century.¹ The study of the Hospitallers continued into the eighteenth and nineteenth century with for example Vertot’s *The History of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem* (1770), and Whitworth Porter’s, *A history of the Knights of Malta* (1858).² The twentieth century witnessed the study of the Hospitallers gain much more dedicated academic scholarship with works by Jonathan Riley-Smith, Anthony Luttrell, and Alan Forey to name but a few.³ Despite the significant historiographical discourse which has developed on the Order, the importance of slaveholding to the Order is frequently overlooked or given very little attention within the modern scholarly discourses on either the Hospitallers or Medieval slavery more broadly.⁴

One of the key aims of this thesis is to provide a critical assessment of the existing scholarship. Within the existing scholarship, regarding Hospitaller slaveholding, there has been very limited reflection on the approach to the topic of slaveholding, which has hindered the development and refinement of how Hospitaller slavery is addressed and considered, this chapter seeks to provide an overview and reflect on the existing scholarship. This chapter will outline some of the shortcomings in the existing scholarship and expose the problematic assertions that underpin the study of Hospitaller slaveholding. The initial discussion will focus on the approach to Hospitaller slavery in the recent work, *The countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423* (2019), by Anthony Luttrell along with Gregory O’Malley and the evidence that this source engaged with.⁵ There will be a discussion of some of the trends that can be identified in this work, such as a focus on manumission and softening the Order’s slaveholding. Continuing the focus on existing works that address Hospitaller

---

slaveholding, Godfrey Wettinger produced the only monograph specifically on the topic of Hospitaller slavery, the approach taken within this work and why there has been very little engagement with this work will be addressed. Finally, there will be a discussion of some of the factors that may contribute to why Hospitaller slaveholding has been underestimated or not addressed in much of the existing Hospitaller discourse.

Overall this chapter seeks to address the shortcomings in the existing scholarship and expose the problematic assertions that underpin the study of Hospitaller slaveholding; such as the contention that slavery is an inefficient form of labour or that the Order freed many of its slaves. Additionally, it has been argued that because of the Hospitaller’s Christian identity, the Order’s slaveholding was somehow more humane or mild, which is a problematic assertion. Similarly, the freeing of Hospitaller slaves through manumission has been employed as evidence to support this perspective. Although this often fails to understand the significance of manumission.

**Trends within the existing discourse**

In the introduction to the thesis, it was briefly outlined that the Order’s slaveholding is frequently overlooked or given very little attention within the modern scholarly discourses on either the Hospitallers or Medieval slavery more broadly. This may be because much of what has been written on Hospitaller slavery is from historians who are primarily interested in the activities of the Order and focus on members of the Order only addressing slaveholding as a secondary or peripheral consideration, with such an approach slaves are easily missed; for example, there are many works discussing Hospitaller naval activity that give little or no consideration to the large number of enslaved oarsmen. Although there are an increasing number of studies that focus on the

---

6 Luttrell questioned the efficiency of slaves and argued that the Order on Rhodes would not have used slaves to row their galleys as a result of the high cost of slave labour, Luttrell ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 54; Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 310 It is interesting to find that it was believed that the work of the whole thirteen of them [Slaves] could be done by four Maltese workers...; Much of the existing discourse on Hospitaller slavery has focused on manumission, Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’; Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’.


8 Patterson, *Slavery and Social death*, p. 247.

9 Joseph Muscat and Andrew Cuschieri, *Naval activities of the Knights of St John 1530-1798* (Midsea books ltd, 2002), pp.138-144, despite the numerous pictures of slaves much of the discussion focuses on how kind the knights were to their slaves; Joseph Muscat, *Sails Round Malta*, *Types of Sea Vessels 1600BC-1900AD* (PIN Pubblikazzjonijiet Indipendenza, 2008), pp. 61-62; Henry Sire, *The Knights of Malta* (Yale university Press, 1994); Liam Gauci, *In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798* (Heritage Malta 2016).
Hospitaller’s extensive exploitation of slave labour these have tended to be relatively brief articles that deal with specific and narrow aspects of slaveholding.¹⁰ For instance Anne Brogini in, Malte: frontière de chrétienté (2006), discusses Hospitaller slave primarily with regard to control and rebellion in a section titled ‘Un danger concret: les esclaves.’¹¹ Sarah Azzopardi-Ljubibratic’s article ‘The Notarial Archives and Jews in early modern Malta: preliminary considerations’ (2018), focuses on the references to Jewish slaves Order’s archives.¹² Joan Abela in, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century (2018), addresses ransom simply as a form of trade, focusing on the slaves as simply another commodity, ‘Not only did the capture of slaves translate into financial rewards but, through the redemption intermediaries, commercial ties were established between subjects of the Cross and the Crescent.’¹³ Additionally, Russell Palmer’s recent article focused on material traces of captivity, within this Palmer highlights the issue of Christian slaveholding being unaddressed in the existing slavery discourse; ‘Major, standard works, including The Cambridge world history of slavery, demonstrate this point, with the latter offering only a single chapter on enslavement in the Ottoman Empire all but erasing slavery controlled by Southern European Christians.’¹⁴ These developments are beneficial as between them they highlight the extensive breadth of the subject, but they have not been able to reflect on the existing status of the discourse or develop more meaningful approaches.

Several of the issues in the existing discourse regarding Hospitaller slavery can be seen in the recent work, The countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423, by the prominent historian Anthony Luttrell along with Gregory O’Malley, which includes important transcribed documents that mention enslaved peoples held by the Order, containing several manumissions and land grants where enslaved people are mentioned. Despite these sources Luttrell and O’Malley provide very little discussion of their significance or the slaveholding behaviours of the Order, glossing over this

evidence with this single paragraph; ‘A different response to the island’s manpower shortage lay in the importation of slaves for both domestic and agricultural labour. Before 1306 Rhodians were being taken away from their island as slaves. Thereafter, Rhodes became a centre for traffic in slaves, though many of them passed through but did not remain on the island. The Venetians were taking slaves to Rhodes during the decade after 1309, many of them from the Greek mainland where the conquests of the Catalan company helped to create a large pool of captives. In 1319 the survivors of allegedly 1,900 rebel Greek islanders from Leros were deported to Rhodes. As early as 1311, the chapter general ruled that the slaves of deceased Hospitallers were to remain on the estates on which they were settled. Slaves might belong to the Order, to individual Hospitallers or to others. Once established on the land, slaves could subsequently be freed to become francomati as ‘Roman citizens’ who might then form part of a free peasantry; they did not become serfs. In 1347 Margarita of Negroponte freed some 14 presumably rural slaves and their children, many of them seemingly from Greek lands; one was apparently a mill keeper and another a female shop or tavern keeper [36]. A slave might be freed in return for a payment [55]. Before about 1365 many manumitted slaves had Greek names reflecting their probable origin on an Aegean Island or on the Greek mainland, but thereafter slaves were more often Russians, Armenians, Bulgars or others.’

Within this summary the focus is almost entirely on the freeing of slaves, and the start of the paragraph further attempts to soften the Order’s development and expansion of slavery on Rhodes as a reaction to labour shortages, a reaction to Rhodians being enslaved, and only a hub as most did not remain. Although, slavery on Rhodes could not have been a solution to labour shortages if many of them did not remain on the island. Additionally, the only secondary references are to an earlier article by Luttrell on slavery and to an article by Nicholas Coureas both of which focused on manumission. The earlier Luttrell article is ‘Slavery at Rhodes’ which was published in 1977, this article is one of the most widely referenced regarding Hospitaller slaveholding, despite being only 20 pages in length of which almost half is a register detailing 51 manumission documents from between 1347 and 1440. The approach to Hospitaller slaveholding in this article is similar to the approach outlined in the paragraph above, Luttrell begins by focusing on Rhodes as a hub where slaves were traded, only acknowledging that the Order owned slaves after several pages; ‘In addition to those who were merely being imported and exported, there were slaves at Rhodes who belonged to the Hospital or to individual Hospitallers.’

It seems odd to describe these slaves as ‘in addition’ when the Order’s naval slave-raiding was what drove the development of the slave market on Rhodes and

16 Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440’, p. 84.
the Order made widespread use of slaves. Over the same period that Luttrell’s article is addressing hundreds of slaves were held by the Order and used in the production of sugar, the link to agriculture is also made by Luttrell in this article. After this acknowledgement that the Order owned slaves, the article immediately highlights that the Order was freeing its slaves and details the various statutes imposed to regulate manumission as a response to the brothering freeing their slaves; ‘Another problem was the tendency of individual brethren to free their own personal slaves.’ Luttrell makes no mention of the rate of manumission, but given that it is described as a ‘problem’ and that the number of slaves is never addressed this would lead the reader to believe the Order freed many of their slaves.

The Coureas’ article, ‘The Manumission of Hospitaller slaves on fifteenth century Rhodes and Cyprus’ published in 2017 is also brief at 9 pages and is entirely focused on 23 previously published manumission documents including several from Luttrell’s register of manumission documents in ‘Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440’ and provides no archival references. Neither Luttrell nor Coureas engages in any meaningful way with the wider historiography surrounding medieval slavery and for both Luttrell and Coureas these articles are their only works discussing Hospitaller slaveholding. Luttrell had written an article on slavery in Spain and Portugal in 1965 although this was based on ‘...a few weeks work...’ Coureas has also previously written about the redemption of captives on Cyprus in his 2000 article Christian and Muslim Captives on Lusignan Cyprus: Redemption or Retention?, this brief article similarly to his more recent one has no engagement with the wider slavery discourse.
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17 Sire, The knights of Malta, p. 86.
18 At the Hospitaller plantation of Episkopi in 1449 there were reported to be 400 slaves employed in the production of sugar, Marina Solomidou-Ieronymidou ‘The Crusaders, sugar mills and sugar production in Medieval Cyprus,’ in Archaeology and the Crusades, proceedings of the round table, Nicosia, 1 February 2005, Edited by Peter Edbury and Sophia Kalopissi-Verti (Pierides foundation, 2007), p. 66; Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440’, p. 86 ‘...slaves who were attached to an agricultural estate...’
Focus on manumission
That the Hospitallers freed their slaves has featured prominently within the existing Hospitaller slaveholding discourse. The only dedicated articles on the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding produced by Luttrell and Coureas focus entirely on the Hospitallers freeing their slaves through manumissions.23 In *Documents Concerning Cyprus* (2011), by Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler say little on the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding but introduce the topic by stating ‘The Hospitallers also had slaves, a number of whom they freed’.24 Luttrell and O’Malley provide a comparable statement ‘Slaves would have provided agricultural labour; some were freed.’25 Manumission documents are also prominent within the Hospitaller archive which is housed in the National Library of Malta, known as the ‘Archivum Ordinis Melitensis’ (AOM).26 The Hospitaller archive is the main source for much of the evidence of Hospitaller activities, as the Order was able to transfer much of the archive with them when they left Rhodes in 1523.27 However, Anthony Luttrell and Greg O’Malley note that the surviving material has some serious limitations: ‘The main series of registers, the so-called ‘Libri Bullarum’, commences only in 1346 and for the years between 1348 and 1381 no more than five registers are extant; there are only nine relevant texts for the years 1306 to 1346, and 49 of the 208 documents published below date to the five years between 1347 and 1352. From 1381 to 1423 only a few volumes are missing but since much of what survives for those years was written in the West those registers may contain rather less information concerning the Rhodian countryside. The fact that almost all of the Hospital’s Rhodian archive from before 1346 did not survive strongly discourages any statistical use of the surviving texts.’28 For Luttrell and O’Malley, these registers contain little reference to the Rhodian Countryside, equally they contain little reference to slaves. The archive is a collection of internal documentation as a result some topics are seldom mentioned. This does not suggest that these items were unimportant but rather they were part of the everyday and unremarkable, Emanuele Colombo has noted that slaves are almost invisible to historians.29 The lack of documentation regarding slaves is not surprising and is comparable to other slaveholding contexts, with regard to slavery in Northern Europe David Wyatt states: ‘Enslaved people are most likely to be glimpsed in the medieval sources during traumatic or liminal moments in their life.
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26 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus*, p. xiii. Additionally, there is a microfilm copy of the AOM held at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library in Minnesota.
27 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus*, p. xiii.
cycles.’ Manumission was very much a liminal moment and would have been important legal documents; the detail in the surviving manumissions is notable as often it will provide a slave’s name, origin and what task they performed, providing insight into their lives.

Several collections of transcribed documents from the Order’s archive have been published; The countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423, contains 208 transcribed documents, Tsirpanlis in Anekdota engrapha gia tē Rodo kai tis Noties Sporades apo to archeio tōn iōannitōn hippotōn 1421 - 1453 (1995), transcribed some 342 documents and Documents concerning Cyprus transcribed 346. Additionally, Luttrell included details of 51 manumission documents and several transcriptions with the article ‘Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440’ multiple slave manumissions have been included within these collections. There is some duplication between these works, with some documents appearing in Tsirpanlis, Luttrell’s article, Documents concerning Cyprus and The countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes. Given how few documents within both Tsirpanlis’s work and the volume Documents Concerning Cyprus focus on slaves the repetition of documents is surprising. This may be a factor in why manumission features so prominently in the limited Hospitaller slaveholding discourse.

Beyond simply the access to the documents there is another reason for highlighting manumission, such a focus can undermine the importance of slaveholding to the Order as it suggests that since the Order freed large numbers of its slaves the labour of those slaves cannot have been particularly significant. Additionally, the focus on manumission attempts to sanitize the Order’s slaveholding placing the Order in the role of liberators who were ‘kind’ slaveholders. For example, Coureas states; ‘...that even in cases where Hospitaller slaves had to perform services to obtain their freedom or purchase another slave to replace their own persons, they still appear to have been more fortunate than slaves in the kingdom of Aragon. There they had to pay their owners sums amounting to two or three times their purchase prices...’ Contrary to Coureas assertion, that the Order’s slaves were ‘fortunate’ to be enslaved by the Order rather than held by slaveholders in Aragon,

---


31 This can be seen in the registry of manumission documents within Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, pp. 92-100; For example, in Luttrell’s register entry 22, is the manumission of Nichola de Metellino who had been a baker at the Hospitaller Casali in Morea. Luttrell provided the reference within the Archive of Malta as AOM 316 Folio 298v, the archive has been re-numerated at the reference is now AOM 316 Folio 302v.


33 Wyatt has noted similar impulses with regard to the historiography on Anglo Saxon England, David Wyatt, Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland 800-1200 (Brill, 2009), pp. 28-32.

34 Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’, p. 112.
Grand Master Hugh Revel statutes of 1262 included the requirement for a Brother to only free their slave if the slave provided the funds to buy two or three slaves, the same requirement that Coureas is implying was evidence of harsher conditions in Aragon. Additionally, Coureas notes that Yiannis Sergencin and Anthony Soupy were freed on the condition that they serve the Order for the rest of their lives, but does not consider that perhaps this would have been a heavier burden than having to pay two or three times their purchase price. Furthermore, Coureas refers to the situation in Aragon from a work by María Dolores López Pérez although this is describing freedom for slaves via self-ransom rather than manumission. Coureas appears to have conflated manumission payments and ransom payments which were typically two or three times higher than the purchase price, the ransom process will be discussed in more detail in chapter 7.

There is no evidence that the Order’s rate of manumission was particularly high, or the conditions of the manumission were particularly kind. The view of manumission as evidence of a more humane slave system displays a lack of understanding of the role of manumission as a means of control and manipulation by the slaveholder. Manumission is not a sign of a more human slave system but can be used to encourage slaves to accept and engage with their enslaved status. As Jennifer Glancy has observed: ‘Far from undermining slavery, regular manumission can reinforce a slave system, particularly in instance in which slaves compensate their owners for their liberty and continue to serve them after manumission, as happened in Roman slavery.’ Manumission was used as a means to encourage obedience, as outlined by Moses Finley, ‘Owners frequently offered slaves the incentive of eventual manumission through various arrangements which automatically brought into being a chain of behaviour and expectations...’ The documents in the Hospitaller archive present only the view of the slaveholder; the enslaved have no voice and as a result the manumission documents which can appear to be ‘kind’ may not be presenting a full picture of the situation, for example many slaves were freed for long service, this could be seen as the Order rewarding a slave
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35 Statutum est quo baylivus, nec alius quisquam frater, non vendat nec det extra domum ullam sclavum, nisi sclavus sit senex aut machatus, seu aliquis velit redimere se, de cuius precio duo aut tres possint haberi sclavi..., Document 3039 ‘Statuts promulgués par le chapitre general de l’ordre sous le magistere d’Hugues Revel’, in Delaville Le Roulx, Cartulaire général de l’Ordre des Hospitaliers, Volume 3, p. 53.
36 Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’, p. 112.
37 María Dolores López Pérez, ‘Marchands, esclaves et mercenaires : les transferts de populations dans le Maghreb médiéval’, in Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes (Xe-XVe siècles) (Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2002), pp. 399-415, ‘Certains d’entre eux parvenaient à retrouver leur liberté par le paiement de fortes sommes, qui doublaient, voire triplaient leur prix de vente initial.’
38 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 174; Epstein Steven, Speaking of Slavery, Color, Ethnicity and Human Bondage in Italy (Cornell University Press, 2001), p. 90 ‘There other common condition was a straight payment...most freedoms came in exchange for cash payments roughly equal to the purchase prices.’
41 Finley, Ancient slavery and modern ideology, p. 142.
for their service, or the Order disposing of an elderly or infirm slave whose labour had diminished in value and removing the cost of maintaining that slave while simultaneously claiming the act to be righteous and a sign of piety.  

This consideration does not appear to have occurred to Coureas or Luttrell, which highlights the problematic approaches within the Hospitaller slaveholding discourse as a result of the lack of understanding of and engagement with the wider slaveholding discourse.

The publication and repetition of documents can cause some issues within the discourse, Coureas’ article only engages with published documents and provides no references to the archival sources, for example, Coureas outlines the 1439 manumission of Kale Georgii tou Latrioti, for this manumission he references Luttrell’s register number 50, within Luttrell’s register the entry states: ‘26 July 1439 [cod. 354, f. 250] Manumission at the petition of Katherine de Lusignana, admiratissa of the kingdom of Cyprus, of Caly georgii tu latrioti sclaua empty[o]ne of the Hospital’s casale of Finika on Cyprus.’

For the same manumission Coureas also provides the reference to the full transcription in Documents Concerning Cyprus where it appears as document 158 with a slightly different archival reference, ‘AOM 354, fol 251r (old 250r)’, helpfully in Documents Concerning Cyprus both new and old references are included as many of the documents in the Hospitaller archive have been renumbered which further complicates the matter of identifying specific documents. The lack of references to the original documents is detrimental as it hinders others from engaging with archival sources in context, forcing a dependence on the previously published sources and their interpretations, which is a barrier to future study. Additionally, this repetition of documents highlights the extent to which the Hospitaller slaveholding discourse has failed to develop, for example AOM 346 folio 164 contains a slave manumission which has been transcribed in Luttrell’s ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, Tsirpanlis, and more recently discussed in the Coureas article, but despite this there has been no constructive engagement with the content. The original 1977 transcription from Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes...’ is as follows: ‘de precepto dominj magistri, et dominorum de conuentu fratre Jeno de Boys requirente fuerunt manumissii Janj sergentin, et Anthonii soupy, sclauj Insule, siue preceptorie langonensiis, cum hac condicione quod toto eorum tempore seruire debeant, et neccessaria ut similibus aliis manumissis, eisdem per preceptorem, siue nostrum locumtenentem prestentur. Data Rhodj die . V . mensis Octubris .m.ccccxxj. sub Impressione etc.’

While Coureas’ 2017 article simply notes; ‘The two Greek slaves of the preceptory of Kos named Yiannis Sergencin and Anthony Soupy, freed by the grand master and the

---

42 Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, p. 90; This will be explored in more detail in chapter 5; Patterson, Slavery and Social Death, p. 225.


44 Borchardt, Luttrell, and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. 158.

convent at the request of the Hospitaller brother Jeno de Bys on 5 October 1421, had to serve the Order for the remainder of their days and receive the necessities of life from the preceptor or his lieutenant ‘like the others similarly manumitted.’46 The details provided by Coureas are simply a translation of the transcription provided by Luttrell; this manumission was used by Coureas as evidence of continued service clauses in manumission documents, ‘Slaves less fortunate than those previously discussed were granted freedom in return for future, as opposed to previous services...’47 This point was previously made by Luttrell also using this manumission, 40 years earlier, ‘Often the freed slave was bound to continue to give service during the life of the Master who manumitted him... or for some other period.’48 The same point has been repeated and in both cases no interpretation or analysis is made, as a result the significance of continued service clauses is not addressed. Continued service clauses are important as a way for slaveholders to keep some control over their freed slaves through the slaves continued dependency and to highlight the distinction between free people and freed people, additionally such clauses require the freed slaves to remain near the slaveholder, the Order’s freed slaves were not able to return home but required to remain and to continue to serve.49 Despite a focus on manumission and publication of manumission documents, the Hospitaller slaveholding discourse has not moved beyond simply noting; ‘The Hospitallers also had slaves, a number of whom they freed’.50

Christianity and slaughter
The manumission of slaves by the Order has also been linked to their Christian identity, beyond the link between manumission and piety for the individual slaveholders, Jürgen Sarnowsky has argued that the Order on Rhodes had misgivings or concerns regarding the enslavement of Christians so as a result would free them, as evidence of this Sarnowsky notes that in 1461 the Order allowed free Greek women who fled from Cyprus and were captured to be sold as slaves but they were to be freed after seven years.51 This decision to free these slaves after seven years of captivity was not a result of the Order’s Christian ideals but was rather in line with an earlier decree from Pope Urban V (1362-1370).52 The decree was issued to encourage the manumission of Greek slaves and as such this is a sign of Papal concerns regarding the enslavement of Greek Christians rather than the

46 Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’, p. 112.
47 Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’, p. 112.
49 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, p.247.
50 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffle, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. Lxxix.
Order’s. Moreover, this seven-year restriction could be circumvented by the Order, as in 1421 two Greek slaves, Yiannis Sergencin and Anthony Soupy, were freed on the condition they served the Order for the rest of their lives. Luttrell notes that the decree of Pope Urban appeared to have no effect on Rhodes.

Sarnowsky is not the only historian to try and link the Order’s actions to their Christian identity, similarly Anne Brogini has framed the medical care provided for sick slaves by the Order as reflecting the importance of the Order’s vows of Hospitality. Rosso Gaetano has questioned how it was possible for the Order to engage with the institution of slavery which he felt was so radically antithetical to Christian ideals and morals. The idea that slaveholding and Christianity are somehow incompatible has been explored in the wider slavery discourse. Writing in 1996, Rosemary Morris when discussing emancipation in Byzantium stated that ‘Slavery is an anomaly in any Christian society.’ To her this view was exemplified in St. Paul’s letter to the Galatians. However, Jennifer Glancy has argues persuasively that this needs to be contextualised within the broader narrative, Glancy observes that ‘...the apparent erasure of division between slave and free that Paul proclaims in 3:28 is only a cover-up, as Paul goes on to reinscribe customary and legal distinctions between slave and free...’. The Catholic church’s concerns regarding slavery were not related to the dehumanisation and mistreatment of the slave but rather that aspects of slave ownership might prove sinful for the Christian slaveholder. This was apparent on Malta where the Inquisition was very interested in the relationships between enslaved and free peoples.

53 Blumenthal, Enemies and familiars, p. 34.
56 Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle : l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque modern’, pp. 49-61, ‘En revanche, les esclaves malades reçoivent des soins assez rares, qui reflètent à la fois l’importance du voeu d’hospitalité prononcé par les chevaliers et leur souci de conserver leur main-d’œuvre en bon état.’
57 Gaetano Rosso, ‘Slaves, corsairs and the Order of Malta in the 16th-17th centuries’, Studi Melitensi, XXVI (2018), pp.69-138. p. 127: ‘Ci si chiede come sia stato possibile che le autorità e le istituzioni religiose e politiche dell’Europa cristiana, compreso l’Ordine di Malta, abbiano approvato e giustificato per secoli un’istituzione radicalmente opposta al comandamento e al sentimento dell’amore.’
58 Wyatt, Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200, p. 10 ‘Following abolitionism, medieval slavery necessarily came to be portrayed as a barbaric, morally corrupting and uncivilised institution that was destined to disappear before the progress of Christian civilisation.’
60 Morris, ‘Emancipation in Byzantium’, p. 130; Galatians 3:27, ‘There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus’
63 This is explored in the discussion of Urban slavery, chapter 4.
Within the context of the Order slaveholding is typically so apparent that it is impossible to argue that their faith prevented them from owning slaves. Although at times there appears to be tension and discomfort regarding this from those writing about Hospitaller slaveholding. These tensions have perhaps led to sanitising interpretations and impulses, as there is a tendency of presenting the Hospitallers as more humane to their slaves because of their Christian faith, often with little evidence to support this contention. For example, Joseph Muscat states; ‘Most probably Muslim slaves in Valletta were treated better than in any other foreign city.’ This will be explored more in chapter 4, but in brief, there is no clear evidence that this is the case.

Rather than highlighting the Order’s supposed ‘kindness’ to their slaves as a means of softening and downplaying the significance of the Order’s slaveholding, Luttrell and Coureas have attempted to distance the Order from the act of enslavement by highlighting the violence of the Order; Coureas identifies the manumission of a Turkish slave in 1511 and notes the rarity of Turkish slaves because ‘...the Hospitallers frequently massacred those Turks whom they captured in battle. It is possible therefore that this Turk had been acquired by purchase.’ Although earlier in the same article Coureas acknowledges the captures of Muslims stating; ‘Some [Slaves] were Muslims or other non-Christians acquired by capture or purchase...’ This focus on slaughter as a means to distance the Order from the act of enslavement had previously been put forward by Luttrell in both his articles, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes: 1306-1462’ and ‘Slavery at Rhodes’. Coureas’s evidence for such massacres is a reference to the Chronicle of Amadi. This evidence is not convincing as the referenced events are from 1308 and 1311, and as Peter Edbury and Nicholas Coureas have argued that the Chronicle of Amadi was composed in 1520, as such this is significantly after the events being described. Additionally, these events are very early examples of Hospitaller naval warfare and are not within the time frame of his article, and most importantly the pages themselves do not suggest a massacre. The Chronicle of Amadi as translated by Nicholas Coureas and Peter Edbury provides a translation for the entry identified by Coureas, ‘The Turks, who numbered 800 or more, were all killed or captured; not more than nine or ten of them escaped.’ Far from suggesting a massacre it is
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64 Tsirpanlis, *Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes*, p. 29: ‘Το ίδιο το Τάγμα είναι γνωστό πως είχε στην κατοχή του σκλάβους...’
explicitly stated that some Turks were captured. Coureas provides no further clarification to suggest that his interpretation of the translation of The Chronicle of Amadi which he co-produced has changed. Furthermore in an earlier article Coureas argued the opposite with regard to slaves taken by the Kingdom of Cyprus stating that ‘Muslim captives were generally seized in the course of piratical raids for economic reasons, with a view to securing a servile labour force to work key industries of the Lusignan kingdom of Cyprus.’ Coureas provides no explanation as to why he believes the Hospitallers would have different motivations or treat captives differently from the Kingdom of Cyprus. It is possible that Coureas believes the Hospitallers to have been more zealous than the kingdom of Cyprus, but given that both groups were capturing slaves to work on sugar plantations on Cyprus it would seem likely that the Order would have similarly acquired its slaves. Luttrell has similarly highlighted and argued that ‘Some of the Turkish slaves involved may have been taken in battle, though the brethren often massacred their Turkish prisoners.’ The slaughter of captured Turks is also highlighted by Luttrell as an explanation as to why Turkish captives were not available to be used as slaves on the Order’s galleys. In both ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes: 1306-1462’ and ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, Luttrell used the same reference as evidence, Ludolphus de Suchem, De itinere Terrae Sancte; while this example does seem to suggest a massacre the example is from 1319, and as Ludolph journeyed to the Holy Land between 1336-1341 this must have been a tale he heard, rather than an eyewitness report, which makes its accuracy questionable. Additionally, this report is not from a document within the Hospitaller archive but more likely an exaggeration of the Order’s martial prowess and, again, this is a very early example.

There is extensive evidence that the Order preferred to enslave captives, for labour exploitation, trade or ransom, rather than slaughtering them. This is clear with regard to Malta: between 1547
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72. Coureas, ‘Christian and Muslim Captives on Lusignan Cyprus: Redemption or Retention?’, p. 531.
73. Use of slaves on sugar plantations is discussed further in chapter 6.
74. Luttrell ‘Slavery at Rhodes’ p. 87.
75. Luttrell ‘Servitudo Marina’, p. 54.
76. Ludolphus de Suchem, De itinere Terrae Sancte, ed. F. Deycks (Litterarischer Verein, 1851), p. 29.
77. In the 17th-century the Order actually enslaved people from the Netherlands as galley slaves who had been galley slaves on a Turkish vessel, Johanna Maria Van Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, (Brill 1998), p. 125; Captured Ottomans were used as slaves on Rhodes, ‘Je n’ai pas trouve d’allusion dans les archives a l’emploi d’une chiourme servile, mais celle-ci est attestee par le recit de l’evasion d’Oruc Re’is: a la suite de diverses mesaventures, le frere du futur Barberousse avait ete affecte aux travaux de terrassement. Ayant besion d’envoyt trois galeres vers les cotes d’Anatolie, les Chevaliers tirent apparentement des rameurs au hasard parmi cette categorie d’esclaves de force. La chose etait banale a en jurger par le recit qu’en fait l’auteur ottoman.’, Nicolas Vatin, L’Order de Saint-Jean-de-Jerusalem, l’Empire ottoman et le Mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522, (Publie avec le concours de centre national de la recherché scientifique, 1994), p. 138; Murphey Rhoads, ‘Seyyid Muradi’s prose Biography of Hizir Ibn Yakub, alias Hayreddin Barbarossa’, Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Vol. 54, No. 4 (2001), pp. 519-532.
and 1575 Brother Matturino de Lescaut Romegas a prominent naval commander within the Order was involved in the capture and enslavement of over 5,000 people.78 Despite this, both Luttrell and Coureas argued that the Order typically did not enslave their enemies and supported this view through the use of very specific evidence, which in the case of Coureas fails to support his view and for Luttrell is a pilgrim’s account rather than evidence from the Order. Similarly, Yvonne Friedman, writing in 2002, argued that the first crusade did not take captives and rather massacred their enemies. She explicitly states ‘The lesson that holding captives for ransom might be more profitable than killing them had to be learned.’79 As evidence of this she provides the account of the siege of Ma’arrat from the *Gesta Francorum*, ‘Our men all entered the city, and each seized as his own whatever goods he found in houses or cellars, and when it was dawn they killed everyone, man or woman, whom they met in any place whatsoever. No corner of the city was clear of Saracen corpses, and one could scarcely go about the city streets except by treading on the dead bodies of Saracens.’80 Friedman does not provide the previous line or the next line of the text that directly contradicts the argument and details clearly that the crusaders were taking captives, the entire section reads; ‘Then Bohemond sent an interpreter to the Saracen leaders to tell them that if they, with their wives and children and goods, would take refuge in a palace which lies above the gate he would save them from death. Our men all entered the city, and each seized as his own whatever goods he found in houses or cellars, and when it was dawn they killed everyone, man or woman, whom they met in any place whatsoever. No corner of the city was clear of Saracen corpses, and one could scarcely go about the city streets except by treading on the dead bodies of Saracens. Then Bohemond took those whom he had ordered to enter the palace, and stripped them of all their belongings, gold, silver and other valuables, and some of them he caused to be killed, others to be taken to Antioch and sold as slaves.’81 Friedman is presenting a narrative where the crusaders did not take slaves, which is clearly not borne out by the primary source evidence. This somewhat

78 This number in a minimum based on the information in the Biography of Romegas as for some engagements the number of slaves is not given but the number of oars on the ship, these have not been included as it is not clear how many oarsmen are assigned to each oar, Biography of Romegas, document 39 of the Codice Trivulziano translated by Carmel Testa in, *Romegas*, (Midsea Books Ltd 2002), p. 223; Also reproduced in C.A. Vianello, ‘Uno stato di servizio di fra Maturino Lescout’, *Archivio storico di Malta*, volume 8: 3 (1936-37), pp. 345-353.

79 Friedman, *Encounter between enemies*, p. 31.


81 *Gesta Francorum*, *The deeds of the franks and the other pilgrims to Jerusalem*, pp. 79-80 ‘Boamundus denique illos quos iusserat in palatium intrare apprehendit, illisque abstulit omnia quae habebant, uidelicet aurum, argentum, aliaque ornamenta; alios uero fecit occidi, alios autem iussit conduci ad uendendum Antiochiea.’
parallels Coureas’s use of The Chronicle of Amadi despite this evidence being in opposition to the point he is making.82

The actions of the Crusaders were particularly violent and were deliberately depicted by contemporary chroniclers as a slaughter so the Crusade could be shown as purifying the Holy Land.83 Had the Crusaders slaughtered the populace of the cities of Antioch and Jerusalem to the extent to which is described in the sources these cities would not have been able to function after the sieges.84 The Crusaders saw themselves on a pilgrimage and once the journey to Jerusalem was over many Crusaders returned to Europe.85 Once the majority of the Crusaders had departed, the establishment of the Crusader Kingdoms would have been impossible had the populations of these cities been wiped out. The new elite needed subjects to administer their territories, so clearly the reports of mass slaughter were over-exaggerated by contemporary Christian writers who sought to present the crusade in the terms of religious ethnic cleansing. There are clear parallels here between the first crusade and the Hospitalers, the Order’s actions were also publicised abroad to highlight violence against Turks.86 Similar to Coureas and Luttrell, Friedman attempts to externalize the Crusaders use of slaves by highlighting the first crusade accounts of the Crusaders slaughtering their enemies.87 Additionally, Friedman argues that slave-taking was a behaviour the crusaders adopted from their enemies.88 Luttrell in an earlier article similar attempts to externalise the Order’s slaveholding as an adopted behaviour caused by external influences, ‘…many brethren, served by their slaves in the semi-oriental society of Rhodes..’89

The importance of this is that Coureas, Luttrell and Friedman when addressing slave ownership by Christians centuries apart responded with similar attempts to distance the crusaders and the Order from slaveholding by highlighting violence and external influences despite the evidence to the contrary. If the Order typically slaughtered all of its Muslim captives, then why did a papal bull in

82 The Chronicle of Amadi, translated by Coureas and Edbury, p. 358, Entry 752.
84 Hay, ‘Collateral damage?’, p. 21.
86 Theresa M. Vann, and Donald J. Kagay. Hospitaller Piety and Crusader Propaganda : Guillaume Caoursin’s Description of the Ottoman Siege of Rhodes, 1480. (Routledge, 2015), p. 46
87 This is also seen within the Anglo Saxon context where Vikings are blamed for on going Anglo Saxon slaveholding, Wyatt, Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland 800-1200, pp. 1-60.
88 Friedman, Encounter between enemies, p. 21.
1237 command the Hospitallers to permit the baptism of their slaves in Syria additionally the Order was being served by domestic slaves prior to the conquest of Rhodes.  

**Wettinger; Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo**

Moving on from the articles of Coureas and Luttrell, the only scholarly monograph that focuses on the subject of Hospitaller slavery to date is that of Godfrey Wettinger, a prominent figure in the study of medieval Malta. Originally written in 1966 as a PhD thesis from the University of London, it was only published in 2002 after several other academics had noted that; ‘...it was a pity the work remained unpublished’. As a result, while Wettinger’s research initially appears to be relatively recent, his *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo: ca 1000 – 1812* predates all of the works discussed so far and it is, for the most part, therefore absent from the historiography to date. To his credit, Wettinger was aware of the lack of historical research on Hospitaller slave ownership. He commented on the apparent disinterest of historians in relation to Hospitaller slavery highlighting how *the historical encyclopedia of world slavery* (2 vols, 1997) and the *Macmillan encyclopedia of world slavery* (2 vols 1998) have not a single reference to Malta ...’, and noting that only Peter Earle and Salvatore Bono have produced works that ...gave much space to slavery on Malta’. The works of Peter Earle and Salvatore Bono are very informative and provide information about slavery on Malta especially with regard to ransom, although neither focus on slave ownership by the Order specifically. Salvatore Bono’s works discuss Malta as part of wider discussions of medieval Mediterranean slavery more generally. Additionally, Peter Earle’s focus is primarily on corsairs, their organisation and activity, with the actual use of slaves by the Order as a minor consideration. The works of both historians have engaged with slavery on Malta, but there remains a lack of focus on the Order’s slaveholding. Wettinger’s book is based almost entirely on archival materials and primary sources with very limited engagement with the secondary literature on either the Hospitallers or medieval slavery more generally. He simply describes the Hospitaller slave system based on the primary evidence rather than attempting to explain, analyse, theorise, or compare the Hospitaller slave system to other systems in any detail. This lack of engagement with the secondary literature can be explained, in part, by the fact that when his text was written there was very little
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90 Luttrell, Slavery at Rhodes, p. 84.
91 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. xxx.
historiography available on the topic. However, Wettingers text has previously been highlighted as
the most important work regarding Hospitaller slavery on Malta.95

The delay in publication means that very few historians have since engaged with the text and it
remains rather marginalised and underutilized although this marginalisation may also be partly due
to the structure of the text. Wettinger sets out no clear research aims as such and there is no
summary of findings, nor an introduction or conclusion. His study simply attempts to describe the
Hospitaller slave system on Malta using examples Wettinger located in the Hospitaller archive. For
example, he outlines the practice of sorcery by the slaves over three pages, detailing three examples
concluding that: ‘The receptivity of the local people themselves however might itself have
encouraged some of the slaves to practice their powers of sorcery which they might not otherwise
have done. In any case, the practice of sorcery was certainly one of the chief ways in which the two
cultures of the Mediterranean world interacted in Malta as a result of the existence of slavery.’96

Disappointingly then, Wettinger provides no discussion of the significance of the Order’s slaves
practising sorcery. He comments on the Inquisition’s interest but there is no mention of the Order’s
reaction. Neither does he consider the agency of enslaved people, for example, he discusses a slave
sorcerer who is noted to be old and who was paid for removing a curse but offers no analysis or
suggestion that this might have been a way for elderly slaves to earn additional income.97

Generally, the approach taken by Wettinger is problematic as his descriptive narrative lacks
analytical depth. For example, Wettinger identifies the decree of 1698 which forbade the knights
from having female slaves younger than the age of 50, he notes ‘Thus the possibility of sexual
misbehaviour by the slave-owners who were knights at the expense of their female slaves was at
length recognised and guarded against.’ While it is true that this decree marks the Order recognizing
the issue and trying to prevent it, Wettinger appears to be suggesting that he believed the 1698
decree to be fully effective rather than analysing it as evidence for ongoing slaveholding behaviours.
Indeed, as will be outlined in Chapter 4, the Brothers likely continued to engage in sexual activity
with their slaves.98 Furthermore, the focus of the work is slavery on Malta and Gozo rather than the
Hospitallers themselves. As such Wettinger is for the most part simply gathering and presenting

95 Francesco Russo, ‘Schiavitù e conversioni a Malta in età moderna: nuove fonti e percorsi di ricerca’, in
Relazioni religiose nel Mediterraneo. Schiavi, redentori, mediatori (secc. XVI-XIX), edibited by S. Cabibbo and M.
Lupi (Viella, Roma 2012), pp. 135-158. ‘Il testo piu importante e piu articolato resta quello di
Wettinger.’; Gregory O’Malley, ‘Some developments in Hospitaller invective concerning the Turks 1407-
1530’, in The Military Orders Volume 6.1, Culture and Conflict in the Mediterranean World, Edited by Jochen
Schenk and Mike Carr (Routledge, 2017), pp. 158-168.
96 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 529.
97 The engagement in sorcery by slaves will be discussed further in chapter 3.
98 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 498.
information on the Hospitallers slave ownership without consideration of how this developed or any comparative analysis with other slaveholding contexts. Wettinger is not alone in this approach, Grima highlighted the same approach within Wismayer's *The fleet of the order of st john 1530-1708*, describing it as; ‘... more intent on amassing information without any attempt at rationalisation and analysis.’\(^9\) This is similar to the collections of transcribed documents identified above which also favour amassing information over analysis.\(^{10}\) It is not clear why, within the study of Hospitaller slavery, that accumulating information appears to be prioritised over analysis. This may be the outcome of the prevalence of slaves in the primary source evidence, combined with the disinclination of scholars to address the significance and importance of slaveholding to the Order, even from those producing works entirely focused on the topic. As previously stated, Luttrell and Coureas made use of a variety of approaches in an attempt to minimise the importance of slavery to the Order. Additionally, within *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo* Wettinger’s antipathy to slavery is at times readily apparent. For example, while discussing slave escape Wettinger states ‘...in fact, the slaves in Malta in private or public ownership frequently risked everything in desperate efforts at escaping, not infrequently meeting with the success they richly deserved.’\(^{101}\) Wettinger also makes comments regarding efficiency; he noted that when free men replaced slaves in the bakery in 1749, 34 paid workers replaced 50 slaves, ‘...an indication of the relative inefficiency of slave labour.’\(^{102}\) Even though this is then later contradicted within the same work when Wettinger details that by 1766 slaves were brought back because the free men were insufficient and they were costing the Order far more than using slaves had.\(^{103}\)

Wettinger is not alone in trying to suggest that the use of slaves was inefficient or more expensive. Luttrell in ‘The *Servitudo Marina* at Rhodes’ questioned the efficiency of slaves and argued that the Order on Rhodes would not have used slaves to row their galleys as a result of the high cost of slave labour, although in his later work, *The town of Rhodes 1306-1356* (2003), with regard to construction he stated ‘...it was cheaper to use slave labour to build walls...’\(^{104}\) Moreover, in *Documents concerning Cyprus*, the introduction states that ‘...some slaves were probably employed in sugar production...’ but also argues that sugar production was seasonal and therefore it was not economical to use slaves, an argument that is undermined a few pages later when detailing that the
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\(^{10}\) Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus*; Luttrell’s ‘Slavery at Rhodes’; Zacharias N Tsirpanis’s *Anekdota engrapha gia tê Rodo kai tis Noties Sporades apo to archeio tôn Iânnitôn hippotôn 1421-1453*; Luttrell, O’Malley, *The Countryside Of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423*.

\(^{101}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 127.

\(^{102}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 318.

\(^{103}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 330.

King of Cyprus managed to support 1500 slaves for producing sugar.\textsuperscript{105} The income the Order gained from Cyprus shows that the production of sugar more than covered the costs associated with using slaves. The seasonal aspect of sugar production did not prevent the use of slaves in the New World nor did it on Cyprus; in fact the seasonal element was essential since it allowed time for the harvests to be boiled over the winter.\textsuperscript{106} This economic argument requires an alternative to the ‘inefficient’ slaves, free people need to be available source of labour but this was not always the case for many of the tasks that were performed by slaves, David Eltis and Stanley L Engerman argued that ‘Concentration of slaves in particular tasks may be attributed broadly to the ability of nonslaves to avoid activities that were particularly unpleasant.’\textsuperscript{107} With regard to rowing specifically, Richard Unger has argued that free people did not want to be oarsmen, ‘... no volunteers could be found at any price and rowers became exclusively men who had not chosen the task.’\textsuperscript{108} The Order on Rhodes had attempted to make use of non-slave labour as oarsmen through a form of hereditary naval service known as the Servitudo Marina, however this system was unpopular and was abolished in 1462. In this instance the Order could not have used free men as oarsmen as none were willing and so they chose to exploit the labour of the enslaved instead, a point that will be further explored in chapter 2.

If the use of slaves was ‘inefficient’, it is rather a moot point, for the Hospitallers made use of slaves and there is no evidence that they ever considered not using slaves or that they questioned the efficiency of using slaves. The focus on the economic inefficiency of slavery often has the same motivations behind it as when Adam Smith famously argued in 1776, ‘...the work done by freemen comes cheaper in the end than that performed by slaves.’ Yet Smith’s influential remarks, written at the height of the British slave trade, probably had as much to do with his abolitionist sentiments as they did with sound economic reasoning.\textsuperscript{109} As such discussions of cost and efficiency with regard to slavery can be misleading, in the instances above, Luttrell, Coureas and Wettinger are attempting to use such a focus to argue that the Order would not use slaves for specific tasks, the motivation for this is not related to cost but rather to undermine the significance of slaveholding to the Order despite the evidence to the contrary, there is clear evidence of large numbers of slaves being used to

\textsuperscript{105} Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, \textit{Documents concerning Cyprus}, pp. Lxxix – Lxxxv.
row the Order’s galleys and produce sugar.\textsuperscript{110} With regard to Wettinger’s use of this economic focus, he is trying to show that slaveholding was inherently inefficient, but the context of his example is significant, it is following the 1749 slave revolt, which will be discussed in chapter 4, this revolt was the driving force behind the reduction in the use of slaves in a range of different tasks.\textsuperscript{111}

**Slaves overlooked**

The issue highlighted at the start of this chapter was that the importance of slaveholding to the Order is frequently overlooked or given very little attention. The question remains, why has slavery been overlooked? This is a complex question and does not have a specific answer, there is a range of different factors that may have contributed to why specific scholars have or have not acknowledged the Order’s slaveholding, this section will seek to identify some of the likely factors.

With regard to penal slavery, Patterson stated, ‘It is truly extraordinary that European scholars have either neglected this whole aspect of the subject or defined it as something other than slavery when they have recognized it. When we look for reasons, it is too easy to claim that there has been a conspiracy of silence, or worse, a deliberate attempt to distort the historical facts. My own feeling is that there has been a genuine failure to recognize the institution for what it was owing to the pervasiveness of the intrusive conception of slavery on the Western intellectual consciousness.’\textsuperscript{112} Patterson’s suggestion that the institution has not been recognised by scholars is possible in regard to Hospitaller slaveholding. The situation of slaves, captives and prisoners has at times been homogenised within the Hospitaller discourse, which can result in slaves not being identified.

The terminology varied over time, which further increases the difficulties of identifying slaves in the sources. Hector Zagal has noted that ‘...the Greek doulos, the Roman servus and the Medieval Servus do not have the same meaning...’\textsuperscript{113} While the Roman *servus* appears to refer to slaves and the Medieval *servus* to serfs, Ross Samson notes how the replacement of slaves by serfs historically, a common assumption, may be the result of *servi* being translated by historians as serf rather than slave instead of any real historical precedent.\textsuperscript{114} Steven Epstein noted that *servus* was applied

\textsuperscript{110} Solomidou-Ieronymidou ‘The Crusaders, sugar mills and sugar production in Medieval Cyprus,’ p. 66.

\textsuperscript{111} Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61, references AOM 6571 folio 92rv.

\textsuperscript{112} Patterson, *Slavery and social Death*, p. 45.


equally to slaves and serfs in twelfth century France.\textsuperscript{115} The Hospitaller statutes of 1262 made use of the term \textit{Sclavus} to refer to slaves.\textsuperscript{116} Verlinden has argued that \textit{Sclavus} was used in the thirteenth century with the growth of Italian slave trading as a generic term for slave, having lost its previous link to Slavic peoples.\textsuperscript{117} Susan Mosher Stuard notes that \textit{Sclavi} was being used in Venice’s Dalmatian urban colony of Ragusa to refer to servile peoples as early as 1272.\textsuperscript{118} In 1413 the Order manumitted a \textit{Servo} on Cyprus in return for a \textit{Sclavum}. This manumission was included in the source collection \textit{Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian archives: 1409-1459} edited by Karl Borchardt, Anthony Luttrell and Ekard Schoffler and summarised as a serf being freed in return for a slave.\textsuperscript{119} By the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries, the Italian \textit{Schiavo} was widely used.\textsuperscript{120} Moses Finley noted that when faced with terms for different servile status often anyone who is not obviously a slave or a free person is simply labelled as a ‘serf’.\textsuperscript{121} Which does appear to have been the case with regard to the people who owed the service to the sea, the \textit{Servitudo Marina}, which has been defined by Luttrell rather ambiguously as both similar to serfdom and unlike serfdom, this will be discussed further in chapter 2.\textsuperscript{122}

Although misidentifying slaves may at times be a conscious choice, for example captive does not have the same negative connotations as slave. This can be seen in Yvonne Friedman’s work, \textit{Encounter between enemies: captivity and ransom in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem}, throughout this monograph Friedman only makes use of the term captive even when such a term does not appear to be applicable, she observes that ‘...the military orders used the captives as slave labour for their building and fortification projects and they therefore had to be kept in tolerable conditions so as not to impair their value as a labour force.’\textsuperscript{123} It is unclear why these ‘captives’ used as slave labour are not simply ‘slaves’, especially as Friedman links their value not to their ransom value but

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{115} Steven Epstein, \textit{Purity Lost; Transgressing Boundaries In the Eastern Mediterranean, 1000—1400} (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), p. 20.  
\textsuperscript{116} Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, p. 85.  
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\textsuperscript{120} Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Ilustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano} volume 2, uses Schiavo.  
\textsuperscript{121} Moses Finley, ‘The Emergence of a Slave Society’, in \textit{Critical readings on global slavery, Volume 3}, Edited by Damian Alan Pargas and Felicia Rosu (Brill, 2018), p. 61.  
\textsuperscript{123} Friedman, \textit{Encounter between enemies}, p. 113.}
rather their value as a labour force. The use of the term ‘captive’ rather than slave may be
tentional to distance the Order from slave ownership, additionally the argument that labour value
would have resulted in tolerable conditions is rather weak, throughout history people who had a
ransom value or a labour value have been worked to death, for example at the end of the siege of
Acre Richard I slaughtered some 3,000 captives whose ransom was being negotiated with Saladin,
clearly value alone does not ensure ‘tolerable’ conditions.¹²⁴

The Order also homogenised slaves, captives, and prisoners, all three groups lived in the same slave
prisons or bagni this is outlined more in chapter 4.¹²⁵ Although there was a clear distinction between
slaves and prisoners serving as oarsmen onboard the Order’s galleys. For the Hospitallers the
overlap between captive, prisoner of war and slave can be linked to the means by which the Order
gained slaves, often through naval combat. Daniel Hershenzon notes regarding captives taken in
naval combat ‘…in modern parlance these captives would be deemed “Prisoners of war”.’¹²⁶ The
free man who was defeated by the Order became their captive/prisoner of war/slave, whereupon
they may be ransomed, given as a gift, exchanged as part of a treaty, sold, manumitted, or a
combination of these, with some slaves being sold to then be ransomed, slaves given as part of a
treaty were often then freed. At no point was the outcome definite, nor was the distinction between
the different forms of servile status explicitly demarcated. As such the distinction between slaves
and captives can often only be made after a slave has been ransomed and so retrospectively was a
captive.¹²⁷ As a result the situation surrounding enslavement and captivity could be very fluid. For
example in February 1503 Camal Bei was regarded by the Order as simply a domestic slave until an
Ottoman negotiator sought his release, thereby highlighting his elite status to the Order; his
situation thereafter changed rapidly from that of a slave to a political hostage whom the Order
sought to use to gain the freedom of a group of Christian slaves held by the Ottomans and they
wrote to Korkut, the son of the Sultan Bayezid II, to begin negotiating the exchange.¹²⁸ Despite this
significant change in status for Camal Bei, there was no change in the term used to describe him and
he was still referred to as Sclavus.¹²⁹ For Camal Bei this change in situation did not discourage him

¹²⁴ Helen J. Nicholson, Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum Et Gesta
¹²⁵ Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 620;
Nadalo, ‘Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier’, p. 291
¹²⁷ Barker and Karras, That Most Precious Merchandise, p. 13; Azzopardi-Ljubibratic, ‘The Notarial Archives and
Jews in early modern Malta’, pp. 213-222.; Joan Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in
the Sixteenth Century (The Boydell Press, 2018), p. 10 n. 59
¹²⁸ Giacomo Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume
¹²⁹ AOM 80, folio 81v, 23rd of February 1503, ‘...sclauu’ suu’ familiare’ nomie Camalbei...’; AOM 80, folio 82v, 8th
of March 1503, ‘...sclauo tuo camalbei.’
from fleeing his captors in 1504 he drowned while attempting to escape Malta.130 This example and
the motivation of Camal Bei to escape while his ransom was being negotiated will be discussed more
in chapter 7. The Order’s use of Sclavus as a broad term does not mean that all of their slaves were
in the same situation or, indeed, that the experiences of people so labelled were static and
unchanging. Camel Bei’s situation varied considerably but the servile label applied to him did not.

This overlap between slave and captive may represent a barrier for engagement with the topic of
Hospitaller slave ownership although this situation was not unique and appears to have been
common in the Mediterranean. Daniel Hershenzon notes ‘...captivity and slavery were not exclusive
conditions but rather dimensions of a single process. Contemporaries used the terms “captive” and
“slave” interchangeably to refer to the system’s victims.’131 Benjamin Kedar with regard to the
Frankish Levant similarly noted, ‘...forms of Muslim existence under Frankish rule were captivity and
slavery, with the dividing line between the two being rather blurred.’132

There is an issue of compartmentalisation which can undermine the significance of the Order’s
slaveholding as Hospitaller slaveholding on Rhodes and Malta are viewed in isolation from each
other and from the wider network of Mediterranean slaving which was international in scale and
incorporated extensive and highly lucrative raiding and trading networks.133 As a result, the
situations on Rhodes and Malta are considered separately and not as part of a continuous and
evolving system of Hospitaller slaveholding. This is also the case with Wettingers work, the focus is
slavery on Malta and Gozo rather than the Hospitallers themselves there is no consideration of how
the Order’s slaveholding developed. This is not an issue unique to the study of Hospitaller
slaveholding as many studies focus on the Order solely regarding either Rhodes or Malta, but for the
study of Hospitaller slaveholding it can lead to some problematic assertions. For example, Luttrell in
‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes: 1306-1462’, argues incorrectly that galley slaves were unknown
during the period [1306-1462] and when discussing the abolition of the Servitudo Marina notes
vaguely ‘...possibly the Hospital began at about this time to use slaves...’134 Luttrell’s speculative
statement indicates doubt that the Order made use of slaves after the abolition of the Servitudo
Marina. The use of galley slaves is evident on Malta, likely as a continuation of their use of galley
slaves on Rhodes, but due to the limited focus on only Rhodes this point was missed by Luttrell. As a

---

130 Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence between Sehzade Korkud and the knights of
131 Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 4.
133 This approach to the Mediterranean as a wider slaving network is prominent in the modern discourse,
‘The captivity of Muslims and the captivity of Christians formed interdependent elements in a single
result this could cause scholars studying Rhodes to consider slaveholding to not be relevant. This situation is not unique to the Hospitallers. Indeed, Wyatt argued that there has been a tendency to underplay or compartmentalize medieval slavery within broader discourses relating to medieval societies, noting ‘...until recently scholars of medieval history have rarely discussed slavery. Indeed, many medieval historians have chosen to ignore the subject altogether.’

It is also important to note that the existing historiography of Hospitaller slaveholding remains isolated from the extensive discourse on slavery in the Mediterranean and on medieval slavery more broadly. The Order’s slave system continued to follow earlier precedents; the prominent historian Charles Verlinden in his seminal 1955 text *L’esclavage dans L’Europe medieval* noted that the slavery taking place on Rhodes was similar to that of the Holy land. This similarity can be seen in the clauses within the Order’s manumission documents, which followed earlier precedents; for example freed slaves regained their rights as Roman Citizens. Although to date, none of the scholars who have written about Hospitaller slavery have been specialists on the topic of slaveholding and they have made little attempt to engage with the complex theoretical developments in the analysis of slave-holding societies that can be seen in other medieval contexts. The study of medieval slavery in general is underdeveloped when compared to the study of New World or ancient slavery, which has been described as a ‘...fixation on great slaveries.’ This relates to the Ancient and New World slave societies that Finley identified as ‘genuine’ slave societies. Although Finley notes that the resurgence in the study of ancient slavery from the mid-1950, resulted from the political situation at the time; ‘...in the guise of a discussion of ancient slavery, there has been a desultory discussion of Marxist theory, none of it, on either side particularly illuminated about either Marxism or slavery.’ Medieval slavery does not fit with the great slave societies identified by Finley, and is underdeveloped compared to the study of New World or ancient slavery, as a result there is a lack of

---

135 Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200*, p. 2.


137 This is explored in chapter 2; ‘...ciuemque romanam et ciues romanos...’; Archivum Ordinis Melitensis (AOM), (The National Archive of Malta) Document 362, Folio 205v-206, (1451); Tsirpanlis, *Anekdota engrapha gia tē Rodo kai tis Noties Sporades apo to archeio tôn ēannitōn hippotōn 1421-1453*, Document 235, pp. 581-582.


141 Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 130.
engagement with Hospitaller slavery by the wider slaveholding discourse, but this is not particularly surprising. Although more engagement would be beneficial to provide an insight into slaveholding behaviours and approaches to identifying slaves in the sources.

Primary sources containing information about slaves is another potential barrier to engagement. While manumission documents have been highlighted as a prominent source regarding Hospitaller slaveholding, as previously emphasized these sources can and have been used to undermine the significance of Hospitaller slaveholding. Additionally, the slaves themselves produced very few written documents requiring the use of other sources, such as the accounts of visitors to Malta.\textsuperscript{142} Christine Muscat encountered the same issue when investigating courtesans in Malta; ‘Voices of courtesans in early modern Valletta must therefore be constructed through peripheral evidence.’\textsuperscript{143} Stephanie Nadalo argues that with regard to piracy the focus of Anglophone historians has often been European slaves rather than Muslims because ‘Muslim slaves did not typically participate in the literary genre of captivity narratives...’ and as a result direct testimony from Muslim slaves is extremely rare.\textsuperscript{144} Although there are some surviving sources from slaves on Malta, Russell Palmer has noted that when accounts of slaves are identified they are frequently deemphasized as unreliable.\textsuperscript{145} This would suggest a more conscious effort to disregard the accounts written by slaves, this will be addressed in more detail in Chapter 4, however it does appear that the accounts of slaves are sometimes discounted as exaggerations.\textsuperscript{146}

Much of the Hospitaller discourse has been focused on significant members of the Order, higher from above rather than from below, within this context it is not surprising that slaves would not be addressed.\textsuperscript{147} With regard to archaeological sites Palmer has suggested that rather than seek new evidence, old evidence needs to be re-examined through the lens of identifying evidence of captivity and slavery holding.\textsuperscript{148} The same is true of the Order’s written sources as well, slaveholding is apparent in the histories produced by the Order’s historians Giacomo Bosio and Bartolomeo dal
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Pozzo. Although with regard to Christian corsairing Peter Earle states ‘From the general silence on this subject one might assume that Christian Europe has had a collective feeling of guilt about the activity of its corsairs for some two hundred years.’ The lack of study regarding Hospitaller slaveholding may be a result of its unsavoury nature. Similar trends can be seen within the approach to medieval slavery more generally. This could explain why some of the works that have engaged with this topic have attempted to sanitise, justify, or externalise slaveholding.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has sought to provide an overview of some of the overarching trends and approaches to the study of Hospitaller slaveholding. While different historians have noted that Hospitaller slaveholding has been underestimated or ignored this kind of reflection has not previously been undertaken within the Hospitaller discourse regarding the topic of slavery. This lack of reflection is likely a factor in why the study of Hospitaller slaveholding has had difficulty moving forward, those works that have engaged with the topic are often doing so in isolation.

Throughout the existing Hospitaller slaveholding discourse there have been multiple, sometimes contradictory, attempts to limit the Order’s engagement with slaveholding; a focus on Manumission, highlighting both the Order’s Christian identity, inclination for slaughter, and inefficiency. The Order is presented as kind to the slaves it possessed and freed them through manumission. Manumission documents are visible within the Hospitaller archive, this can be the cause of the focus on manumission but beyond that it is a focus that can easily be used to argue the Order was a ‘kind’ slaveholder. Additionally, the Order’s slaves are presented as being fairly treated and not harmed or beaten unnecessarily. The Order is then distanced from the act of enslavement, by not enslaving its enemies. The discourse presents an idealised version of slavery that did not exist; different authors writing about different topics at different times have all made the same attempts to in some way sanitise the Order’s use of slaves. Much of the Hospitaller slaveholding discourse has not moved beyond simplistic interpretations of the slaves, the same examples of slaves highlighted by Luttrell 40 years ago, are still being discussed in the same terms as then with no development in the


150 Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 10.

151 Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland 800-1200*, pp. 2-3 ‘Indeed, many medieval historians have chosen to ignore the subject altogether. Those historians who have dealt with slavery have attempted to sanitise our view of the institution... Other historians have attempted to distance the societies of medieval Britain from the institution of slavery by attributing its existence to the influence of other ethnic groups.’

discourse. Moreover it has been highlighted that accumulating information appears to be prioritised over analysis. Unlike much of the existing discourse this thesis is seeking to not only amass information but provide more analysis and engage far more with the wider slavery discourse which has valuable methodologies for approaching primary source evidence.

Why has slavery been overlooked? There is no clear answer, this chapter highlighted a range of different possibilities and while there will not be a single cause, the compartmentation of the slaves on Rhodes and Malta as separate has not helped the understanding of the Hospitaller slave system. Additionally the focus of the Hospitaller discourse has often been from above, focusing on leading Hospitallers, and overlooking the Order’s slaves. The Hospitallers at their inception had no link to slavery or intention to take up slaveholding; this development was likely the result of circumstance rather than grand design, for example one of the main uses of slaves by the Order was to row its fleet of galleys, the Order needed galleys to continue its mission of holy war. The use of slaves for this task was a by-product, as the Order on Rhodes had initially used a form of inherited naval service known as the Servitudo Marina to man the oars. This service has some clear overlaps with slavery but the approach within the discourse has ignored this and defined those who owed the Servitudo Marina in opposition to slaves, this will be explored further in the following chapter.

---

Part 1, At Sea

Chapter 2, The *Servitudo Marina*

The operation of the Order’s galleys required a substantial number of oarsmen, approximately 120 per galley.¹ The recruitment of oarsmen was a major concern for all of the Mediterranean naval powers.² The Knights Hospitaller on Rhodes obtained oarsmen through the *Servitudo Marina*, ‘Service to the sea’, a system of hereditary naval service that was used until it was abolished in 1462.³ Following the abolition of the *Servitudo Marina* the Order made widespread use of slaves, convicts known as *Forzati* and debtors known as *Buonavoglia*. As noted by Robert Davis a similar shift occurred across the Mediterranean as traditional naval recruitment failed to provide enough oarsmen, causing naval powers to turn to ‘…slave labour to make up the ever-widening shortfall.’⁴ The reason for this shift related to the changing status of oarsmen and will be further explored within this chapter.

The *Servitudo Marina* was not slavery, those involved in the service were not bought or sold and did not face the same restrictions. The importance of the *Servitudo Marina* for this study is the way some aspects of this service overlap with slavery and how this service has been interpreted within the Hospitaller discourse. The use of people bound to *Servitudo Marina* rather than slaves to provide oarsmen has been interpreted as evidence of the Order’s non-engagement with slave labour during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, a problematic approach that defines the *Servitudo Marina* in opposition to slavery.⁵ This has prevented the consideration of links between the *Servitudo Marina* and slavery, this chapter seeks to examine this and present a reinterpretation of the *Servitudo Marina*. Examining how this interpretation has developed provides an important example of a trend in the Hospitaller discourse which distances the Order from slavery and slaveholding or highlights only certain aspects such as the freeing of slaves.

¹ Mike Carr, *Merchant crusaders in the Aegean 1291-1352*, (The Boydell press 2015), p. 83. This number will be investigated further within this chapter.
³ The earliest surviving referenced within the *Liber Bullarum* is from 1347, AOM 317, folio 234v, this is also highlighted by Luttrell, in ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes 1306-1462’, p. 54.
⁵ This can be seen within the arguments of Anthony Luttrell which are discussed further within this chapter, Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 53-54, ‘Their servitudo was not that of the slave...’
Within the Hospitaller archives there is no outline of what the *Servitudo Marina* involved or what it meant for a person to have that obligation. None of the surviving documents outline what the *Servitudo Marina* entailed. This is not surprising, since the earliest Hospitaller documents are from 1346 and there are large gaps within the material that survives; between 1346 and 1381 there are very few registers. Although many of the terms used by the Order were not defined, this was not an issue unique to the Hospitallers, as the Cypriot laws regarding slavery also do not specify the legal status of the slaves or the common restrictions related to their servile status. Oarsmen like slaves are rarely mentioned in the surviving documentation. Given the importance of the navy to the Order this lack of information may seem surprising as the Admiral was an important role in the Order and the first Admiral Fulk de Villaret, appointed in 1299, later became Grand Master in 1305. The earliest reference to the *Servitudo Marina* is from 1347 within one of the earliest surviving *Libri Bullarum*: the document freed Xeno Lustiariti Mirodi and his children from the *Servitudo Marina*. No doubt the Order was making use of the *Servitudo Marina* prior to 1347, but the basic legal status of the individuals who owed the *Servitudo Marina* was not given.

In 1975 Anthony Luttrell produced the only dedicated article on the subject, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes; 1306-1462’ and classified these documents freeing those who owed *Servitudo Marina* as ‘manumissions’. These manumissions appear alongside slave manumissions within the *Libri Bullarum* in the Archive of the Order of Malta, typically under the heading ‘libertates et inmunitates marinariorum et servorum’, or ‘Libertates Servorum et Marinariorum’. The similarities between these documents extend beyond their placement within the *Libri Bullarum*, like slave manumissions the documents freeing those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* contain clauses that return the individual’s status as a Roman citizen, *teque liberum et absolutum ciuemque Romanam efficimus*.

---

7 Undefined terms have been highlighted by Luttrell and O’Mally, *The Countryside Of Hospitalier Rhodes 1306-1423*, p. 23 Casale, p. 27, the categories of military men; Slaves in Cypriot Laws see, Benjamin Arbel, ‘Slave trade and slave labor in Frankish and venetian Cyprus (1191-1571)’ in *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries* (Variorum, 2000), (IX) p. 159; Nikolaou-konnari Angel, ‘Greeks’, in *Cyprus, society and culture 1191-1347*, Edited by Angel Nikolaou-Konnari, Chris Schabel (Brill, 2005), p. 38.
9 Second entry on the folio, line 2 contains ‘...ab omni nexu servili marino et terestri...’ 1347 AOM 317, folio 234v, mentioned by Luttrell in ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’ pp. 54, 60.
10 Luttrell ‘The Servitudo Marina’, p. 63 ‘...the manumission of marinarii...’; Luttrell, ‘Lindos and the defence of Rhodes’, p.322 ‘...a woman from Rhodes who was bound to the Servitudo Marina, the master of the Hospital manumitted her...’ referring to AOM 367 folio 170.
11 AOM 347 folio 214v, 220v, AOM 363 folio 206, 200, transcriptions included in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus*.
This terminology in regard to slaves is expected and follows medieval slave manumission norms; regaining the rights of a Roman citizen appears in manumission documents unrelated to the Order such as in the 1301 manumission of Ianni Cruschulo of Chios.13 Benjamin Arbel has highlighted that ‘...it was considered self-evident that the principles of Roman law, as defined in Justinian’s corpus and its commentaries, guided legal practice of manumission which declare that the freed slave regained his status of ‘Roman citizenship’ and which enumerate the various capacities connected with this status.’14 The sixteenth century Hospitaller historian Giacomo Bosio, in his history of the Order, described how liberty was returned to those who owed the Servitudo Marina when the service was abolished in 1462, '...fecero i Vassalli, e Sudditi sopradetti, franchi, liberi, & esenti in perpetuo, dalla seruitù della Marinaria sopradetta...', they became free franks, highlighting that their previous status was not free.15 The implication is that the individual was regaining a lost status, although probably it was a status that never existed for that individual, since Servitudo Marina, like slavery, was typically an inherited status.16 This clause does not appear within all Servitudo Marina manumission documents but appears to be more common in later documents.17 Additionally like a slave manumission, within the documents freeing those who owed the Servitudo Marina the terms maumittimus, manumissionem or manumittentis were often used.18 Although within the more recent works, Documents Concerning Cyprus, by Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler and Anekdota engrapha gia tē Rodo kai tis Noties Sporades apo to archeiōn tōn lōannitōn hippopotōn 1421 -1453 by Tsirpanlis these documents are described as ‘exemptions’ rather than ‘manumissions’, the reason for this difference is not outlined in either work

12 Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, pp. 444-446, document 152, transcription of AOM 357 folio 221v-222; A similar clause can be seen in AOM 363 fol 206, Slave Manumission of a Tartar Slave Ludovicus 1451, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. 389, document 285, ‘...liberum et inmunem civemque Romanum efficimus per imperpetuum...’

13 McKee, Uncommon Dominion : Venetian Crete and the Myth of Ethnic Purity, p. 131 note 148 ‘...in omnibus eficiaris Romanus...’

14 Arbel, ‘Slave trade and slave labor in Frankish and venetian Cyprus (1191-1571)’, p. 153.


16 This idea was suggested by Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina’, p. 54, but there is a lack of evidence about Rhodes prior to the arrival of the Order.


and may be an attempt to further distance the *Servitudo Marina* from Slavery.\(^{19}\) Regardless, these documents, like slave manumissions, provide an insight into the system. Also like slave manumissions, these examples were most likely the exceptions rather than the norm, but they are some of the most detailed documents regarding the *Servitudo Marina*.

In the same article where Luttrell classified the documents freeing those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* as manumissions he also defined the service in opposition to both serfdom and slavery stating that ‘Their *servitudo* was not that of the slave, nor was it the corvee of a serf, but rather the duty of a conscript paid for his service.’\(^{20}\) This fails to address the similarities with regard to the manumissions documents between those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* and slaves. Additionally this was counter to the view held by earlier historians, for example E. Rossi had described the *Servitudo Marina* as a form of slavery.\(^{21}\) Luttrell acknowledged this difference in a footnote and stated that Rossi misinterpreted the status but provided no explanation.\(^{22}\) Charles Verlinden in his work *L’esclavage dans L’Europe medieval* noted that Luttrell’s article had revealed the existence of a form of public servitude, the *Servitudo Marina*, this suggests that Verlinden viewed it as similar to slavery or serfdom.\(^{23}\) Additionally the Order’s historian Giacomo Bosio described the status as similar to a serf.\(^{24}\) Luttrell’s interpretation in this article has been broadly influential and has become the cornerstone of modern understanding of the *Servitudo Marina*; indeed it appears as a reference within all subsequent scholarly discussions of the *Servitudo Marina* as a result the earlier interpretations of Rossi and Verlinden are not referenced in later works.\(^{25}\)

\(^{19}\) Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus*, the term exemption is used to describe documents freeing those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* in Document 9 (AOM 339 folio 256v) and Document 68 (AOM 346 folio 164rv); Tsirpanlis, *Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes*, for documents freeing those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* the term ‘απαλλαγή’ is used which translated to exemption, as can be seen in document 22 (AOM 347, folio 200v-201) and document 284 (AOM 363 folio 243v).


\(^{22}\) Luttrell, ‘The servitude marina at Rhodes’, p. 53 footnote 12.

\(^{23}\) ‘A. Luttrell a montre qu’il y existait une sorts de servitude publique, la *Servitudo Marina*, dont les membres etaient galeriens sur les navires de l’Ordre,’ Verlinden, *L’esclavage dans L’Europe medieval* Volume 2, p. 975.

\(^{24}\) ‘Eravi in Rodi vna conditione di Sudditi, e Vassalli, chiamati Marinari; i quali quasi come Serui della Religione; à quella erano obligati d’vna seruitù, che Marinaria si chiamaua...’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano* volume 2, pp. 285-6.

In a departure from this interpretation Jürgen Sarnowsky argued that the Order’s concerns about
the enslavement of Christians can be seen through the freeing of those who owed the *Servitudo
Marina*.\(^{26}\) This presents *Servitudo Marina* as a form of enslavement and suggests the use of
Christians in this servile status was something the Order was concerned about. Although the context
in which Sarnowsky linked the *Servitudo Marina* to enslavement is important. It has been argued in
the previous chapter, that the focus on slave manumission within the discourse, starting with Luttrell
and continued by Coureas, reveals an impulse to ‘sanitize’ the Order’s slave system, manumission
having traditionally been framed to highlight the slaveholder’s humanity without consideration of
the use of manumission as a form of control.\(^{27}\) This impulse to ‘sanitize’ the Order’s actions is
similarly reflected in Sarnowsky’s argument in relation to manumission and the *Servitudo Marina*.
There is no clear link between manumission and the Order’s Christian identity, and there is no
evidence that the Order was concerned about its enslavement of Christians. In a more recent work,
Sarnowsky shifts his position, presenting the *Servitudo Marina* as a service undertaken by Greeks
with no mention of servile status.\(^{28}\)

Despite Luttrell presenting the service as different from slavery his outline of the service includes
several unacknowledged parallels to slavery; ‘...the Hospitallers recruited the predominantly Greek
population of the islands for naval service through a system known as the *Servitudo Marina,*
*servitudo marinariorum* or *servitut de la marine.* By this arrangement the *subditi marinarii* were
obliged, normally by reason of the status of one or other of their parents, to serve at sea. This
*Servitudo* never involved Latins, and it seems to have had no exact parallel anywhere else.’\(^{29}\) That
those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* inherited their status and were identified as being separate
from those people who regulated their status are clear parallels to slaves or serfs.\(^{30}\) Further he

---

\(^{26}\) ‘Bedenken des Ordens gegenüber der Versklavung von Christen zeigen sich gelegentlich in den aktuellen
Beschlüssen des Rats... Das galt zum einen für die Befreiungen von der servitudo marina (bis 1462), die immer
\(^{27}\) Kleijwegt, ‘Freedpeople: A Brief Cross-cultural History’, p. 19 ‘...a whole generation of scholars have looked
at the combination of government intervention and manumission as a powerful indicator of a particular slave
society’s humanity.’
\(^{28}\) ‘...und ein Teil der griechischen Einwohner der Insel unterlag der servitudo marina, einem unfreien Status
p. 359; On Rhodes, part of the crews were Greeks who had to serve under the *servitudo marina,* which was
only abolished in 1462 and required its own administration.’ Sarnowsky, ‘The ships of the Knights of St John’,
p. 362.
\(^{29}\) Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 52.
\(^{30}\) David Eltis and Stanley L. Engerman, ‘Series Editors introduction’, in *The Cambridge world history of slavery,
XIII, ‘A second common characteristic is the fact that chattel status is a heritable condition passed down
15, ‘...the vast majority of slaves in history have originated from outside the group that was responsible for
their enslavement.’
argued that galley slavery could not have taken place alongside the Servitudo Marina: ‘Galley-slaves were almost completely unknown during this period, for oarsmen were expected to fight as well as to row and so had to be trustworthy; in any case, the cost of slaves was extremely high. Furthermore, the Hospitallers often slaughtered captured Turks who might have been put to the oars.’ 31 This view is underpinned by several problematic and flawed assertions resulting in a skewed interpretation of the Servitudo Marina in what remains the only dedicated secondary source on the topic, on which many other interpretations within the discourse are based. These problematic assertions will now be addressed in turn, to unpack the issues and flaws within them.

Firstly, galley slaves were not ‘...almost completely unknown during this period...’ as Luttrell argues. Indeed, the existence of galley slaves in the Mediterranean is evident for some time prior to the Hospitaller’s period on Rhodes. The statutes of the maritime republic of Ragusa included specific mention of slaves that sail as mariners and as hired sailors. 32 These statutes were originally compiled in 1272, pre-dating the Hospitaller conquest of Rhodes. 33 The fourteenth century additions to the Rhodian Sea law, a Byzantine legal text, specifically mentions crimes caused by slaves sent out to work by the slaveholder, ‘κύριος’, these additions must have had significance to naval activity to merit their inclusion in the text. 34 The Fatimid Navy had been making use of forced labour to crew their ships even before the first crusade. 35 Galley slaves were used in the Mediterranean during the medieval period. Luttrell himself highlights examples of slaves being presented as substitutes rowers as part of the manumission of people who owed the Servitudo Marina, thus slaves and Servitudo Marina were working side by side in the fifteenth century. 36

Secondly, the issue of galley slaves rebelling and being untrustworthy was a continuous one throughout the period, but it was never an insurmountable problem. This is evident from the
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32 The statute of Dubrovnik of 1272, Liber statutorum civitatis ragusii compositus anno mcclxxii, Translated by Vesna Rimac, edited by Vesna Bace & Nella Lonza, (State archives in Dubrovnik, 2012), Book Seven, statutes XIX ‘De servis qui vadunt marinarii’ and XX ‘De servis qui vadunt conducti’, p. 268.
34 The Rhodian Sea Law, Edited by Walter Ashburner, (The clarendon Press, 1909), p. CLXVI, Appendix D, p. 122, ‘Εαν δούλος ύπό του ιδίου δεσποτου μισθωθη ελς εργαστήριου ή εις εργασίαν , λεγετώ ό κύριος αυτού τα τής πίστεως αυτου. εαν δε μή είπη και ο δούλος σύλα ποιήση και αποσράση, τώ Ιδίν δεσπότη και αυτα τα συλα και ή φυγη και ο θάνατο s δια Του 5 μισθού αυτου εκδιδόσθω’
continuous use of slaves onboard Hospitaller ships until the end of the eighteenth century. Various methods were used to minimize these problems, such as chaining the slaves to the deck and having a mix of labour types per bench, these same methods had been used successfully on Athenian Triremes. Given the nature of medieval galley combat, and contrary to Luttrell’s assertion, the oarsmen would not typically be expected to fight, as this would have reduced the speed and manoeuvrability of the galley. In case of enemy boarding action the enslaved oarsmen would have had to defend themselves, as those boarding the ship would not have had the opportunity to pick between enslaved possible friend and foe. Typically examples of slave uprisings on ships usually occurred while the ship was at sea rather than during combat. Moreover, the assertion that slaves would not fight for their Master is problematic given the numerous examples of enslaved warriors; the Hospitaller’s enemies often made use of armed slaves without issue, notably the Ottoman Janissaries and the Mamluks of Egypt.

Thirdly, the issue of cost, the initial cost of purchasing slaves would likely have been high, although it has been previously stated that some people under Servitudo Marina provided slaves to the Order in return for their freedom. If the Order was capturing slaves or being given slaves, then the cost of purchasing slaves to serve as oarsmen would not have been a consideration for the Order. Slaves were used across the Mediterranean as oarsmen in almost every fleet and were later used by the Order, clearly the issue of cost was not an insurmountable obstacle. Additionally galley slaves could perform other tasks when not rowing that would have benefited the Order.

37 The abolition of slavery in the name of the French Republic, 16th June 1798, article 2, ‘L’esclavage est aboli. Tous les esclaves connus sous le nom de Bonavogli sont mis en liberte, et le contrat deshonorant pour l’espece humaine qu’ils ont fait, est detruit.’ Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 586.
39 Guilmartin, Gunpowder and galleys, pp. 71-75.
40 One notable example was when the Christian Galley slaves of the Ottoman Governor of Rhodes rose up and rowed the ship to Malta, Wettinger, Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 146.
42 ‘...teque liberum et absolutum ciuemque romanam efficiems partier atque franchum per inperpetuum.’ AOM 357 folio 221v-222, transcribed in Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 152, pp. 443-446.
44 Guilmartin, Gunpowder and galleys, p. 108.
Malta often made use of slave labour to construct defences. This also occurred on Rhodes; in 1516 the Order made use of slaves as the additional workforce to construct fortifications on Rhodes.\footnote{Luttrell, 1306-1356, p. 167 ‘it was cheaper to use slave labour to build walls...’; Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 2, p. 615; AOM 82, Folio 191, July 7th 1516.}

Luttrell’s final point regarding galley slavery states ‘Furthermore, the Hospitallers often slaughtered captured Turks who might have been put to the oars.’ This argument has already been problematised within the historiographical discussion in the previous chapter, where it was noted that Luttrell’s argument is based on a reference from Ludolphus de Suchem and a specific massacre in 1319 and does not suggest that kind of action was typical.\footnote{Coureas, The manumission of Hospitaller slaves on Fifteenth Century Rhodes and Cyprus’, p. 110 bases his view that the Order often slaughtered Turks rather than captured them on, ‘Chronique d’Amadi’, Volume 1, pp. 257-8, 393, although this is not clear, especially for page 393 where the text states ‘et li turci, quali erano da ottocento et piu, forono morti et presi tutti...’ clearly stating that some Turks were captured, this is made even more clear in, The Chronicle of Amadi, translated by Coureas and Edbury, p. 358, entry 752, which states ‘The Turks, who numbered 800 or more, were all killed or captured.’; Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 54, references Ludolphus de Suchem, De itinere Terrae Sanctae, p. 29, the same argument and evidence is put forward in Anthony Luttrell ‘Slavery at Rhodes 1306-1440’ in Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the crusades 1291-1440, (Variorum Reprints, 1982), (VI) p. 87.} In the same year the Chronicle of Amadi details an engagement where the Order burnt 30 Turkish ships and ‘...took 3,000 Turks, alive or dead...' which suggests the Order was taking captives.\footnote{The Chronicle of Amadi, translated by Coureas and Edbury, p. 365, entry 781; ‘Chronique d’Amadi’, volume 1, p. 400, ‘in ditto anno, doe galie et doe fuste de frati de Rhodi investirono trentado navigli turcheschi, a l’isola et hebeno vittoria; arseno li navigli et preseno tra morti et vivi 3000 Turchi.’} Nicolas Vatin has noted that he was unable to find any evidence of the Knights slaughtering captured Turks.\footnote{Vatin, L’Order de Saint-Jean-de-Jerusalem, l’Empire ottoman et le Mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522, p. 104, ‘Je n’ai trouve aucune trace, a la periode qui nous concerne, de l’ancienne habitude des Chevaliers de tuer systematiquement les Turcs qu’ils capturaient, coutume pourtant attestee jusqu’ au milieu du xv siecle.’} There is evidence of the Order capturing large numbers of Turks and being involved in the enslavement and ransom of them.\footnote{1319 the Order defeated 29 Turkish vessels ‘killing or capturing more than 1500 turks.’ Anthony Luttrell, ‘The Hospitallers of Rhodes Confront the Turks 1306-1421’, The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World, (Variorum, 1992), (II) p. 86; 1450 The Order exchanges their slaves to free Christians, AOM 362, fol 179.} There is unfortunately a lack of clear evidence for Turks being captured, enslaved and put to the oars from the fifteenth century, yet it is not unreasonable to assume such a process was taking place. H. J. Sire, argued that the increase in the supply of Turkish captives used as oarsmen in the fifteenth century was the reason why the Order ended their use of Servitudo Marina.\footnote{H.J. Sire, The Knights of Malta, (Yale University Press, 1994), p. 86.} Additionally Vertot noted that in 1464, shortly after the abolition of the Servitudo Marina, a Venetian ship carrying Muslim passengers was detained by the Order and the Muslims were made into galley
Given that the practice of using captives as galley slaves is well documented when the Order was on Malta, it would be reasonable to assume the Order was developing this system while on Rhodes.

The origins of the Servitudo Marina are unknown, although Luttrell has suggested that it may have been a surviving Byzantine service: ‘Whatever vestiges of Byzantine customs may have survived, the Hospitallers obviously found the Servitudo Marina convenient...’ This connection is not clear and the sources for the Byzantine navy are very poor. Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus focused the recruitment of Imperial rowers or Prosalentia around hereditary service in return for lands within Constantinople. A range of different groups were engaged as Prosalentia but primarily persons from port towns of southern Greece and the Gasmules who were the children of Greco-Latin Marriages.

The details of this hereditary naval service are unknown. Luttrell’s evidence for his view is the work of Helene Ahrweiler which focuses on wider trends in Byzantine naval recruitment and neither discusses Rhodes or provides an example that is clearly linked to the Servitudo Marina. A class of rowers whose service is based upon hereditary obligation is not dissimilar from the Servitudo Marina, and as Luttrell stated; ‘...it seems to have had no exact parallel anywhere else.’ Although the link between the service and the granting of lands is not present in the Servitudo Marina. In regard to naval service in return for lands, the Byzantine naval recruitment has similarities to the Order’s 1313 appeal for Latin colonists, in which lands were offered in return for the provision of a galley rather than granted to individual oarsmen who were offered only wages. Additionally there

---

52 Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, pp. 52-54.
56 Ahrweiler, Byzance et la Mer: La Marine de Guerre, p. 405.
58 Grant of Lands in return for a galley of 112-120 oars, ‘Preterea promittimus et convenimus quod cuilibet qui in locis et terries predictis habitare voluerit et tenere continue pro servicio nostro et domus unam galeam de centum duodecim usque ad centum viginti remos paratam et furnitam omnibus suis ycharriis ac apparatibus iuxta usus et consuetudines Regni Jerusalem et cipri dabimus et concedamus in pheudum perpetuum terras ac possessions valentes annuativm duo milia turonenses grosso argenti, vel mille bisancios de Rodo, dew quibus se et dictam galeam valent subsceptare.’ Llengua de Aragon, legajo 718, Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid; Seccion de Ordense militares an Juan de Jerusalem, transcribed in Anthony Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, The hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the west 1291-1440,
is no mention of the Servitudo Marina or a similar form of labour within the earlier Rhodian Sea Law.\(^{59}\) While the origin of the Servitudo Marina remains unclear, the Order made use of the service to solve the problem of crewing its ships. This problem had existed from the Order’s arrival on Rhodes, the 1313 magistral bull which appealed for colonists included a call for oarsmen, the intention was for Latins to move to Rhodes and man the Order’s ships.\(^{60}\) The response to this call for colonists was poor, so the Order’s issue of how to crew its ships remained.\(^{61}\) Luttrell links the low number of Latins to the Order’s use of Servitudo Marina, ‘The number of Latins who eventually held lands in Rhodes on such terms was small, and so the Hospitallers recruited the predominantly Greek population of the islands for naval service….’\(^{62}\) If the Servitudo Marina existed prior to the Hospitallers’ arrival on Rhodes then the bull of 1313 calling for colonists may have been a means of diversifying the available galley crews to ensure a mix of Greeks and Latins, or perhaps as a means of increasing the number of available oarsmen.\(^{63}\) Luttrell has argued against the use of galley slaves but there is no reason to view these systems as mutually exclusive, in the sixteenth century the Order made use of a range of servile labour to row its ships, slaves, convicts known as Forzati and voluntary rowers, known as Buonavoglia, the distinctions between these servile labour groups will be explored in the next chapter.\(^{64}\) While on Rhodes it appears that the Order predominantly made use of oarsmen who owed the Servitudo Marina although a mix of labour onboard the ships should be assumed.

**The number of people owing Servitudo Marina**

There has been no attempt within the existing historiography to outline the number of people who owed the Servitudo Marina. The population of Rhodes in the early fourteenth century is difficult to estimate, Luttrell has recently described the population as ‘...virtually incalculable...’ though he has previously estimated the population of Rhodes in 1301 as numbering ‘around 10,000 or even less.’\(^{65}\)

---

\(^{59}\) Ashburner, *The Rhodian Sea Law*.

\(^{60}\) *Item quilibet galitus qui ad insulam nostram Rodi veniet*, ab instant mense augusti inantea, causa habitandi in eadem habebit et recipiat quolibet mense quando navigabit in servicio nostro et domus stipendia que dabimus aliis galiotis, et quando non navigabit habebit continue et recipient a nobis et domo suam panaticam pro substantacione sue vite.’, Llengua de Aragon, legajo 718, Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid; Seccion de Ordense militares an Juan de Jerusalem, transcribed in Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, p. 773.

\(^{61}\) Luttrell, ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, p. 769.


Despite this concept of the scale of this system is needed to understand the impact on society and what proportion of the population was affected.

The size of the Order’s fleet fluctuated over time, making it difficult to estimate the number of oarsmen required, although the number of galleys at specific times can be identified. The Chronicle of Amadi describes several Hospitaller engagements; in 1319 2 galleys and 2 Foists of the Order engaged the Turks at Chios.\(^6\) In 1360 the Order sent 4 galleys to assist King Peter, in 1366 4 galleys and 12 foists joined the fleet of the King of Cyprus.\(^7\) The Order took part in several maritime leagues and provided galleys for these: 4 in 1332, 10 in 1334 and 6 in 1344.\(^8\) Luttrell has summarised the Order’s naval capacity thus, ‘The number of galleys requested from or promised by the Hospital between 1332 and 1351 usually varied from three to six... Between 1361 and 1367 the Hospital could normally provide four galleys for a campaign...’\(^9\) Overall it seems that the Order’s fleet for much of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was made up of 6 galleys since galleys were kept in reserve to defend Rhodes.\(^10\) The Order could sometimes bring a larger force together, in 1440 the Order armed 4* naves*, 8 galleys and some other *grippi*, although this was through extraordinary taxation and seems to represent the limit of the forces the Order could muster at the time.\(^11\) The number of oarsmen required depended on the galley’s size; the bull of 1313 provided offers to any settler who would provide a galley of 112 to 120 oars, this appears to have been the size of the typical Hospitaller galley.\(^12\) Luttrell notes that in 1316 Nisyros owed a galley of 120 oars. The other ships used by the Order are less well defined; the *gallioet* was a smaller galley with between 32-40 oars, the *fusta* was typically smaller again with between 20-30 oars.\(^13\) The number of rowers per oar is not expressed within the documents. To focus on the galleys, Theresa Vann has noted that in the the figure of 10,000 is ‘largely guesswork.’, Luttrell, ‘Greeks, Latins and Turks on Late-Medieval Rhodes’, p. 360.

\(^6\) The Chronicle of Amadi, translated by Coureas and Edbury, p. 365 (1319, entry 781).

\(^7\) The Chronicle of Amadi, translated by Coureas and Edbury, p. 374 (1360, entry 818), p. 378 (1366, entry 833).


\(^11\) ‘E dopo questo fece con diligenza armare quattro Nau, otto Galere, &alcuni Grippi..’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 2, p. 158.

\(^12\) ‘unam galeam de centum duodecim usque ad centum viginti remos’, in Llengua de Aragon, legajo 718; Seccion de Ordense militares an Juan de Jerusalem, Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid in Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, pp. 771-773; Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, p. 759.

fifteenth century the Order employed 3 oarsmen per bench.⁷⁴ Later ships used 5 oarsmen per oar, those ships typically only had between 50 and 60 oars. For comparison, a Venetian galley could have had as many as 180 oarsmen, arranged 3 to a bench each with their own oar.⁷⁵ It is likely, given the large number of oars that were on the ships of the Order in the fourteenth century, each rower had their individual oar.⁷⁶ The system of having 3 oarsmen to a bench in the medieval period rose to prominence in the thirteenth century with the rise of the Trireme.⁷⁷ Mike Carr notes that the Venetian Doge advised the Pope that the naval league of 1333 would require at least 120 oarsmen per ship.⁷⁸

Assuming 120 oars per ship with one oarsman to an oar, 6 galleys would require 720 rowers. This number makes no allowance for spare rowers, which would have been required. The Order at times produced a fleet of more than 6 galleys, as previously mentioned assembling 10 galleys in 1334 and in 1440 the Order armed 4 naves, 8 galleys and some other grippi.⁷⁹ Naves were large merchant ships with a crew of approximately 120.⁸⁰ To crew these fleets the Order would have needed well over 1,000 oarsmen, approximately 1,200 and 1,440 oarsmen for the years 1334 and 1440 respectively. These examples are not typical, but it is also unlikely that every person who owed the Servitudo Marina was at sea at once, suggesting that the Order had well over 720 oarsmen. On Malta in 1590 the Order kept 785 slaves to crew its six galleys alongside the paid freemen (Buonavoglia), and convicts (Forzati), a total of 1,407 oarsmen.⁸¹ As a result of using 5 oarsmen per oar on ships of 50-60 oars, seventeenth century galleys were typically crewed by between 250-300 oarsmen without spare oarsmen. The increasing number of oarsmen needed per galley between the fourteenth and seventeenth century was likely a factor in the Order’s recurring shortages of manpower.⁸² The Order would have also needed to crew its other ships; a magisterial bull of 1433 abolished the caravana gripparie alias taphareze for ten years, this service was the manning of the

---

⁷⁸ Carr, Merchant crusaders in the Aegean 1291-1352, p. 83.
⁸⁰ Rodgers, Naval warfare under oars 14th-16th centuries, p. 113.
⁸² Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p.263 reference AOM 258 Folio 182, 1649 All of the Orders slaves were commanded to row due to shortages, p.347 references AOM 1472, 1711 Papal Galleys attempted to purchase slaves but the Order had to few.
Grand Master’s ships and transport vessels. It is unknown how many people owing Servitudo Marina would have been involved in those activities but it was likely significant as the abolition of those services was meant to encourage individuals who had fled Rhodes to avoid the Servitudo Marina to return. Additionally the Order likely made use of oarsmen not bound by the Servitudo Marina as well, as the bull of 1313 highlights the Order’s attempts to increase the number of available oarsmen. These numbers are estimates, and similar to Luttrell’s estimate of the population of Rhodes in 1301, they are ‘...largely guesswork...’ based on what is comparable. The Order likely made use of paid oarsmen alongside Servitudo Marina. It would not seem unreasonable that the Order may well have had over 1000 oarsmen, a substantial portion of the overall population, which as previously noted, Luttrell estimated at 10,000 in 1301. Additionally, this estimate does not account for the risks involved in being an oarsman on the galleys of the Order, as Luttrell notes, in 1412 the Lord of Lesbo Jacopo Gattilusio captured a Hospitaller ship and tortured the crew, such losses would have to be replaced likely producing a further burden to those who owed the Servitudo Marina.

Furthermore, the number of people linked to the Servitudo Marina would have been higher than simply the number of oarsmen as it included their families, owing the Servitudo Marina was an inherited status. Double the number of oarsmen would be a conservative estimate, 2000 people who owed the Servitudo Marina, approximately 20% of the population based on Luttrell’s figures. There is no evidence that the women who were linked to the Servitudo Marina served on the oars. On Malta there was a clear distinction that rowing was a male occupation, the Order made use of male galley slaves, selling female captives and only accepting convicts (Forzati) as galley slaves from

---


84 ‘...a nostris iam dictis insula, ciuitate, burgo et terra recessisse et abesse, sub spe non amplius ad iam dictas insulam et terram reuertendi, et alios in maximam displicenciam, onus et melencolia in nostris insula, ciuitate et terra prelibatis’; Sarnowsky, *Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15*, pp. 359-360.

85 Llengua de Aragon, legajo 718 from Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid, transcribed in Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, pp. 771-773, ‘Item quilibet galiotus qui ad Insulam nostrum Rodi veniet, ab instant mense augusti inantea, causa habitandii in eadem habebit et recipiat quolibet mense quando navigabit in servicio nostro et domus stipendia que dabimus alis galiotis, et quando non navigabit habebit continue et recipient a nobis et domo suam panaticam pro substantacione sue vita.’


aboard if they were young men with long sentences. Additionally on Malta rowing was a relatively common punishment for male criminals, there does not appear to be a case where a woman was sentenced to row. Despite women not rowing on the Order’s galleys owing the Servitudo Marina was still a significant burden and still impacted their lives and status. Given that the Servitudo Marina impacted broadly on the population it is therefore important for us to analyse the implications of the hereditary nature of this status in further detail.

The Servitudo Marina as an inherited status
Clearly a large number of people were involved in the Servitudo Marina, this resulted in the creation of a servile portion of the population. The hereditary nature of the Servitudo Marina negatively affected those who owed it. The clearest example of this negative effect was that people did not want to marry those who owed the Servitudo Marina. Manumission often took place to facilitate marriage. These manumissions are predominately of women who owed Servitudo Marina as through them their children would also owe the Servitudo Marina. Bosio, writing in 1594, in his summary of the 1462 abolition of the Servitudo Marina highlighted that one of the complaints was that people did not want to take a wife in Rhodes, lest their children become obliged to serve. Those who owed the Servitudo Marina were not restricted from marrying by the Hospitallers or in a legal sense but were isolated by the negative implications of their status. This was a significant issue to the people of Rhodes and would have made owing the Servitudo Marina undesirable.

The laws of Rhodes, the Capitula Rhodi, outlined how the obligation passed down through the children, typically children of mixed Latin and Greek parents, if the children born of a Latin father and a Greek mother were considered to be Latin, ‘...quam nascituri de franco, et Greca, habeantur, et teneantur pro franchis.’ The ‘Latins’ in this case were the Knights themselves and colonists from

90 Jonathan Muscat, ‘The Administration of Hospitaller Malta – Bandi and Prammatiche 1530-1798’, (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2011), p. 74 references National Library of Malta (NLM), Lib. 149, folio 168-169, 1574, selling meat to a slave would result in a life time sentence for a man to row, while a woman would be whipped, p. 33 NLM, Lib. 149 folio 169-170 1558, Tailors sentence to 4 years rowing for overuse of embroidery and silk, wearing such clothes resulted in a 50 scudi fine, if this was not paid a man would be sentenced to 4 years rowing while a woman would be whipped.
92 ‘non voleuano pigliar Moglie in Rodi; acciocché Figliuololoro, a quella seruitù obligati non rimanessero’ Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 2, pp. 285-6.
93 The exact date of the Cailula Rodi is unknown, Luttrell argues that it is between 1310 and 1381, Anthony Luttrell, ‘The Fourteenth-Century Capitula Rodi’, in The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World, (Variorum, 1992), (VI) p. 204; The marriage clause from the Capitula Rodi ‘item quod omnes tam mascu,
the west; the term in this context is poorly defined.94 Jürgen Sarnowsky has suggested this meant children born of a Latin father and a Greek mother who owed the Servitudo Marina would be classed as Latins and therefore not owe the Servitudo Marina.95 However, an addition to the clause in the Capitula Rhodi specifically stated that such children would owe Servitudo Marina and must reside in the town of Rhodes even if their father was a Latin.96 It is not clear when this addition was added, but was in use by 1383 because in that year the children of Dimitrio Calodiqui de Saloniqui a scribe, were manumitted from the Servitudo Marina having inherited the status from his wife Maria Avemina.97 This change was perhaps meant to prevent the decline in the number of people who owed the Servitudo Marina as previously these Greek and Latin marriages would have reduced the available number of oarsmen for the Order. Originating in Roman law, ‘Partus Sequitur Ventrem’ was the legal doctrine that inherited slave status was derived through the status of the mother and was common across a range of slaveholding societies in Europe and the New World.98 This ensured that the offspring of unions between slaveholders and their enslaved women could not become legally free. That owing the Servitudo Marina specifically passed through the mother when they owed it, in contrast to the norm of status passing from father to child in a mixed marriage of Latin and Greek, suggests that owing the Servitudo Marina was an inherited status similar to being a slave.

David Eltis and Stanley L. Engerman have specifically identified status being passed through the mother as a common characteristic of chattel status that is not found in the more general category of coerced labour.99 In the 1429 manumission of Georgio, son of Vasili de Satalia, it was expressly stated that he owes the Servitudo Marina from his mother’s side only, ‘...seruituti marinarie ex latere quam femine, tam nati, quam nascituris de franco, et Greca, habeantur, et teneantur pro franchis.’ Provided in Luttrell, ‘The Fourteenth-Century Capitula Rodi’, pp. 207-211

94 Llengua de Aragon, legajo 718, Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid, Seccion de Ordenes militares an Juan de Jerusalem, in Luttrell ‘Feudal Tenure and Latin colonization at Rhodes; 1306-1415’, p. 773.

95 ‘Besonderes Interesse verdient unter anderen die Bestimmung, daß ein Kind eines lateinischen Vaters und einer griechischen Mutter als Lateiner behandelt, also nicht der Servitudo Marina, der Pflicht zum Dienst auf den Kriegsschiffen des Ordens, unterworfen werden soll.’ Sarnowsky, Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15., p.43.,


97 ‘...igitur tuis inclinati supplicationibus liberos sexus utriusque abortum et quos ex Maria Auemina coniuge tua stricta seruituti marina inantea te contingent suspicere ipsorum personas dumtaxat a prestatione marine seruici et ab ipso seruicio de consilio et accensu fratrum nobis assistentium francos liberos perpetuo facimus et inmunes...’ AOM 322 Folio 330, transcribed in, Luttrell, ‘Greeks, Latins and Turks on Late-Medieval Rhodes’, p. 374.


tantumodo matris...’\(^{100}\) The \textit{Servitudo Marina} continued to be inherited based on the status of the Mother into the fifteenth century.

The hereditary nature of the \textit{Servitudo Marina} is evident within the 1427 manumission of Johannes son of Georgios, his wife and the children they may have.\(^{101}\) In return for their freedom, substitutes had been arranged; Johannes Trigonan, his wife Xeni and any children they might have, but not their existing children.\(^{102}\) Notably, the existing children of the replacements do not become linked to the \textit{Servitudo Marina}, possibly demonstrating that, similar to Roman law, the status of the children is dependent on the status of their parents only when they are born rather than changing later on if their parents status changes.\(^{103}\) This would explain why in manumission documents when those who owe the \textit{Servitudo Marina} are being freed, if their existing children are also being freed it is explicitly stated. An early example of this explicit statement of the status of children can be seen in the 1381 manumission of Nichola Stratico, he is exempted from the service, but his children and future children are not.\(^{104}\)

Bosio noted men left Rhodes to escape the \textit{Servitudo Marina} and did not want to take a wife from Rhodes while outlining the reasons for its abolition.\(^{105}\) This suggests that men would rather leave Rhodes in search of a wife than marry those owing the \textit{Servitudo Marina}.\(^{106}\) Marc Bloch’s study of serfdom highlighted the same effect with serfs, ‘The free peasants, their neighbours, refused to


\(^{101}\) ‘…se te et liberos tuos utriusque sexus ex te et uxore tua nascituros a tali servili nexu marinarie...’ AOM 347 Folio 214v/220v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, \textit{Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459}, document 82.

\(^{102}\) ‘nobis iohannem trigonani de Famagusta et xeni araclieni uxorem ipsius iohannis trigonan ac filios utriusque sexus ex ipsis iohanne et xeni imposterum nascituros in locum tui ratione dicte servitutis marinarie subrogare et exhibere volebas, exceptis tamen filiiis ante presentem obligationem ab ipsis iohanne et xeni natis, videlicet theodoro, petro, arfani et erini, qui ad huiusmodi servitutis marinarie onus nullatenus astricti sive obligati intelligentur...’ AOM 347 Folio 214v/220v; The system of freedom in return for substitutes will be discussed in more detail in the discussion of Servitudo Marina manumissions.

\(^{103}\) Patterson, \textit{Slavery and Social death}, p. 139.

\(^{104}\) ‘Die octava Iulii per dominum magistrum Nichola Stratico habitator Paramolini marinarius religionis fuit exemptatus a quocunque servitio marin[a]rio usque ad beneplacitum ipsius domini magistri, filiiis suis procreatis et procreandis in dicta servitute semper remanentibus, mandatumque fratribus etc. ne contraveniant. Datum sub impressione.’ AOM 321 Folio 243/ 251 in Luttrell, O’Malley, \textit{The Countryside Of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423}, p. 183.

\(^{105}\) ‘…perche molti di questi Huomini, per fuggire quella servitù se, n'erano andati ad habitare altrove...non voleuano pigiar Moglie in Rodi...’, Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano} volume 2, pp. 285-6.

\(^{106}\) ‘Men left Rhodes because they could not find wives who were not burdened by hereditary obligations to marine service which would be passed on to the children’, Anthony Luttrell, ‘The Latin’s and life on the smaller Aegean islands 1204-1454’ in \textit{Latin and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204} edited by Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton, David Jacoby, (Psychology Press, 1989) p.148
marry them.’¹⁰⁷ This provides an insight into the dishonour and servile taint associated with owing the Servitudo Marina and the negative social implications. Manumission from owing the Servitudo Marina as a condition of marriage further highlights the reluctance to marry those who owed the Servitudo Marina. For example, in 1453, Magistrisse tu Crisoteli was freed from the Servitudo Marina at the request of Nicholaj de Gorgosta, a citizen of Rhodes and judge.¹⁰⁸ Magistrisse was soon to be married to Nicholaj, this upcoming wedding appears to be the motivation for why the manumission was taking place.¹⁰⁹ The couple already had two children who were also freed.¹¹⁰ This manumission also granted the status of Roman citizen to Magistrisse and her existing and future children, ‘civemque romanam et cives romanos...’¹¹¹ In 1458 the Order freed Maria to Kalopsichi at the request of Theodorus Calomeri who intended to marry her.¹¹² Luttrell notes that this manumission seems to have been a condition for the marriage to take place.¹¹³ Maria and her children were to be freed and no longer linked to the Servitudo Marina.¹¹⁴ As Theodorus Calomeri was from Lindos it seems likely that Maria would be leaving Rhodes, the Capitula Rodi stated that those who owed the Servitudo Marina must reside in the town of Rhodes.¹¹⁵ The requirement to reside in the town of Rhodes would have further limited marriage prospects. Seeking manumission to prevent entering a mixed-status marriage appears in other contexts as well, in 1833 the General Assembly of Virginia granted Henry Lewis petition for a slave to be freed so that they could legally marry.¹¹⁶ These examples suggest that once the condition of owing the Servitudo Marina was removed these people became acceptable for marriage immediately. In contrasted to freed slaves who would typically face

lingering negative connotations because of their previously enslaved status. Those who owed the Servitudo Marina were from Rhodes they were not defeated enemies.117 This could be compared to the debt slaves used by the Order on Malta, the Buonavoglia, those purchased from abroad were kept in the slave prisons and while those from Malta had more freedoms, this will be explored further in the next chapter. Although unlike the Servitudo Marina the status of Buonavoglia was not inherited.

It is unknown how many prospective marriages may have failed because the Order would not grant manumission, failed attempts to gain manumission were not recorded. It should be assumed that gaining manumission was not particularly easy especially during the fifteenth century when there were shortages of rowers, otherwise the men of Rhodes would not have looked abroad for wives, nor would those who owed the Servitudo Marina have fled. In some cases, it appears that free people who had relationships with those who owed the Servitudo Marina attempted to gain manumission for their partners. In 1445, Mary the wife of Primiquiri Caye a citizen of Rhodes was freed from Servitudo Marina.118 In this example the couple were already married and from the document it seems the manumission was given due to the services offered by her husband Primiquiri.119 For this example Mary’s status as a person subject to Servitudo Marina had not prevented the marriage but was clearly an ongoing concern that would have affected their children.

Within these examples, a woman was being freed at the request of either her prospective husband, or husband, as a reward for services offered or as a result of the husband’s status, such as Nicholaj de Gorgosta, a citizen of Rhodes and judge.120 It seems likely that for couples of lower status manumission would have been more difficult if possible at all. Additionally in all these mixed-status examples it is free husbands seeking to free their wives or prospective wives from owing the Servitudo Marina, possibly because the status was only passed to children through the mother giving

118 AOM 357 folio 211, transcribed in Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 151, p. 442, ‘Marie, filie quondam Michaelis, pellicano insule nostre Rhodi, nec non uxoridi viri Primiquiri Caye, ciuis et habitatoris nostre ciuitatis Rodi.’
119 AOM 357 folio 211 ‘Mariam, nostram et dicte domus nostre seruam ascripticiam, ob dei reuerenciam atque meritorum obsequiorum tuorum intuit nec non et ob contemplacionem precaminum predicti viri tui, qui nos super hoc instanter et instantissime requisuit, eiusque diuturnorum seruitiorum nobis et dicte domui multiplicitar pretiorum, tenore presencium,’ transcribed in Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 151, p. 442.
additional importance to women being freed. Although this is not unexpected, female slaves marrying free men appears to be more common than the alternative in slave contexts as well.\textsuperscript{121}

It was possible to owe the Servitudo Marina through means other than birth or marriage. Owing the Servitudo Marina could at times be a condition of manumission from servitude or slavery; freed slaves were obliged to take on the role as a form of continued service.\textsuperscript{122} Conditional manumission was not uncommon in many slaveholding societies and at times resulted in the ‘freed’ slave having continuation obligations that resulted in what Patterson described as ‘…a twilight state of semimanumission.’\textsuperscript{123} Coureas argues that intermediate position between servitude and full emancipation.\textsuperscript{124} Additionally he views the change from being a serf to owing the Servitudo Marina as positive a ‘…promotion for deserving serfs.’\textsuperscript{125} Coureas uses an example transcribed by Tsirpanlis, in 1449 Grand Master Jean de Lastic ‘promoted’ a serf of Kos to owe the Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{126} Coureas and Tsirpanlis both refer to this change in status as a promotion.\textsuperscript{127} This view assumes that for a serf or slave to be ‘freed’ but owe the Servitudo Marina was for the benefit of the individual, and does not acknowledge that this was a means by which the Order could increase the number of oarsmen, which was an issue as in 1440 the decline in the number of oarsmen was noted in a decree calling for a more accurate register of those who owed the Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{128} Attempts to increase the number of people linked to the Servitudo Marina can be seen earlier, in 1347 a free man Costecome married Anna daughter of Leo Cauasilla, a serf, under the condition that their


\textsuperscript{123} Patterson, Slavery and Social Death, p. 219.

\textsuperscript{124} Nicholas Coureas, ‘The Hospitallers and their manumissions of Rhodian and Cypriot serfs (1409-1459)’, in The Military Orders Vol. VII: Piety, Pugnacity and Property, Edited by Nicholas Morton (Routledge, London & New York, 2020), p. 150 ‘The emancipation of Rhodian serfs into the class of marinarii is especially interesting, for this social group formed an intermediate station between servitude and full emancipation.’

\textsuperscript{125} Coureas, ‘The Hospitallers and their manumissions of Rhodian and Cypriot serfs (1409-1459)’, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{126} ‘…et gaudeas tu tuique ex te descendentes sexus utriusque gaudeant illis prouilegiis et inbmunitatiubs, quibus ceteri marinij dicte insule gaudent…’, Aom 361, folio 284r-v, transcribed in Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 191.


descendants would owe Servitudo Marina and Costecome provided the Order with a female slave.\textsuperscript{129} There appears to have been no specific reason to link this marriage to owing the Servitudo Marina beyond simply increasing the number of available oarsmen.

In 1411 Johannes, son of Theodore of Durazzo, a privately owned slave of Mariom of Cyprus, was thought to owe galley service.\textsuperscript{130} The accusation that a slave might owe the Servitudo Marina suggests that the two states were not mutually exclusive and that privately owned slaves could owe the Servitudo Marina and serve alongside the non-slaves that owed the Servitudo Marina. After an investigation it turned out that he did not owe the Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{131} Slaves of the Order would serve on the Order’s ships but that was a different situation from someone who owed the Servitudo Marina. It is possible that it was believed he was a substitute for someone else or that he had inherited the status, but the document does not detail why it was claimed that he owed the Servitudo Marina and focuses on the fact that the claim was not justified. In 1445 Michali Aluniti gave the Order 2 slaves in return for his freedom from the Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{132} It would appear that on the same ship it would be possible to have a slave of the Order rowing as a galley slave, a privately owned slave who owed the Servitudo Marina, a manumitted slave that owed the Servitudo Marina, and a Greek of Rhodes who owed the Servitudo Marina; each of these are people of very different circumstance working under the same conditions, which would have no doubt further increased the negative social implications of the Servitudo Marina for the Greeks of Rhodes. Additionally, there are some cases where those freed from Servitudo Marina had to defend their freed status as they were being called upon to serve, suggesting that manumission was not always a simple exit from the system.\textsuperscript{133}

Resistance to and regulation of the Servitudo Marina
For some individuals flight was preferable to the Servitudo Marina, flight was a powerful forms of resistance, as it displayed the agency of the individual against the system, and the failure of the system. Flight was used by serfs in Medieval England, ‘...an effective source of protection against a

\textsuperscript{129} AOM 317 folio 241v-242, partially transcribed in Luttrell, ‘slavery at Rhodes’, document 6, p.93; Costecome described as ‘homo liber et francus’ Anna described as ‘servus noster et domus nostre.’

\textsuperscript{130} ‘lohanem filium Theodore deDuracio slave domine Mariom de Chipro, dicendo et asserendo dictum lohanem esse astrictum servituti marinaria’ AOM 339 Folio 256v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459, Document 9.

\textsuperscript{131} ‘et nichil ab ipso domino admirato fuit probatum contra predictum johannem.’ AOM 339 Folio 256v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459, Document 9.

\textsuperscript{132} ‘Acceptamus, insuper, atque et recipimus duos sclauos emptcios, unum masculum, alterum feminam.’AOM 357 folio 221v-222, 1445, transcribed in Tsrpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 152, p. 446.

\textsuperscript{133} AOM 331 folio 188v-190, Janni Accouppa defends that he was freed by the recently deceased Admiral, Palamedo di Giovanni, an investigation is held that determines him to be free, discussed in Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina’, p. 59.
ruthless lord...Flight, with the risk of recapture and punishment, was often their only means of defence.'

On Malta the Order had to keep all vessels guarded to try and to prevent slaves from escaping. By fleeing Rhodes those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* were engaging in a form of resistance that was shared with the Order’s slaves and serfs.

This issue of flight, more than any other, reveals that the people of Rhodes did not want to perform the *Servitudo Marina* and found their situation unsatisfactory. This also highlights that the rule of the Order was less benign than has been suggested within the discourse, exemplified by Luttrell’s view that a ‘...few hundred brethren who governed their Rhodian state in paternalistic fashion; doubtless they seemed authoritarian and militaristic to the Greeks but their despotism was comparatively benevolent...’

Luttrell by framing the Order’s governance of Rhodes as paternal and benevolent shares some similarities with Greco-Roman conceptions of the relationship between slaveholder and slave, the father and child, which is used in St. Paul’s letter to the Galatians. Additionally the people who owed the *Servitudo Marina* were not the only group to resist, the people of Kos and Leros rose up against the Order’s rule in 1318. To further challenge the paternal view of the Order rule in 1440 the Grand Master threatened the people of Lindos with death if they did not serve on the Order’s ships.

The depopulation of Rhodes as a result of people fleeing the *Servitudo Marina* and also from the effects of the plague was given as a reason for the 1462 abolition of the *Servitudo Marina*.

---

135 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 130.
136 ‘The harsh living conditions aboard the galleys, the military operations, shipwrecks and often deadly illnesses, encouraged the islanders to evade service and run away to the mountains.’ Angeliki Panopoulou, ‘At the centre of the sea routes; maritime life in crete between the middle ages and the early modern era’, *The sea in history, the medieval world*, Edited by Michel Balard, (The Boydell Press, 2017), p. 397.
137 Flight of serfs appears to have been an ongoing issue on Cyprus for the Order, AOM 355 folio 248-250 (249-251), Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459*, documents 171, p. 202-208, AOM 359 folio 170v-171 (174v-175v), documents 230, p. 281, 1447.
138 Luttrell, ‘Greeks, Latins and Turks on Late-Medieval Rhodes’, p. 360. ‘...few hundred brethren who governed their Rhodian state in paternalistic fashion; doubtless they seemed authoritarian and militaristic to the Greeks but their despotism was comparatively benevolent...’; Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, pp. 34-38.
139 Luttrell, *The town of Rhodes*, p. 81.
140 Luttrell, ‘Lindos and the defence of Rhodes’, document 2, 20 September 1440, Rhodes; the master of the Hospital summons the oarsmen of lindos to serve against the mamluk fleet on the ship he is sending to them, AOM 354, folio 246v, Original Greek, ‘εις τούτο παρακαλό σας άκριβός καί όριζο σας απανο είν πέναν τής άπηστίας καί τής φούρκας και να χασου όλλα τους τά καλλά τά έχουν κατά την οραν οπου’
141 Tsirpanlis, *Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes*, document 32, AOM 350 folio 243v-244; ‘Et erano sottoposti alla giuridittione dell’Ammiraglio Hor perché molti di questi Huomini, per fuggire quella servitù se, n’erano andati ad habitare altrove; & essendo oltra di ciò, per cagione delle guerre, e della peste,
before that flight had effected the operation of the Order’s navy, in 1433 the Order attempted to encourage those who had fled the Servitudo Marina to return by offering to pardon them and reducing the obligations of the Servitudo Marina, by abolishing the caravana gripparie alias taphareze for ten years, a service related to the manning of the Master’s ships and transport vessels. By reducing the obligations of the Servitudo Marina in 1433, the Order accepted that some vessels would need to be crewed by other means. This suggests that the Order was able to crew these ships by other means, although it is unclear as to what the alternative arrangement was. Additionally it is unknown that the punishment for flight was for those who owed the Servitudo Marina. On Malta in 1593, Verdala’s Pragmatic outlined that slaves trying to escape would have their nose and ears cut off. Additionally in 1531 after slaves fled Fort St Angelo the Order fired on the fleeing ship. It would seem that mutilation or death was viewed by the Order as a reasonable response to slave flight which is unsurprising as in Barbados and Jamaica the most brutal punishments were reserved for runaways. In this context the response of the Order to reduce the burden of the Servitudo Marina and pardon those who fled could be seen as a key difference between that status and being a slave. Although there are also examples of slaves being similarly pardoned for fleeing, Verlinden notes an example from 1435 where Pierre de Fontcouverte brother of the Hospitaller preceptor of Masdue, attempted to encourage three slaves who had fled to Toulouse to return by offering to free them on the condition that they served for 5 more years. Epstein notes two examples from fourteenth century Crete where slaves who had fled were freed.


144 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 71 referencing Verdala’s Pragmatic 1593, NLM Libr Ms 704, vol 2 fol. 100 et seq.

145 ‘E nel medesimo punto eccitati, & animati hauendo i Soldati, e gli altri, che seco veniuano, si scagliò contra gli Schiaui sopradetti; molti de’quali trouandosi proveduti d’alcune armi, fecero gagliarda resistenza. Però furono finalmente costretti à ritirarsi nella prigione; doue dopo hauergli fatti tutti disarmare, e rinchiudere, & hauendo diligentemente proveduto alla sicurezza del Castello; andò per far tirare alcuni pezzi d’artigliaria contra la barca, che via se ne fuggiuà; Mà vide, che poco lontano, fuori della bocca del Porto, era già stata presa da certe barche, armate d’Archibusieri, con le quali il Comendatore Fra Pietro de Noè, velocemente seguita l’haueua.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano, volume 3, p. 100.


147 Charles Verlinden, L’esclavage dans L’europe medieval, Volume 1 (De Tempel, 1955), p. 762 ‘...en 1435, Pierre de Fontcouverte, chevalier, procureur de son frère Berenger, precepteur des Hospitaliers du Masdeu, affranchir, a condition qu’ils reviennent server pendant 5 ans, Mancor, Maffumet et Georges, Sarrasins don’t seul le dernier est baptize, et qui se sont sauvues a Toulouse?’
via testamentary manumission. In 1793 in Jamaica a treaty was made with the maroon leaders. Typically these examples are exceptions rather than the norm, but this does show that slaves who fled could be pardoned. It would have been difficult for the Order to prevent those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* from fleeing, they were a substantial part of the population, they would likely have been supported by the community. Similar to Serfs in Russia in the nineteenth century, this flight did not necessarily have to mean leaving, as they were indistinguishable from the rest of the population and could easily blend into their surroundings. This was especially true on Rhodes, where in the countryside the Order’s involvement was limited.

In 1386 as a response to the issue of flight on Rhodes the Grand Master attempted to regulate the *Servitudo Marina* and decreed that a register of all those who owed the service should be compiled. The Grand Master linked the flight of those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* to mismanagement of the service by the Order’s scribes and officials, which made the service more of a hardship than it needed to be; the register was thought to correct this. The register would be compiled so that each person could serve in turn or if unable to serve, provide a substitute. The implication from this is that because of the lack of a register of who owed the *Servitudo Marina*, some people were not serving in turn, with some perhaps serving more often than they should have. This resulted in some people who owed the *Servitudo Marina* taking flight in protest. These registers are in some ways comparable to the serf censuses that took place in nineteenth century Russia in response to similar complaints that some serfs were not serving in their master’s estate. In both situations poor record keeping was blamed for the issues, ignoring wider problems. The Grand Master believed that the solution to this problem was to better regulate the operation of the

---

148 Epstein, *Speaking of slavery*, p. 120.
149 Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, p. 181
system. This solution did not acknowledge that the obligations of the Servitudo Marina may have caused those who owed it to flee. Additionally the registers were likely intended to make flight more difficult as with the register the Order could attempt to prevent individuals from leaving Rhodes prior to their service. Clearly by 1386 the issue of flight was already a concern for the Order.

The point is made that each person owing Servitudo Marina must serve his turn, this highlights that the service had a limited term. This is not a surprise, as ships typically did not operate year-round, and it is unlikely that the Servitudo Marina would have required people to serve constantly. In the Mediterranean, the sailing season was typically from early April to late October.\(^{155}\) There is no detail as to how long a period of rowing would have been, but it is likely to have been at least several weeks.\(^{156}\) It is unclear how long those who owed the Servitudo Marina were expected to serve, the Chapter General of 1428 specifically states that the register will include all those over the age of 17 who owe the Servitudo Marina. This suggests that the service started at 17, which is comparable to other Mediterranean naval systems.\(^{157}\) For convicts sentenced to serve on the galleys in Spain in 1566 the minimum age was seventeen.\(^{158}\) Given the Order’s focus on substitutes, the service may have lasted until the individual’s child was 17 and so able to serve in their place. A Servitudo Marina manumission of 1427 freed Johannes, son of Georgios Zalapi Vinan, his wife and descendants.\(^{159}\) In return for their freedom the Order receives Johannes Trigonan his wife and their future children, but not their current children, in this case it would appear that Johannes Trigonan would be required to row for at least 17 years a considerable period of time, as a comparison convicts on the galleys in Spain in 1566 were required to have a sentence of at least 4 years and Muslim slave oarsmen, on Doria galleys in 1587, served for an average of 12 years.\(^{160}\)

There was often a call for the creation of new registers during the Chapter General; this was seen in 1410, 1428 and 1440. The lack of accurate registers was continually blamed for the decline in the number of available oarsmen and for causing those who owed the Servitudo Marina to flee as a

\(^{155}\) Hershenzon, *The Captive Sea*, p. 28.

\(^{156}\) Italian oarsmen provided obligatory free service for up to 6 weeks, Rodgers, *Naval Warfare under oars 4th-16th Centuries*, p. 114.


\(^{159}\) ‘...se te et liberos tuos utriusque sexus ex te et uxore tua nascituros a tali servili nexu marinarie...’ AOM, 347 folio 214v,220v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459*, document 82.

result of the mismanagement of the service by the scribes and officials.\textsuperscript{161} The Chapter General of 1428 stated that the registers should be revised every 5 years.\textsuperscript{162} Yet despite the number of registers apparently being produced, none have survived placing in question whether all of these new registers were ever actually produced. The Order was still using the registers to regulate the Servitudo Marina in 1458, just four years before the abolition of the Servitudo Marina, the manumission of Maria To Kalopsichi stated that Maria’s name would be struck from the register of those who owed Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{163}

From the text of the 1386 decree temporary substitutes may have been relatively common, although substitutes do not appear in the documents, this is likely because those people providing the temporary substitute in their place still owed the Servitudo Marina.\textsuperscript{164} How a substitute was obtained is unclear and there is no implication as to what happened to those that were both unable to perform the Servitudo Marina and unable to find a substitute. Manumission was sometimes granted in return for providing a permanent substitute. Freedom through substitution occurred throughout the Order’s servile labour forms. For example in 1413 a serf Strati was freed on Cyprus on the condition that he purchased a slave to replace him.\textsuperscript{165} Similarly in 1347, a slave Nicola Corupi gained his freedom also by providing a slave as a replacement.\textsuperscript{166} Unlike these examples the substitutes provided by people who owed the Servitudo Marina were voluntary, they replaced the individual who was freed, but were not owned by the Order, more than any other person who owed the service. A manumission of 1421 details the release from the Servitudo Marina of Arfaradena and her three daughters Marieta alias Strauriani, Duquena, and Angelina at the request of their father in return for providing two male and one female substitutes, Bartholomeus of Rhodes, Thomas of

\textsuperscript{162} National Library of Malta, Ms 501, 205-205v (1428); Sarnowsky, \textit{Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15}, pp.359-360; Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina’, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{164} ‘…de primo usque ad ultimum unusquisque per suum circuitum et ordinem serviat in officio marine in galia seu cui tenetur et aliter non cogatur nisi persona sit impotens ad serviendum quo casu prestet excambium.’ AOM 323 Folio 217-218v, Document 132, in Luttrell, O’Malley, \textit{The Countryside Of Hospitalier Rhodes 1306-1423}, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{166} AOM 317 folio 242 Manumission of Nicola Corupi, transcribed in Luttrell ‘slavery at Rhodes’, document 5, p. 93; Similarly, AOM 318 folio 219, Manumission of Giorgious in return for a slave, 1352, Luttrell ‘slavery at Rhodes’, document 15, p. 95
Famagusta, and his wife Maria. The father, Georgios Beltran, and his son had previously been freed from the *Servitudo Marina* as well.

It appears that Georgios Beltran was working to free his entire family from the service; his manumission had been granted by Brother Luce de Vallins, sometime before 1419. His manumission and that of his son do not appear to have been recorded, but it was restated immediately following the manumission of his wife and daughters. It is not clear why the original manumission took place, but it is interesting that the males secured their freedom first, then appealed for the female members of the family. This may have been to avoid the harsh physical labour of the *Servitudo Marina* for men, while the manumission of female family members might be delayed until the service impacted their ability to marry. Additionally because of the different legal status of men and women a free man would have possibly found it easier to seek manumission of his wife than vice versa. Family units working together to free themselves from servile conditions was relatively common cross-culturally in both medieval and New World slavery, and this example suggests that it occurred similarly on Rhodes for those who owed *Servitudo Marina*. The manumission of the wife and daughters was due to the provision of substitutes. From the Order’s perspective four women were freed from *Servitudo Marina* and, in return, the Order was presented with a husband and wife as well as an individual all of whom now owed the *Servitudo Marina*, and their offspring of which would owe *Servitudo Marina* in future. Additionally, Thomas of Famagusta and his wife could have represented new arrivals to Rhodes, helping to reverse the island’s depopulation and, as Famagusta was a port, it is likely that Thomas may have already known how to row. The two male substitutes would no doubt have been more immediately useful to the Order than the four women.

There is no evidence that the substitutes provided to free Georgios Beltran’s wife and daughters were of a servile status, these were not slaves purchased and given to the Order but individuals

---


168 AOM 346 folio 164v-165, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459*, document 69.

169 Both manumissions occurred on January 20th, 1422. AOM 346 folio 164-165, Brother Luce de Vallins was Marshal and Lieutenant when Georgios was manumitted from the *Servitudo Marina* this was no longer the case by May 1491, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459*, document 69.


seemingly willing to take on a servile status. A Servitudo Marina manumission of 1427 included a clause outlying that the substitutes agreed of their own free will and without deceit, which suggests that there had been issues with substitutes being deceived previously, especially as this clause does not appear in earlier manumission documents. Although the clause may have been included because the son, who did not owe the Servitudo Marina, was required to row if his father fled and the Order was ensuring the son accepted this obligation, as an attempt to discourage flight but also to ensure the Order still had available oarsmen. If substitutes were being deceived into taking on the Servitudo Marina it is unclear as to how, given that a sizeable portion of the population of Rhodes owed the service it is reasonable to assume that the details and requirements were well known, but for substitutes not from Rhodes as was the case with the substitutes provided by Georgios Beltran they might not have known the full implications of taking on the obligation of the Servitudo Marina. It is also unknown why someone would want to be a substitute and take on a role that others were fleeing. It is not clear how those who owed the Servitudo Marina would arrange short-term substitutes when they were called to serve let alone identify substitutes that would permanently take on their obligations to serve the Servitudo Marina. The substitutes may have been motivated by other factors that are not present in the documents, perhaps the people being freed from the obligation found some way to motivate them. It is possible that the substitutes were paid; no mention is made of this in the documents, but that arrangement would be between the person being freed and the substitute rather than the Order. Perhaps these substitutes were in debt. The Order on Malta certainly made use of debt bondage to provide oarsmen. The Order would pay the individual’s debts who, in turn, would then work off their debt to the Order through physical labour on the galleys.

Conditions on the Galleys
Many of the practical aspects of the Servitudo Marina are unknown, such as whether it was a paid service or not. The 1313 appeal for colonists stated that oarsmen would be paid, but these were free oarsmen not linked to the Servitudo Marina. Luttrell has argued that the service was both paid and

---

172 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459, document 69.
173 ‘...dicti iohannes et xeni eius uxor et ipse theodorus nomine fideiussionis de eorum spontanea voluntate non coacti nec aliquot dolo seducti confessi fuerunt et contenti pro te iohanne zalapi se ipsos et filios suos utriusque sexus ex ipsis nascituros astrinxerunt et obligaverunt per imperpetuum servitutis dicte marinarie animadvertentes tue fidelitatis zelum,’ AOM, 347 folio 214v,220v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459, document 82.
174 ‘...theodorus iam nominates ipsius iohannis filius tamquam fideiussor patris sui fuga sive absentia ipsius, ut premissititur, si continget vel obstante libertate dicti theodori...’ AOM, 347 folio 214v,220v, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives 1409-1459, document 82.
unpaid. In *The Town of Rhodes: 1306-1356*, Luttrell described the people bound to the *Servitudo Marina* as owing ‘...occasional unpaid naval service.’ While in his article ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’ he argued that ‘... the subditi marinarii received some pay for their service.’ Luttrell’s only explicit reference to payment of those bound by the *Servitudo Marina* is from 1462 within the document abolishing the *Servitudo Marina* and this is not stated as a regular payment for the performance of the service. Hospitaller galley crews were paid by the Treasury, this is made clear in the 1300 statutes of William De Villaret as part of the outlining of the role of the Admiral, although it does not reference the *Servitudo Marina* as it predates the Hospitaller conquest of Rhodes. The role of the Admiral was later amended in 1353 when it was detailed that the Admiral was responsible for the recruitment of galley crews. Luttrell states that ‘...this 1353 text almost certainly included the subditi marinarii...’ although people owing the *Servitudo Marina* are not explicitly mentioned in the text. It is notable that neither the 1386 decree that instituted the registers nor the 1433 bull that reduced the obligations of the *Servitudo Marina*, made any mention of payment. As both documents aimed to discourage the flight of those who owed the *Servitudo Marina*, if the service had been paid it would seem likely that the Order may have increased that payment to make the service more appealing to those who served. It is possible that such aspects of the *Servitudo Marina* were simply not recorded. Regarding the status of the people who owed the service, payment does not suggest a less servile status. Paid forced labour is still involuntary labour; additionally, slaves could be paid a wage without this affecting their status.

---

177 Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 56.
178 Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 56 based on the text ‘...cum ipsi marinarii de consuetudine hactenus observata pro certo precio ad eundum in dictis armamentis expresse forent obligati.’ from AOM 372, folio 118v-119.
180 ‘...que tota maniera de marinars... e que la moneda la qual sera pagadora per lo Thezaur als dichs marinars que lamiralhs la deya penre et ad el sia baylada o ad aquel que el volar per frayre los pagamens als marinars sobre dichs...’, AOM 64 folio 4 in Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 56.
182 Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 311 references AOM 646, folio 681, 1686 An enslaved craftsman on Malta, Sciabi requested greater wages as his current wage did not cover the costs of living, AOM 1112, 1648, Slaves working in the Smithy get a shared annual wage.
The conditions while at sea would have been incredibly poor, the work was physically demanding
and the situation life-threatening. There is a lack of detailed documents about the situation onboard
the ships of the Order during the fourteenth and fifteenth Centuries, although later evidence does
provide insight. The conditions of the ships would have remained similar and the work, the dangers,
and the physical limitations of the ship were the same.\textsuperscript{183} Mediterranean galleys were long and sleek
with little space for supplies.\textsuperscript{184} John Francis Guilmartin describes the space onboard a galley,
‘...every scrap of available space aboard a galley was occupied by oarsmen and their benches...
something on the order of 95 per cent of a galleys deck space was devoted to the oarsmen and their
benches.’\textsuperscript{185} The galleys were very cramped, the rowers slept on their benches and were exposed to
the elements. There was little space for personal hygiene and the galleys stank.\textsuperscript{186} Naval
engagements could last some time, the rowers would remain at their benches throughout, their
effluence would soak into the timbers of the ship.\textsuperscript{187} The Knights of the Order would stuff their noses
with tobacco and spices to cover the smell.\textsuperscript{188} It is not surprising that given the conditions many of
those who owed the Servitudo Marina attempted to flee, slaves on Malta would injure themselves
to avoid having to row, and the Order punished those who did with death, this will be explored
further in the next chapter.\textsuperscript{189} Rowing a galley was a long and harsh life, Peter Earle when discussing
galley slaves states that ‘...a fit man, however, might spend thirty years or more on a galley
bench.’\textsuperscript{190}

On board the galleys there would have been a considerable need for discipline and efficiency which
would likely have been motivated through physical violence if necessary. The book of Michael of
Rhodes details how oarsmen on Venetian galleys would be lashed from stern to bow for
blaspheming, these would have been hired professional oarsmen.\textsuperscript{191} This text was written by a
fifteenth century mariner, Michael, who was working on Venetian galleys; although there is no
documentation of Michael’s origin before becoming an oarsman on a Venetian ship in 1401, from his

\textsuperscript{183} The lack of information is highlighted by John Francis Guilmartin, ‘unfortunately little is known about the
nature of the knight’s naval organization during their stay on Rhodes.’ In Guilmartin, Gunpowder and galleys,
p. 117.

\textsuperscript{184} Guilmartin, Gunpowder and galleys, pp. 62-64, In the Mediterranean food and water was relatively easy to
locate, ships did not have to carry large numbers of provisions.

\textsuperscript{185} Guilmartin, Gunpowder and galleys, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{186} Discussion of galley hygiene, ‘...it was said that the odor of a galley could be perceived a mile or more
leeward.’, Rodgers, Naval warfare under oars 14th-16th centuries, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{187} Muscat, Cuschieri, Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798, p. 32.


\textsuperscript{189} Muscat, Cuschieri, Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798, p. 142 references AOM 125 folio 44.

\textsuperscript{190} Earle, Corsairs of Malta and barbary, p. 171, references AOM 646 folio 126.

\textsuperscript{191} The Book of Michael of Rhodes, Edited by David McGee, volume 2, (The MIT Press, 2009), p. 327, Folio 112a
‘...se l sera homo da remo debia eser frustado da puope a proda.’, translated as ‘if he is an oarsmen he should
be lashed from the stern to the bow.’
name suggests he had connections on the island. Michael could have left Rhodes to escape servile status.\textsuperscript{192} During this period each oarsman was responsible for his oar, as a result the crews needed to be more disciplined and skilled than the later galleys where multiple oarsmen operated the same oar.\textsuperscript{193}

**Abolition of the Servitudo Marina**

The *Servitudo Marina* was abolished in 1462, Bosio outlined the reasons for the abolition: people had fled the service, people did not want to take a wife in Rhodes, war and plague had diminished the population more generally.\textsuperscript{194} As stated previously, the issue of flight was first highlighted in 1386 as part of the call for a new register of all *Servitudo Marina* and then again later in the bull of 1433 which reduced the obligations of the service.\textsuperscript{195} The issue of marriage is evident in many of the manumission documents. Both the bull outlining the abolition of the *Servitudo Marina* and the 1433 bull mention plague. While the documents of the Order do not address plague specifically, Bosio notes that in 1455 Rhodes was affected by famine and plague.\textsuperscript{196} Rhodes was particularly susceptible to outbreaks of plague because of its range of interactions. Plague outbreaks often followed trade routes and the Order’s naval strategy of capturing Turkish ships further connected the island with larger networks of interaction and transmission of disease.\textsuperscript{197} The 1455 outbreak of plague on Rhodes spread throughout Europe, reaching the Balkans in 1455, Istanbul in 1456 and Barcelona in 1457.\textsuperscript{198} Outbreaks of plague would no doubt have affected those who owed the *Servitudo Marina*, the cramped and squalid conditions on board the ships as well as the increased contact with people from outside of Rhodes, especially Turkish captives, would have made those who owed the service particularly susceptible to disease. On Malta the Order made special arrangements for the medical

\textsuperscript{192} Stahl, ‘Michael of Rhodes; mariner in service to Venice’, p. 39.


\textsuperscript{194} ‘Et erano costoro sottoposti alla giuridittione dell’Ammiraglio Hor perché molti di questi Huomini, per fuggire quella servitù se, n’erano andati ad habitare altrove; & essendo oltra di ciò, per cagione delle guerre, e della peste, scemato molto il Popolo in Rodi; e s’alciuni Forestieri, iui ad habitar andauano; perche quella seruitù s’era molto comunicata, e sparsa nel Popolo; non voleuano pigliar Moglie in Rodi; acciocché Figliuoliloro, a quella seruitù obligati non rimanessero.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, pp. 285-6.


\textsuperscript{196} Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano* volume 2, p. 251.


care of its galley slaves in specialised wards in the hospital in Valletta. While there is no evidence that the Order had similar arrangements for those who owed Servitudo Marina on Rhodes, that such arrangements were made in Malta suggests that those working on galley required special treatment. None of these reasons were the result of recent changes, as the service had been failing to meet the Order’s demand for oarsmen for some time. In 1440 the Order was attempting to crew a large fleet, and there was a decree calling for a more accurate register due to the decline in the number of oarsmen. To make up for the shortage of oarsmen the people of Lindos, who were not subject to Servitudo Marina, were summoned to serve against the Mamluk fleet. In 1433 as part of an attempt to encourage those who had fled the Servitudo Marina to return the obligations to the manning of the Master’s ships and transport vessels was abolished for 10 years. The reasons given in 1462 for the abolition of the Servitudo Marina were all linked to depopulation, suggesting that the number of available oarsmen had been so drastically reduced that the Servitudo Marina was no longer viable. Although in 1433 the Order had another means to provide oarsmen for these vessels.

The document abolishing the Servitudo Marina presented itself as being for the benefit of the Greek population of Rhodes as the Servitudo Marina was replaced with a tax on grain; it is not made clear how this allowed the Order to replace the Servitudo Marina, but perhaps it allowed the Order to hire oarsmen or to provide funds to support a larger system of galley slavery. H. J. Sire presents a different reason for the abolition separate from depopulation, ‘...by 1462 the supply of Turkish captives, who were impressed as rowers, was sufficiently constant to permit the abolition of the Servitudo Marina...hence forth the use of galley slaves to form two thirds of the crews became invariable, while Buonavoglia supplied the rest.’ This suggests that rather than the abolition being the result in declining population of Rhodes it was the increasing availability of an alternative labour

201 Luttrell, ‘Lindos and the defence of Rhodes’, document 2, 20 September 1440, Rhodes; the master of the Hospital summons the oarsmen of lindos to serve against the mamluk fleet on the ship he is sending to them, AOM 354, folio 246v, Original Greek, ‘είς τούτο παρακαλό σας άκριβός καί όριζο σας απανο είν πέναν τής άπηστίας καί τής φούρκας και να χασου όλλα τους τά καλλά τά έχουν κατα τήν άραν οπου’
204 Sire, The knights of Malta, p. 86.
Theresa Vann also highlights the role of enslaved oarsmen and other sources of labour arguing persuasively that, ‘...after 1462, the ships were oared by captives, or, possibly in the case of corsairs, by free men who were promised a share of the profits.’ The service had been disliked by the Greek population, Jürgen Sarnowsky has highlighted the role played by the inefficiency of the system and the lack of willingness of the Greek subjects in its abolition. While the resistance of the Greek population to the Servitudo Marina may have been a contributing factor, the abolition should not be viewed as the Order advancing the rights and freedoms of those who owed it but rather replacing them with more easily controlled and exploited labour, and in particular the labour of slaves. Joseph Muscat and Andrew Cuschieri concerning the Order on Malta noted, ‘Like all other occupying powers, it ruled with an iron hand and was primarily interested in quelling any unrest that might arise.’ The abolition of the Servitudo Marina likely reduced the unrest among the Order’s Greek subjects on Rhodes. With the end of the Servitudo Marina those that had previously owed this service became free and were allowed to marry like any other free person without their children inheriting servile status. The surviving documents make no mention of how far the stigma of servitude remained on those who were freed, having previously been of a dishonourable servile status working alongside slaves would no doubt have left some taint of servility.

Unfortunately, few documents provide insight into the decline of the Servitudo Marina or the subsequent transition to the use of slave labour. The problems contributing to the decline of the Servitudo Marina developed for some time, the reason for the lack of documentation is likely because there was no sudden shift in labour. The Order was already diversifying its crews before the abolition of the Servitudo Marina. The use of slaves by the Order gradually increased; some privately owned slaves owed the Servitudo Marina, and some people were freed from the Servitudo Marina in return for slaves that replaced them. There is also evidence that the Order was engaged in capturing slaves following the abolition of the Servitudo Marina, Theresa Vann has noted that Grand Master Jean Baptiste de Orisni in 1475 met with the ambassador to the Sultan of Egypt to exchange Muslim

---

205 Finley, Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology, , p. 194 ‘So long as that labour is needed slavery cannot decline tout court; it has to be replaced.’
209 ‘fecero i Vassalli, e Sudditi sopradetti, franchi, liberi, & esenti in perpetuo, dalla seruitù della Marinaria sopradetta; dandogli autorità, e libertà di potere contrattare Matrimonio, con gli altri Vassalliliberi, e franchi; Dichiarando, che i Figliuoli loro similmente franchi in perpetuo rimanessero.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano, volume 2, pp. 285-6.
The Hospitaller archive notes that Brother Garcia Bexerra captured slaves and brought them to Rhodes in 1521. The capture of slaves is not necessarily evidence for their exploitation on the Order’s galleys, and Nicolas Vatin has noted that he was unable to find any mention in the Hospitaller archive as to the employment of slaves for this purpose. Nevertheless, the account of Oruc Reis, the brother of the Ottoman admiral Hayreddin Barbarossa, detailed that the Order did make use of slaves on their galleys, which was seen as trivial by the author. The absence of detailed evidence for the use of slaves on the Order’s galleys immediately following the abolition of the Servitudo Marina should not be seen as evidence of the absence of slaves on the Order’s galleys; this is more likely a result of the Order not detailing what would have been a normal situation at the time, as the use of slaves on galleys was widespread by the sixteenth century.

The abolition of the Servitudo Marina by the Order in favour of a shift towards galley slaves is not surprising. Only 4 years later in 1466, Afonso V of Portugal issued a letter of privileges to encourage settlers to Cabo Verde which quickly became dependent on slave labour. Additionally the shift from the traditional sources of oarsmen to slavery to obtain rowers was not unique to Rhodes and occurred across the Mediterranean. These developments for the most part took place in the sixteenth century around the Mediterranean, but on Rhodes it occurred earlier, possibly because of the limited population and the prominence of the navy to the Order. Venice did not use slaves as it recruited oarsmen from Dalmatia, Genoa recruited from the Rivieras but also turned to slave labour in the sixteenth century, Rhodes did not have a large population from which to attract oarsmen and its attempts to encourage oarsmen to move to Rhodes were unsuccessful. Robert Davis argues that the use of slaves was not only to fulfil a role that free men would not, but was also necessary because traditional naval recruitment was failing to provide enough oarsmen, causing naval powers

---

211 AOM 82 folio 53.
215 Rodgers, Naval warfare under oars 14th-16th centuries, p. 110; Slaves used in Genoa as a result of difficulties finding oarsmen in the 16th-century, Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpria’, domestici, p. 158, 1313 Bull attempted to encourage Latin oarsmen to come to Rhodes.
to turn to ‘...slave labour to make up the ever-widening shortfall.’ The use of slaves across the Mediterranean made the role of an oarsman less desirable; Richard Unger argues that the use of unfree labour as oarsmen, ‘...divested the job of any status it may have had, no volunteers could be found at any price and rowers became exclusively men who had not chosen the task.’ On Rhodes, those who owed the Servitudo Marina had not chosen the task and the increasing negative stigma attached to it further encouraged those who owed the Servitudo Marina to seek freedom through manumission or flight. Slaves would not have found the Order’s galleys more appealing than the Greek population of Rhodes although the Order found it easier to restrict their movements and control them. The Order’s control over their slaves was outlined clearly in the 1510 Pragmaticae Rhodie which contained a section on the restrictions placed on slaves; requiring them to be locked up at night, and to wear iron shackles on their feet. The Order was able to prevent the flight of slaves by taking measures to restrict their freedom that could not have been used against the Greeks of Rhodes who owed the Servitudo Marina. This is because the slaves were isolated without support from the community on Rhodes and were more clearly indistinguishable from the rest of the population so could not easily hide.

Conclusion

The Servitudo Marina was an important aspect of the Order’s time on Rhodes, it was no doubt significant both to the Order and the Greek population who served on the Order’s ships through the Servitudo Marina. Additionally the oarsmen’s families were affected by the Servitudo Marina, sons would owe the service, daughters would find it harder to marry because of the Servitudo Marina. This status negatively affected those who owed it and discouraged those around them from marrying them to prevent the obligation passing to their children. It is likely that several thousand

217 Unger, The ship in the medieval economy 600-1600, p. 235.
218 Freedman, Images of the medieval peasant, p. 81.
220 A servus in the Roman tradition from the verb servo, a captive not killed but put to work, Steven A. Epstein, Speaking of Slavery, Color, Ethnicity and Human Bondage in Italy, (Cornell University Press, 2001), p. 20; Isidore of Seville, Etymologies, translated by Priscilla Throop, (MedievalMS, 2005), Book 9, 4.43.
221 AOM 349 folio 122, AOM 350 folio 243v-244, transcribed in Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, document 32, p. 265 ; ‘ut vos ab eadem seruitute et exercicio dicte caravane gripparie, alias taphareze, remittere et relaxare volemus, suis humilimis supplicationibus inclinati, ab ipsa seruitute, seruicio et exercicio dicte caravane ipsius gripparie seu thaparese, usque ad terminum x annorum.’; Luttrell, The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes 1306-1462’ p. 63; Sarnowsky, Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15, pp. 359-360.
people owed the Servitudo Marina. Despite this there has been very little in-depth engagement with it, Luttrell’s 1975 article remains the only dedicated work on the subject.223 Many of the details of the Servitudo Marina remain unclear, such as how this system originated and how it had functioned before the arrival of the Order.

The Servitudo Marina was not slavery, although the Servitudo Marina overlapped with slavery in several significant ways; inherited servility, dishonourable status, loss of volition, and violence. Those who owed the Servitudo Marina required manumission to leave the system. Within these documents the terminology of how their freedom was regained overlaps with the terminology used within slave manumissions. Although within some works these documents are described as ‘exemptions’ rather than ‘manumissions’ to further separate the Servitudo Marina from slavery.224 Like slave manumissions the terms of these manumissions often varied and were at the discretion of the Grand Master.225 The issue of flight suggests that manumission was rare and difficult to gain.226 Some slaves and serfs were ‘freed’ on the condition of owing the Servitudo Marina.227 Coureas and Tsirpanlis both refer to this change in status as a promotion, Coureas did use the same positive terminology to refer to a pair of slaves being freed on the condition of becoming a serf in 1421.228

The Servitudo Marina the obligation was in some ways more severe and limiting then other forms of forced galley service, convicts and debt slaves did not pass on their status to their children. However, within the limited Hospitaller historiographical discourse where the Servitudo Marina is mentioned it has been presented in a different light, rarely described as servile; it has been distanced from slavery, the significance of the negative aspects has been minimised, there has been a focus on manumission as a sign of morality and attempts to sanitize the institution; overall very similar to how the Order’s use of slaves has been approached. This distancing of the Servitudo Marina from slavery has allowed for the argument that the Order did not use slaves on their galleys. This chapter

223 Luttrell ‘The Servitudo Marina’, p. 63 ‘...the manumission of marinarii...‘; Luttrell, ‘Lindos and the defence of Rhodes’, p.322 ‘...a woman from Rhodes who was bound to the Servitudo Marina, the master of the Hospital manumitted her...’referring to AOM 367 folio 170.

224 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, the term exemption is used to describe documents freeing those who owed the Servitudo Marina in Document 9 (AOM 339 folio 256v) and Document 68 (AOM 346 folio 164rv); Tsirpanlis, Unpublished documents concerning Rhodes, for documents freeing those who owed the Servitudo Marina the term ‘απαλλαγή’ is used which translated to exemption, as can be seen in document 22 (AOM 347, folio 200v-201) and document 284 (AOM 363 folio 243v).

225 The persistent issue of people fleeing from the Servitudo Marina suggests that it was difficult to gain manumission.


227 Coureas, ‘The Hospitallers and their manumissions of Rhodian and Cypriot serfs (1409-1459)’, p. 150

has attempted to refocus the approach to the *Servitudo Marina* and highlight flaws in existing scholarly interpretations of the service.

The difference between slaves and those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* is likely why the Order transitioned to using slaves. Unlike slaves those who owed the *Servitudo Marina* were not outsiders, the Order could not enforce the same restrictions on their freedoms that would later be enforced upon enslaved oarsmen.\(^{229}\) While the *Servitudo Marina* was abolished in 1462 its decline had started far earlier and there was a gradual transition to using slaves, some were provided as part of the conditions of manumission for those who owed the *Servitudo Marina*.\(^{230}\) The *Servitudo Marina* was key to the development of the Order’s use of galley slaves.


Chapter 3, The significance of galley slavery

This chapter seeks to explore the significance of slavery within the galleys of the Order on Malta. Slaves appear to have been fundamental to their operation from the outset of the Order’s arrival on the island, Joseph Muscat has stated that; ‘The naval activities of the Order, especially after 1530, became its raison d’etre...’.¹ This chapter will first outline the scale of the Order’s navy; the increasing number of galleys and the increasing number of oarsmen required per galley. Manning the Order’s galleys was of prime importance and required a large number of oarsmen. With the abolition of the Servitudo Marina in 1462 this became the most vital occupation of the Order’s slaves. Indeed as Wettinger has persuasively argued: ‘...there was probably no time when the slaves of the order kept ashore outnumbered those employed on the galleys...’.² The second part of the chapter will discuss the cost of the Order’s naval operations and the income the galleys provided from capturing ships and slave-raiding. The galleys of the Order required large numbers of slaves to operate, yet they were also key to the acquisition of captives who were then enslaved. These slaves provided the Order with both labour and generated significant wealth for the Order through the trade with other slaveholding powers.³ Slaves served on the Order’s galleys as oarsmen, but they rowed alongside semi-free men, known as Buonavoglia (short for rematori di Buonavoglia), and convicts, Forzati; these groups will therefore also be discussed before moving on to explore the treatment of the Order’s oarsmen and the conditions in which they lived and worked.⁴ These conditions were overall very poor. As Mikhail Kizilov stated: ‘Perhaps the most terrible fate was to become a galley-slave’.⁵

This chapter does not aim to detail every naval engagement the Order took part in, rather it highlights those that provide an insight into the role and conditions of slavery, as well as other servile labour groups on the Order’s galleys. Despite their prolific exploitation galley slaves are rarely discussed within the surviving documents. This is not unique to the Order: Salvatore Bono has noted

¹ Muscat, Sails Round Malta, p. 31
² Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 295.
⁴ ‘rematori di Buonavoglia’ means rowers of goodwill, that is ‘volunteer rowers’ and were considered freemen. Despite being classed as freemen the Buonavoglia were often working off debts to the Order; this will be discussed in more detail bellow, Grima, The Fleet of the Knights of Malta, pp. 264-66.
that slave oarsmen are barely mentioned in sources regarding the Italian navies. Nevertheless, some accounts written by galley slaves do exist and these describe a situation that differs quite markedly from the one presented by the modern historiography on the topic. Moreover, Peter Earle has noted a lack of engagement within the historiography on the study of medieval piracy and corsairing, observing that: ‘From the general silence on this subject one might assume that Christian Europe has had a collective feeling of guilt about the activity of its corsairs...’ This feeling of guilt might be why the naval activities of the Order are often presented in a sanitised way. Indeed, their naval exploits are even defined in opposition to piracy and corsairing which is all the more surprising given the extensive evidence for their participation in such activities.

Following the abolition of the *Servitudo Marina* in 1462, the Order made use of slaves, Forzati and Buonavoglia. From the 1590 census undertaken by Diego della Quadra for the Viceroy of Sicily, Carmelo Trasselli outlined the crew breakdown of the Order’s 6 galleys: this table is included in Appendix 3. The Order had 1,407 oarsmen on these six ships, slaves made up 55.8% of those oarsmen, Forzati made up 15.5% and Buonavoglia made up 28.7%. A significant shift from the use primarily of hereditary servile oarsmen who owed *Servitudo Marina*, although this change is not surprising as across the Mediterranean convicts and slaves had replaced freemen at the oars. The change was partly linked to reducing the cost of paying oarsmen, additionally Richard Unger notes that once slaves and criminals were put to the oars the job lost its status; the association with slaves made the role unpalatable for free men, which reduced their willingness to man the oars and as a result the oars became primarily manned by forced labour. In Genoa by the start of the seventeenth century the galleys were rowed exclusively by men who were either enslaved or in some other condition of forced labour. Furthermore, there was a significant change from the end of the sixteenth century into the seventeenth century in the system of rowing that further encouraged the shift to forced labour; the use of 5 oarsmen per oar was a rowing system known as a

---

6 Bono, *Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici*, p. 155 ‘Nelle storie - in verità non numerose e non esaurienti - delle marine italiane si tace o si accennà appena agli schiavi impiegati come rematori: e stato in effetti piuttosto trascurato tutto ciò che concerne gli equipaggi e le ciurme.’
7 Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 10.
11 Unger, *The ship in the medieval economy 600-1600*, p. 235.
Scaloccio and replaced the previous system the Zenzile in which each rower handled their own oar.  

The benefit of the Scaloccio system was that it only required one skilled oarsman at the bench’s end to manipulate the oar’s handle, typically a Buonavoglia. This change encouraged more widespread use of slaves on the Order’s galleys.

The Scale of the Order’s Navy

The number of galleys that the Order operated increased during its time on Malta. The Order left Rhodes with 4 galleys in 1522, the Santa Anna, the San Giovanni, the Aquila and the Santa Maria Vittorisa. The Order arrived on Malta in 1530 with 3 galleys, the Santa Croce, the San Filippo and the San Giovanni. By 1555 the Order had 4 galleys which were sunk by a tidal wave, yet their naval capabilities quickly recovered as the King of Spain gave them two galleys, and the Grand Master built one which the Pope supplied with a crew. According to Bosio, by 1558 the Order was operating 5 galleys and this was still the case nearly 30 years later in 1584. The Order’s naval power further increased during the seventeenth century, Dal Pozzo notes that the Order operated 6 galleys in 1628. Wettinger provides a breakdown of the 6 galleys operated by the Order in 1632 (See Appendix 3). The number increased to 7 at the end of 1651, as noted by Dal Pozzo.

---


18 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 30 ; Brogini, Malte, p.86, references AOM 425 folio 211; Abbe de Vertot, The history of the Knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem, styled afterwards the Knights of Rhodes and at present, the Knights of Malta, Volume 4, (J. Donaldson, 1757), p. 229-230.


21 Appendix 3; Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344.

22 Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 2, (Gerolamo Albrizzi, 1715), p. 196 ‘Anco il Gran Maestro Lascaris conoscendo il profitto, che risultava
states that in 1685 ‘...the order’s navy consisted of eight of the strongest and best equipped galleys in the whole Mediterranean, together with a number of small sailing-ships and auxiliaries.’ In 1690 Jean Dumont visited Malta and confirmed that the Order had 7 galleys. This rate of growth was considerable: in less than 100 years the Order had doubled the number of galleys in operation from 3 in 1530 to 6 in 1628. This in turn meant a significant increase in the number of oarsmen the Order required.

The number of galleys could fluctuate rapidly, as the Order captured and repurposed Turkish ships. For example, in May 1589 Brother Chamesson sailed out with 3 galleys and chased 2 Turkish galleys from Rhodes; the Turks abandoned their ships in shallow waters and fled. Brother Chamesson liberated the 400 Christian slaves found aboard these galleys and added the vessels to his fleet. Christian slaves likely made up the majority of the oarsmen of the captured galleys, since they were added to Brother Chamesson’s fleet it seems the liberated Christians continued in the same role as before their liberation until the fleet returned to Malta. He went on to capture 260 slaves on some other Turkish vessels and seized a large quantity of gold coins. In 1564 the Order captured a large Turkish galleon called the Sultana; they renamed it the San Giovanni and it joined their fleet. The Grand Masters also operated their own ships which, in principle, were distinct from the Order’s fleet but seem to have generally been regarded as part of it. When Grand Master de Valetta died in
1568, he left the Order his 2 galleys and 530 slaves, which likely included the enslaved oarsmen who propelled them.  

Overall, while the number of galleys the Order operated varied from year to year, with both defeats and victories affecting the number of galleys, the size of the Order’s navy increased from its arrival with 3 galleys in 1530, to between 5-6 galleys for most of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, increasing further to 7 ships in the second half of the seventeenth century. Salvatore Bono has suggested that in times of dire need it was possible for the Order to muster as many as 12 galleys. The increasing size of the Order’s navy required an increasing number of oarsmen; it is possible to estimate how many oarsmen would have been needed and, in turn, provide an indication of the number of slaves that the Order was exploiting on its galleys.

Dal Pozzo presented an outline of the number of oarsmen on the Order’s ships in 1574: the Order’s flagship, known as the Capitana had 28 benches per side with 250 oarsmen, 5 oarsmen per bench in the aft quarter and 4 oarsmen per bench on the rest, this would have resulted in a total of 238 oarsmen with 12 spare; the other galleys only had 25 benches per side and a total of 200 oarsmen, suggesting 4 oarsmen per bench. This is in line with the numbers Salvatore Bono provides when estimating the number of oarsmen on a general Mediterranean galley: he outlines that there would have been between 25-30 benches on each side, 50-60 in total, and each bench had 3-4 oarsmen, for a total of between 150 to 240 oarsmen. To judge from Bono’s numbers the Order’s galleys held more oarsmen than would be expected for their size, as they had already transitioned to using more men per bench, 4-5 rather than 3-4, although the number of benches was at the lower end of Bono’s estimates, 50 per galley with the Capitana having only 56 benches.

Carmelo Trasselli has provided a breakdown of the crew of the Order’s fleet of 6 galleys in 1590: this table is included in Appendix 3. Excluding the Capitana, the average galley had 224 oarsmen in 1590, the Capitana, which was always significantly larger, at that time had a total of 286 oarsmen.

---

30 Testa, Romegas, p.105; AOM 53 folio 181, 184 et seq.
31 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 99 ‘Ci e noto comunque che, nei momenti di massima potenza, la flotta arrivo a contare una dozzina di galere; nel 1617 erano sette: la capitana, la padrona e cinque altre.’
32 Muscat, Cuschieri, Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798, p.32 ; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detto di Malta, volume 1, p.99 ‘Nella Capitana, ch’era di banchi 28 vi fossero 250 Remiganti, armandosi il quartiero di poppa cinque per banco e il resto a quattro, e nell’altre non piu di 200 non essendo che di 25 banchi.’
33 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 107 ‘I n ogni galera, la nave per eccellenza della guerra corsara fino all’introduzione dei vascelli tondi, vi erano 25-30 banchi o panchine a destra e altrettanti a sinistra, ciascuno con 3-4 o piu rematori: in totale, dunque, da 150 a 240 galeotti circa.’
The average of 224 is in line with the estimate of 200 provided by Dal Pozzo, the additional oarsmen were likely spare in case of losses while at sea. The Capitana’s total number of oarsmen in 1590, was 286, notably higher than Dal Pozzo’s estimate of 250; this increase suggests the Capitana in 1590 had transitioned to using 5 oarsmen per oar on every bench. If the Capitana in 1590 had 56 benches like the 1574 Capitana then it would have required 280 oarsmen; the remaining 6 were likely reserve oarsmen. By 1631 the use of 5 oarsmen per bench was standard throughout the Order’s fleet: Wettinger outlines that the commissioner of the galleys, Brother Giovanni Macedonia, stated that on each galley there must be 5 oarsmen per oar and 20 oarsmen kept in reserve; as each galley had 26 benches per side, suggesting the Order required 280 oarsmen per galley. The Capitana appears to have increased in size overtime as well, typically having 30 benches per side. Although the numbers are not always clear, according to the account of Otto Groben in 1675 the Order had 7 galleys, the flagship had 32 oars per side while the other galleys had 28 oars per side each pulled by 5 oarsmen. Commenting on Groben’s numbers, Thomas Feller noted that the flagship was constructed to have 30 oars and the Order’s galleys typically had 16 oars per side. The number 16 is far lower than other estimates; a ship of 16 oars per side would only have required 160 oarsmen. It is possible that this number is based on earlier ship designs, as in 1632 the smallest of the Order’s galleys was the San Carlo with 281 oarsmen, while in 1590 the smallest was the Santa Marta which required 196 oarsmen. Carmel Testa highlights the similarities between the Order’s galleys and those of Genoa and - based on the 1692 text on Genoese ship construction the ‘Architectura Navalis’ written by Joseph Furtternbach - estimates that the average galley had 270 slave oarsmen.

Clearly the design of the Order’s galleys changed over time. As Dal Pozzo outlined, in 1574 a galley required 200 oarsmen, and to judge from the 1590 break-down that the average galley had 224 oarsmen, the additional oarsmen were likely reserves. By 1632 the size of the average galley had

36 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p.340, references AOM 6397, fol 206rv, the document is undated but Wettinger notes that Macedonia only became commissioner in 1631.
37 McManamon, ‘Maltese seafaring in mediaeval and post-mediaeval times’, p. 49.
38 Thomas Frelter, Knights, corsairs and slaves in Malta an eyewitness account, (Pubblikazzjonijiet indipendenza, 1999), p. 63, note 5.
39 Frelter, Knights, corsairs and slaves in Malta an eyewitness account, p. 42.
40 1632 numbers from Appendix 4, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344; 1590 numbers from Appendix 2, Table E) Galere, in Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese’, pp. 474-480, average excludes the Capitana which was substantially larger. ; Joseph Grima provides slightly different numbers, he states that there were 357 Buonavoglie while both Wettinger and Anne Brogini use the number 387, Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys (c. 1600-1650)’, p. 114, references NLM 162, folio 127r-v
41 Testa, Romegas, p. 150, references Joseph Furttenbach, Architectura Navalis, (Durch Jonam Saurn, Bestellten Buchtruckern daselbsten, 1629).
increased to 294 oarsmen. These increases were due to a change in design and rowing system; the galleys now had more oarsmen per bench and required a minimum of 280 oarsmen. This change is outlined in appendix 2. The increase in the number of oarsmen needed per galley was not unique to the Order. Galleys of the Spanish navy also increased in size, from requiring 170 oarsmen in 1587 to needing 260 oarsmen per ship in 1621.

Overall, the number of galleys the Order operated increased, and the number of oarsmen per galley increased. Not only were there more oarsmen but more of them were slaves and there were fewer Forzati and Buonavoglia. In 1547 it was decreed that the number of slaves on each galley was not to exceed 50. Although by 1590 far more than 50 slaves were being used on each of the Order’s galleys, the Capitana alone made use of 154 slaves as oarsmen and overall the Order utilised 1,407 oarsmen (Buonavoglia, Forzati and Schiavi), of which slaves accounted for more than half. In the 42 years between 1590 and 1632 it seems that the number of oarsmen on the Order’s galleys had increased by a third, while the number of slaves had increased by two-thirds, this is outlined in appendix 2. During this period, the Scaloccio rowing system where each bench of oarsmen rowed the same oar replaced the previous system the Zenzile where each oarsman had their own oar. This change occurred across the Mediterranean; it is unclear what drove this shift, but the outcome was that each bench only required the innermost oarsmen who set the rowing rate to be highly skilled. This change meant that a galley could operate even if the majority of the oarsmen had no experience of rowing. Additionally by only requiring one oarsmen per bench to be highly skilled the dangers that could be caused by unskilled oarsmen disrupting rowing were reduced. This supported the use of forced labour as intentional disruption of rowing could not be undertaken individually.

The skilled innermost rower was typically a Buonavoglia and part of their role as chief rower was to monitor the slaves on their bench. Slave resistance on the Order’s galleys will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter. With the abolition of the Servitudo Marina in 1462 the Order was already
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43 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 340, references AOM 6397, fol 206rv, the document is undated but Wettinger notes that Macedonia only became commission in 1631.
45 Testa, *Romegas*, p. 37, reference AOM 87, folio 102v.
46 Appendix 2, *Table E) Galere*, in Trasselli, ‘Una statistica Maltese’, pp. 474-480, Slaves accounted for 785 out of 1,407 oarsmen, approximately 56%
making more use of slaves as oarsmen, the shift to the Scaloccio may have further facilitated the increased use of slaves, by 1632 only one rower per oar would have been a Buonavoglia, the minimum required to occupy the key position at the bench’s end.51

The total number of oarsmen increased from 1,407 in 1590 to 2,190 in 1669. The number of slaves increased significantly, from 785 in the year 1590 to 1,560 in the year 1669, and this trend continued; Rossi has argued that there were 2,000 slaves working on the Order’s galleys in the eighteenth century.52 Slave oarsmen became more significant to the operation of the Order’s galleys over time and comparisons suggest that the Order made use of a much higher proportion of slaves on its galleys than other maritime powers. For example, Miri Shefer Mossensohn has stated that ‘In the 1660s over ninety percent of the Ottoman navy consisted of free men, with only ten percent slaves, prisoners of war, or convicts.’53 The opposite of the situation on the Order’s galleys and very different from many of the European galleys. With regard to other European maritime powers, Ruth Pike details that slaves made up only 31% of oarsmen in the Spanish fleet in 1655, although this had increased to 41% by 1668; the Spanish fleet made more use of Forzati oarsmen who accounted for two-thirds of the fleet’s oarsmen in 1655.54 Salvatore Bono outlines that slaves made up only approximately 30% of oarsmen on Italian galleys.55 Anne Brogini outlines that in 1594 slaves represented 58% of the Order’s oarsmen, which increased to 69.7% in 1632 and 71.2% in 1669, this information is detailed in Appendix 3.56 Wettinger also provides a breakdown of the oarsmen in the Order’s fleet of 6 galleys in 1632: at this time the Order utilised 1,846 oarsmen, of which slaves accounted for more than two-thirds.57 The difference is clear when considering the situation on an individual bench of five oarsmen. On an Italian galley per bench of five oarsmen there would have

51 McManamon, ‘Maltese seafaring in mediaeval and post-mediaeval times’, p. 49.
52 Rosso, ‘Slaves, corsairs and the Order of Malta in the 16th-17th centuries’, p. 91.
54 Pike, Penal servitude in early modern Spain, pp. 11-13, 1655 oarsmen in the Spanish navy, 1247 Forzados, 581 slaves, total oarsmen 1882.
55 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpria’, domestici, p.158 ‘Accanto agli schiavi - la cui proporzione era normalmente del 25-30 per cento - sedevano i forzati e i cosiddetti Buonavoglia, uomini liberi offertisi spontaneamente come rematori perchè sopraffatti dai debiti, spesso di giuoco, o disperati per la mancanza di lavoro.’
56 Anne Brogini, ‘Au Coeur de l’esclavage mediterraneen; Malta aux xvic-xvic siecles’, Schiavitù e servaggio nell’economia europea (secc. XI-XVIII), Edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi, Serie II, 45, (Le Monnier, Florence, 2014), p. 541, ‘en 1594, les esclaves représentent 58% de l’ensemble des rameurs et cette proportion ne cesse d’augmenter au XVIIe siècle, se stabilisant aux environs des 2/3 de l’effectif, soit 69.7% en 1632 et 71,2% en 1669.’ Although Brogini noted that the source used for 1594 only represents two of the Order’s galleys.
57 Appendix 3, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p.344, slaves counted for 1284 out of 1846 oarsmen, approximately 70%; Wettinger, 'The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 29.
been only one slave and at least one Buonavoglia. On the Order’s galley in 1632 there was the minimum of one Buonavoglia per bench and not enough Forzati oarsmen to have one per bench; as a result the vast majority of the benches were manned by enslaved oarsmen, who would occupy three or four of the spaces on each bench. On the Venetian galleys slaves could represent up to two-thirds of the oarsmen, although typically the number of slaves was limited due to concerns over security. Many factors likely affected why there was such a difference. The Order could only draw on a much smaller population for its oarsmen. In 1630 the population of Malta was estimated at approximately 50,000 in 1632 the Order had 1,846 oarsmen without the use of slaves, Forzati or Buonavoglia this would have required the commitment of approximately 4% of the population. The smaller population would also have resulted in less criminals and so the Order had less Forzati available. Alternatively a preference for slaves could stem from the opinion that through violence and fear forced labour could outperform free oarsmen. Additionally the Order’s galleys, through their military operations, were able to enslave their foes which meant the Order did not have to rely on purchasing slaves. Although the Order’s supply of slaves was not always able to meet the demand, which resulted in shortages, of oarsmen and the Order purchasing both slaves and Forzati from abroad. This trade in slaves is only briefly mentioned within the Order’s archives, with few details regarding the slaves that were received. Slave oarsmen were purchased from France and Italy as early as 1551, and again in 1598. Dal Pozzo details that in 1577 the Order purchased Forzati as oarsmen in the port of Marseille. This continued into the seventeenth century; the Order

58 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p. 158 ‘Negli statuti dell’ordine stefaniano si stabiliva che <<ogni galera non possa tenere piu che uno schiavo a banco>> e al tempo stesso avesse almeno un Buonavoglia su ogni banco.’
59 Appendix 3, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344.
60 Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 28.
61 Rodgers, Naval warfare under oars 14th-16th centuries, p. 110; Slaves used in Genoa as a result of difficulties finding oarsmen in the 16th-century, Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p. 158.
62 ‘The Barberini Latino manuscript’, (Vatican Apostolic library manuscript 5036), transcribed in, Lo stato dell’Ordine di Malta 1630, edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes, (Centro Studi Melitensi Taranto, 2017), p.65, folio 16 ‘Fa L’isola circa 50 mila anime, essendosi, dopo che e venuta ad habitarvi la Religione, raddoppiato il numero degli habitanti.’
64 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 109 ‘Le marine europee ebbero sempre un minor numero di schiavi a disposizione e ritennero comunque più prudente evitare che gli schiavi musulmani costituissero la maggioranza della ciurma...’
65 Muscat, Cuschieri, Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798, p. 45.
66 AOM 427 fol 260v, discussed in Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344; Brogini, Malte, p. 90, references AOM 451 folio 272.
purchased slaves from Croatia in 1688. In 1603 Grand Master Alof de Wignacourt was disappointed that the majority of the slaves captured after a mission to Lepanto and Patrasso were women and children thus not suitable for galley service. Shortages of oarsmen were not a problem unique to the Order, it was a common issue within all European navies, especially with regard to slaves. Even the papal galleys suffered from such labour shortages and several times called upon the Order to provide slaves to address this. In 1588 Dal Pozzo mentions that the Order gave 130 slaves to the Pope. Only 4 years earlier in 1584 the Order had refused a request for 100 galley slaves from the Duke of Tuscany, due to there being an insufficient number on Malta. This highlights the power the Pope had over the Order: rather than suggesting that the Order had slaves to spare, in 1595 when the Pope requested 100 slaves from the Order in exchange for Forzati oarsmen, the Order fulfilled the request, although the Grand Master highlighted that they were sent despite the scarcity of slaves on Malta and in recognition of the Pope as supreme master of the Order. These repeated requests for galley slaves perhaps show that the galley slaves of the Order...
were considered to be of a particular quality. Paul Bamford noted that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Malta was one of only two Mediterranean slave markets where the French navy purchased slaves in considerable volume, purchasing as many as a hundred slaves per year during the 1670s. This highlights the significance of Malta as an international slave market and a supplier for slaves to Europe.

The Papacy continued to appeal to the Order for slave oarsmen throughout its time on Malta, requesting 40 oarsmen in 1669 and attempting to exchange 200 Forzati for 200 of the Order’s slaves in 1723; although the Order rejected this as Forzati oarsmen caused more problems than slave oarsmen. As Wettinger outlines ‘...they had, with their many vices and bad habits, frequently done great harms to the fleet of the Order.’ Louis XIV had attempted a similar exchange of slaves for Forzati in 1662. The Order’s desire to make use of slave labour rather than Forzati is not surprising, while for the most part Forzati were treated like slaves, which will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter, there were differences in situation. The Order typically sought Forzati with long sentences to benefit from the Forzati gaining experience of rowing and the operation of the Order’s galleys, this required them to have committed violent crimes which would have made them more of a security risk. Additionally for Forzati with a life sentence there was no possibility of freedom which would have further encouraged them to attempt to flee, whereas for galley slaves the possibility of ransom existed, which could discourage flight and would have provided income for the Order. Despite the preference for slaves, Forzati continued to be part of the Order’s oarsmen through its time on Malta and the Order was often given Forzati oarsmen; as early as 1597 the Order was given 50 Forzati by the king of France and in 1651 it was given 250 Forzati by Pope Innocent X. In the seventeenth century the Order was still actively seeking more Forzati to serve on its galleys.

in Consiglio il desiderio di S. Santitá d'hauere dalla Religione , cento schiaui per rinforzo delle sue Galere, i quali si sarebbono compensati con altrettanti Forzati, o in altro maggior numero come sarebbe parso al Commendatore Fr. Emilio Pucci Comandante delle Galere Pontificie, ch'all'hora con le medeme si ritrouaua in Messina. Però il G. Maestro, e Consiglio prontissimi a corrisponder ai desideri del Pontefice, ordinarono ch'i Procuratori del Tesoro facessero scelta di detti schiaui, e che fossero tosto condotti a Messina.’; Wettinger Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 263, references AOM 1377 folio 169-70; 

76 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 267, references AOM 1333, AOM 1444, Nicholas Cotoner to Ambassador Verospi (Rome), ff. 53-54r, 25 Apr. 1669.
77 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 266.
78 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 268, references AOM 1214 folio 95.
80 Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, pp. 90-91; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovannì Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 391 ‘Nel mese di Genaro del seguente anno 1597, essendo ri- accogli: tornato in Malta il Commendator Fr. D. Federico de Britto, vno de tre Ambasciatori spediti in Francia a congratularsi col Re Christianissimo della sua riconciliazione con la Santa
At times, the Order suffered from extreme shortages of oarsmen. In 1606, the Grand Master lamented the loss of 540 galley slaves, several of the Order’s galleys had been wrecked on the islet of Zembalo near Tunis, the slaves used this situation to escape. In 1555 four of the Order’s galleys were destroyed as a result of a storm; the galley slaves had been chained to the decks despite the conditions and hundreds died, necessitating the Order’s land slaves being sent to the galleys, while some of the Maltese peasants also volunteered to row. Additional oarsmen and galleys were also provided by the King of Spain and the Pope. As a result of shortages in 1649, all of the Order’s slaves were ordered to row. The Order appears to have at times pressed the population of Malta into service; in 1572 Forzati were brought from France to man the Order’s galleys and replaced Maltese oarsmen, ‘...who in fact, had been sent to the galleys by force, without sentence of court.’ Carmel Testa and Godfrey Wettinger view this as an example of impressment; Wettinger states that this is the only known occasion of press-gang methods used in Malta, although this may have occurred again in 1685 when, due to the lack of slaves, recruits were drawn from the Maltese population. Ivan Grech has observed that ‘...recruits were rallied from Malta’s population by the beat of the drum.’ Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo presents the 1685 example as the hiring of sailors who
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Sede, e per parte sua, e de Colleghi facendo relatione , della sua Ambasciata, certificò il G. Maestro, & i Consiglieri, ch'erano stati da Sua Maestà con somma benignità accolti, e con affettuose espressioni assicurati, che non meno ch’i Re suoi Predecessori hauerebbe tenuto special cura, e protettione della Religione, e che non hauerebbe , mancato di farle tutte le gratie, e favori possibili: Per caparra de'quali hauea offerito di dare per servitio della Religione 50 Forzati, e di confermare i suoi Priuilegi, di che tutto il Conuento infinitimmente se ne rallegrò, ordinando ch’ a S. Maestà se ne rendessero humilissime gratie.’; Pozzo, *Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta*, Volume 2, p. 192 ‘Trovasi in questo tempo la nostra Ciurma molto fiacca, e diminuita, mentre impiegata, per tanti anni nel soccorso di Candia, haveva come abbandonato l’esercitio del corso, che soleva dare abbondanti proventi di prede, e di schiavi. Per tale consideratione volle Papa Innocentio darle un spontaneo rinforzo di 250 Forzati, che con Vascello a posta si mandarono a pigliare a Civitavecchia.’
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82 Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, p. 86, references AOM 1385, Alof de Wignacourt to Ambassador Mendes (Rome), ff. 144-145r, 2 May 1606, ‘ma quell che più ci preme, di tutti li schiavi che erano il principal nervo e sustanzia delle nostre forze maritime’.
85 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 348, references AOM 258 Folio 182.
86 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 30 references AOM 93 Folio 62; Pozzo, *Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta*, volume 1, p.49, ‘Eran venuti in questo tempo da Marsilia sopra il Galeone della Religione una quantità di Forzati, che mandaua il Rè Christianissimo, come souente far soleua per armamento di queste Galere; E trovandosi sopra le medesime quantità di Remiganti Maltesi, che finito il tempo del lor servitio, chiedeuan d’esser licen tiati : Per ciò li Forzati di Francia giussero opportunamente per supplire in luogo loro; E così riarmate le Galere, fecero vn viaggio in Sicilia a proueder l’Isola di vettouaglie…’
were paid for their labours. Although that the recruits were paid does not mean that they were not recruited by force. These shortages appear to have continued into the eighteenth century; in 1711 the Pope attempted to purchase slaves from the Order but found that there were none available.

In summation, the size of the Order’s navy increased considerably during its time on Malta, which resulted in an increased demand for oarsmen, especially as changes to the system of rowing required more oarsmen per galley. The Order significantly increased the proportion of slaves on their galleys, until slaves made up approximately two-thirds of the oarsmen. These changes did not occur in isolation, but the Order’s galley crew were made up of more slaves than other comparative European galleys. Additionally the Order interacted with other slaveholding powers, purchasing and requesting servile oarsmen during times of shortage and also selling and giving gifts of enslaved oarsmen.

**Cost of the Order’s naval operations**

The operation of the Order’s galleys was extremely expensive. As noted by Joseph Grima ‘Perhaps the greatest headache ever present in the financial administration of the Order of St John’s Treasury in Malta was the heavy expenditure incurred by the galley-squadron.’ The cost per year appears to have varied: in 1583 the Order spent 97,535 scudi on its four galleys, approximately 24,384 scudi per galley; as the Order’s income in that year was 151,734 scudi, the galleys took 64% of the Order’s income. Grima notes that this figure appears particularly high when compared to 1587 when the Order spent 75,671 on its four galleys, approximately 18,918 scudi per galley. In 1630 it was reported that it cost 22,000 scudi to maintain a galley. Within the Order’s documents it can be difficult to find clear estimates of the costs, for 1631 Grima has presented two different costs based on two different documents, 27,000 scudi and 24,000 scudi. This appears high when compared to
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‘Per supplire alla Ciurma, ch’era il più difficile d’una Galera, doversi far ricerca di tutti gli Schiavi del Tesoro, così de’ ritenuti in altri servigi, come de rilasciati; & in difetto di Schiavi, doversi assoldare marinari da remo, come altre volte s’era praticato col soldo di dieci scudi a cadauno, cinque di donativo, e cinque da scontarsi uno il mese sopra la paga, che doveva correr loro a ragione di due scudi il mese, con la piatanza di marinaro.’

90 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 266, references AOM 1472.

91 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 340, references AOM 6397, fol 206rv, the document is undated but Wettinger notes that Macedonia only became commission in 1631.

92 Detailed in Appendix 2.
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1637 when the Bailiff Brother Don Carlo Valdin estimated the upkeep cost of each galley at 20,000 scudi for the 5 galleys and 23,000 scudi for the Capitana. In 1650 the Prior of Dacia, Brother Christian Osterhausen, estimated that the upkeep of the Order’s 6 galleys cost between 125,000 and 130,000 scudi; based on these estimates the cost per galley would have been between 20,833 and 21,666 scudi. From these examples while the cost per galley may have varied from year to year, there is not a clear change; based on the data from 1583 and 1587 the Order’s expenditure on a galley in the 1580s was approximately 21,651 scudi, which is in line with the upper estimate from 1650.

This is significant because it shows that the changes that took place in the organization and number of oarsmen do not appear to have made a notable difference in the cost of running the galleys. Fewer oarsmen were being paid, but a substantially increasing number had to be fed and clothed. As discussed above, based on the breakdown of the galley crews from 1590 outlined by Carmel Trasselli, the average galley excluding the Capitana had 224 oarsmen, while by 1632 the size of the average galley had increased to 294 oarsmen, (again excluding the Capitana). The number of oarsmen per galley had increased by approximately 30% with no significant change in cost. However, the makeup of the crews had changed; in 1590, 28.7% of the crew were Buonavoglia, 15.5% were Forzati and 55.8% were slaves. By 1632 the number of Buonavoglia had reduced to 20.9%, the number of Forzati had reduced to 9.4% and the number of slaves had increased to 69.7%. The number of oarsmen increased without the costs increasing, it seems likely that this was because the increase in the number of slaves allowed the Order to keep costs the same. Joseph Muscat has argued that a galley with slave oarsmen cost half what a galley using free oarsmen would. It is difficult to justify such a claim, the costs of operating a galley would vary considerably depending on the context, to make a comparison within the Order’s context is possible as the costs of maintaining the Order’s galleys from their final years on Malta are available, at which point the galleys were rowed by free men, Marinari di Remo, because the Order had far less slaves at this time. Based on the Order’s accounts for the ten years between 1778 and 1788, William Thornton estimated a galley
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cost 42,723 scudi. J.M. Wismayer considers a similar period and produced a far higher average, approximately 58,000 scudi but includes additional costs.

To argue that the increased use of free oarsmen in the eighteenth century resulted in higher costs compared to the use of slaves in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would be an oversimplification but with regard to the changes in the number of oarsmen and the make-up of the crews between 1590 and 1632 the increase in the number of slaves does appear to have reduced the costs per oarsmen on the Order’s galleys. Although it seems unlikely that the reduction in the number of Forzati would have affected the galley expenditure whereas the reduction of the Buonavoglia may have. The lack of sixteenth century accounts makes it impossible to clearly show the extent to which the reduction in the number of Buonavoglia effected cost but broadly, the cost of the salaries of the Buonavoglia was reduced by having a minimum number of Buonavoglia per galley, one per bench, which was the situation in 1632. The cost of paying the Buonavoglia in 1644 amounted to 8,057 scudi of the 29,508 scudi spent on crew salaries for the Order’s six galleys.

Based on the average expenditure for the Order’s fleet from 1650, the payment to the Buonavoglia represented approximately 6% of the total cost and only represented approximately 20% of the oarsmen. In 1590 Buonavoglia would have made up around 28% of the oarsmen so their salaries would have cost more. It seems unlikely that the Order would have chosen to reduce the number of Buonavoglia unless it was in some way beneficial, especially as their presence was considered a deterrent to the galley slaves rebelling. Salvatore Bono notes that due to concerns over security many European navies did not want the majority of their oarsmen to be Muslim slaves. The Order does not appear to have been significantly concerned, however, as their oarsmen had been predominately made up of slaves since 1590. As the number of oarsmen increased the cost of
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105 Joseph Wismayer, The seven year balance sheet of the sovereign, military and hospitaller order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and Of Malta from 1st May 1778 to end of April 1785 (Universal Intelligence data bank of America, 1984), p. 31.
106 Appendix 3; Wettering, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344; Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p. 158 ‘Negli statuti dell’ordine stefaniano si stabiliva che <<ogni galera non possa tenere piu che uno schiavo a banco>> e al tempo stesso avesse almeno un Buonavoglia su ogni banco.’
107 Grima, ‘The Maintenance of the Order’s Galley-Squadron’, p. 146, references AOM 738 foil 2r-v ‘et anco di dare in capo all’anno scudi otto milacinquanta sette p. il soldo dalli Buonavoglia di tutte le sei Galere’
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feeding and clothing them would also have increased. The Order provided all oarsmen with clothes, these were valued at 5 scudi and 5 tari every year, while the cost for the Buonavoglia’s clothes was deducted from their pay.\textsuperscript{112} For the 1,846 oarsmen in the year 1632 this would have cost the Order 9,999 scudi for the entire fleet; based on the average expenditure from 1650, this would have represented approximately 7.8% of the total cost.\textsuperscript{113} Although the reduction in non-servile labour was not unique to Malta; with regard to Spain, Pike has argued that there was a clear link between reducing the costs and making use of slaves; ‘In order to avoid a crushing economic burden there was no alternative but to depend on a servile rowing force.’\textsuperscript{114} This presents the decision to use slaves to reduce the cost of oarsmen as the only option, and understates the significance of a decision that forced thousands to endure galley slavery.

The Order’s navy also produced revenue, by capturing ships, cargo and crews that could be used by the Order or sold.\textsuperscript{115} There is a lack of information about how much revenue was generated through this, but much of what was raided or looted was subsequently then used by the Order. The navy to some extent subsidised the Order’s operations by providing high-value assets: ships, cargo, and slaves, at what appeared to be zero cost. For example, as mentioned above, in 1564 the Order captured a large Turkish galley called the Sultana; renamed it the San Giovanni and incorporated it into their fleet.\textsuperscript{116} The cost of a new galley would have been significant, but that value was not offset against the Order’s naval expenditure. The galleys also raided for slaves, many of whom were then put to work on the same galleys that had captured them; the Order’s navy both provided slaves and required them.\textsuperscript{117} Without the galleys raiding for slaves that could be used in the galleys, the cost of obtaining slaves to man the Order’s galleys would have been far higher. Additionally, many of the slaves captured by the galleys were put to work in other areas of the Order’s operations and many of them were also ransomed, generating further income. Wettinger has estimated that ‘…the average annual income of the treasury of the Order from the ransom or sale of its slaves must have stood for most of the eighteenth and at least the final decades of the seventeenth centuries around the figure
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\item \textsuperscript{112} Grima, ‘The Maintenance of the Order’s Galley-Squadron, p.146, references NLM 162, folio 108r-v.
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\item \textsuperscript{115} ‘Profits came from the foodstuffs seized from Ottoman cargo ships in the Levant and the men and vessels captured along the North African, Levantine, and Aegean coasts.’, McManamon, ‘Maltese seafaring in mediaeval and post-mediaeval times’, p. 47; Gauci, In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798, p. 146; Muscat, Slaves on Maltese Galleys, p. 10.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Muscat, Cuschieri, Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798, p. 24; Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 3, p. 471.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 12 ‘The major source of demand for slaves came from the Mediterranean navies.’; Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, p. 87. ‘Occasional prizes, brought to Malta by the Hospitaller galleys on their seasonal campaigns around the Mediterranean, were obviously a prime source of manpower’; Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).’, pp. 391–413.
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of ten thousand scudi, comparable in size with the annual sums spent by the order on the upkeep of the three slave prisons.¹¹⁸ In 1630 it was estimated that the cost of maintaining the slave prison was 8950 scudi while the redemption of slaves provided 7,000 scudi, the ransoming of captives covered around 80% of the cost of the slave prison.¹¹⁹ Brother Louis De Boisgelin outlined that between 1779 and 1788 the Order on average earned 16,617 scudi per year from the ransom of slaves.¹²⁰ Salvatore Bono estimates that in 1630 the Order earned 12,000 scudi from captured ships.¹²¹ Grima describes this as ‘…an indirect source of income…’, this phrasing presents the income from ransoming slaves almost as incidental.¹²² Although within the eighteenth century accounts of the Order there is no distinction, the income generated from the ransom of slaves was placed between rents from the Lazzaretto isolation hospital and the proceeds from the mint.¹²³ The Order’s galley slaves also represented a large group of labourers that could be used to perform other tasks: for instance, in 1552 the Grand Master assigned the galley crews to the construction of a new castle on Xiberras.¹²⁴ In the same year, galley slaves also worked on the fortifications on Malta.¹²⁵ Similarly, in 1547 the Order’s galley slaves were ordered to join in the construction of Fort Saint Angelo.¹²⁶ The value of this labour to the Order is impossible to quantify but it would have been significant.

While the Order’s fleet generated significant revenue, within the historiography it is often highlighted that this revenue does not appear to have covered the fleets costs. For example Wettinger states, ‘...the Treasury could never hope to recover from the ransom and sale of its slaves the vast sums it spent every year on the maintenance both of the galley squadron and of the other ships of the Order’s fleet.’¹²⁷ It is notable that in this statement Wettinger is suggesting that there was an expectation that the Order’s fleet should cover its costs. Other historians have made similar suggestions; Michel Fontenay highlighted that the Order’s navy was unprofitable in 1630 based on the value of the captured ships, estimated at 12,000 Scudi, despite noting that this number does not
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¹¹⁹ ‘The Barberini Latino manuscript’, (Vatican Apostolic library manuscript 5036), transcribed in, Lo stato dell’Ordine di Malta 1630, edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes, (Centro Studi Melitensi Taranto’2017), p.59, folio 13v-14r.
¹²⁰ Louis De Boisgelin, Knight of Malta, Ancient and Modern Malta, Volume 1, (Richard Philips, 1805), p. 302.
¹²¹ Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 182 ‘intorno al 1630 il ricavato dalle prede e stimato 12mila scudi, ma le spese di mantenimento della flotta arrivavano allora a 135mila scudi.’
¹²² Grima, The fleet of the knights of Malta, p. 90
¹²³Thornton, Memoir on the finances of Malta , p. 9; Wismayer, The seven year balance sheet of the sovereign, p. 8.
¹²⁴ Testa, Romegas, p. 37, references AOM 216 folio 173, AOM 88 folio 116r.
¹²⁵ Brogini, Malte, frontière de chrétienté, p. 159, references AOM 88 folio 121.
¹²⁶ Brogini, Malte, frontière de chrétienté, p. 145.
account for the value of the Order’s slaves.\textsuperscript{128} Salvatore Bono concludes that the Order’s corsair activity, which was presented by the Order as a defence of Christianity from Muslim threats, did not provide financial resources but absorbed them.\textsuperscript{129} Corsairs meanwhile were profitable and produced a high rate of return.\textsuperscript{130} That the Order’s naval activity was not profitable is used within the historiography as a means of differentiating between the Order’s naval activity and corsairing, as outlined by Peter Earle ‘... the navy was guilty of behaviour which could not be true of any self-respecting corsair. It did not make a profit!’\textsuperscript{131} The lack of profit is then used by Earle to justify why he does not refer to the Order as corsairs, ‘...I decided to give them the benefit of the doubt, and refer to them as a navy, not as corsairs...'\textsuperscript{132} This is a means of distancing the Order’s violence and slave-raiding from corsair violence and slave-raiding, although as Michel Fontenay highlights the Order did not concern itself with such a distinction.\textsuperscript{133} Additionally by highlighting that the Order did not make a profit, this allows for the Order’s naval activities to be presented as not motivated by greed and as such nobler than the similar activities of Barbary pirates.

There is a lack of surviving documentation to provide a clear account of Corsairs’ costs compared to the Order.\textsuperscript{134} Although it is not surprising that the Order’s naval activity was less profitable compared to Corsairs, as Salvatore Bono notes that to avoid taxation the Corsairs would sell as much as possible before coming back to Malta.\textsuperscript{135} Unlike the Corsairs, the Order’s ships also undertook naval operations where the main objective was not profit but military victory and as such attacked

\textsuperscript{128} Fontenay, ‘Corsaires de la foi ou rentiers du sol? Les chevaliers de Malte dans le “corso” méditerranéen au XVIIe siècle’, p. 378 ‘En année normale le produit des prises (sans compter les esclaves directement affectes aux chiourmes) est estime 12.000 ecus vers 1630, ce qui est tres loin de payer les frais d'entretien de l’escadre, evalues a cette date a 135.000 ecus sur un budget de 380.000.’
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\textsuperscript{131} Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{132} Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, pp. 106-107; Fontenay, ‘Corsaires de la foi ou rentiers du sol? Les chevaliers de Malte dans le “corso” méditerranéen au XVIIe siècle’, p. 365.

\textsuperscript{133} Fontenay, ‘Corsaires de la foi ou rentiers du sol? Les chevaliers de Malte dans le "corso" méditerranéen au XVIIe siècle’, p. 365 ‘Beaucoup d'historiens, sous l'argumentation que l'Ordre etait un etat souverain, avec une politique et des motivations ideologiques, excluent ce type d'activites navales du champ semantique et de la < thematique > corsaires. Pourtant, l'Ordre lui-meme ne s'embarrassait pas de tant de scrupules, ni sur le mot, ni sur la chose.’

\textsuperscript{134} Fontenay, ‘Corsaires de la foi ou rentiers du sol? Les chevaliers de Malte dans le "corso" méditerranéen au XVIIe siècle’, p. 377 ‘ Pour calculer le profit corsaire, il faudrait etre en mesure de dresser un veritable compte d’entreprise, avec d’un cote les capitaux engages, et sous quelles formes, de l’autre le produit net apres liquidation des prises, paiement de l’amiragliato et des nombreux frais annexes. La chose n'est pas impossible pour le XVIII siècle, mais infaisible pour le XVII.’

\textsuperscript{135} Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo), location 2770.
targets Corsairs would have avoided.\textsuperscript{136} This is outlined by Peter Earle ‘...the normal prey of the corsairs were relatively small and lightly armed merchant men. This meant that the seizure of a prize very rarely involved any battle at all.’\textsuperscript{137} The Order was involved in large-scale naval warfare very different from that of the Corsairs: for instance, in 1535 the Order, the Pope and Emperor Charles V laid siege to Tunis; the Order sent 4 galleys, and the grand carrack the \textit{Santa Anna}.\textsuperscript{138} In 1571 the Order took part in the battle of Lepanto, one of the largest naval battles in the early modern period; the Christian force was made up of at least 211 galleys, of which 3 were contributed by the Order, the Christian forces won and this battle marked ‘...the end of Muslim naval superiority in the Mediterranean.’\textsuperscript{139}

The larger military activities of the Order could also allow the Order to gain slaves. Vertot details that in 1531 the Order captured 800 women from Modon; ‘There is no expressing the riches they carried off out of this city; but that which gave the inhabitants still greater pain, was their transporting on board their gallies or ships, upwards of 800 married women and maidens, whom they made prisoners and slaves.’\textsuperscript{140} The women are described as ‘prisoners and slaves’ although there would have been no distinction, prisoners were treated like slaves.\textsuperscript{141} These women would not have been used on the galleys but rather ransomed or sold in the slaves market in Malta. The decision to take these women when they would not be used on the galleys was likely because of the value that could be gained from the sale or ransom of them to provide wealth for the Order. In 1685 after the fall of the Greek town of Coron, there was a count of slaves taken by the combined Christian forces so that they could be distributed, 1,336 slaves had been taken, from that the Order received 334 of which a third was owed to Papal forces; although many more were brought to Malta, more than 500 according to Dal Pozzo, these additional slaves had been hidden as to be kept from the distribution.\textsuperscript{142} The majority were women and children as the Grand Master would later complain that of the 60 men brought from Coron only 36 were able to row, the Order had little direct use for
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\textsuperscript{140} Vertot, \textit{History of the knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem styled afterwards the knights of Rhdoes and at present the knights of Malta}, Volume 4, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{141} Hershenzon, \textit{The captive sea}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{142} Godfrey Wettinger, ‘Coron Captives in Malta, An Episode in the History of Slave-dealing’, \textit{Melita historica}, 2(1959)2, pp. 216-223; Pozzo, \textit{Hitoria della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta}, volume 2, pp. 573-574 ‘Il numero degli Schiavi rivelati ascese a 1336., de quali secondo la conventione fatta in Roma tra'l Pontefice, e l'Invitato della Republica Lando, ne fu fatto un giusto ripartimento tra la Republica, e gli Ausiliari, e ne toccò alla Religione la quarta, parte, cioè 334 , del qual numero il terzo se ne contribuì a i Pontificii. Però a Malta ne pervennero poi con le Galere, e con altri Bastimenti di più di 500.., & il Tesoro per sentenza della Camera de' Conti li confiscò a tutti quelli, che non potero giustificare d'haverli comprati dopo fatto il publico ripartimento.’
women and children.\textsuperscript{143} It is likely that the women and children would have been sold or ransomed, which still provided benefit for the Order but based on the Grand Master’s complaint this benefit did not overcome the fact that they could not be used as oarsmen on the Order’s galleys. The Order’s naval engagements might at times prove lucrative, but they could also be very costly: in 1625 the 5 galleys of the Order engaged 6 north African galleys, the Order lost resulting in the capture of 2 galleys, the San Francesco and the San Giovanni.\textsuperscript{144} The Bishop of Malta donated 3,000 scudi to the Order to help them overcome this loss, additionally the Castellan of Amposta presented 12 slaves and the Grand Master gave 30 slaves.\textsuperscript{145}

This focus on profit is a distraction; the assumed unprofitability is questionable, as has already been mentioned the importance of labour provided by the galley slaves and the extent to which the Order’s fleet captured high-value assets was undervalued in the documents. Wettinger provides details of the activities of Grand Master de Valette’s two private Corsair vessels: between 1557-1568 they ‘...procured a total income in goods and slaves of some 400,000 ducats.’\textsuperscript{146} This equates to an income of approximately 67,333 scudi per galley per year, far more than the cost of the galleys.\textsuperscript{147} The Grand Master’s galleys were profitable so why should it be assumed that the Order’s fleet was unprofitable. More importantly there was no requirement for Order’s navy to make a profit any more than the Order’s defences constructed on Malta, these activities were not undertaken for profit. Wismayer notes that in the eighteenth century Grand Master de Vilhena wrote to the French Ambassador to Turkey ‘...that the Order did not go to sea principally in quest of Muslim slaves, but to safeguard Christian shipping and commerce...’.\textsuperscript{148} The Order’s fleet was undertaking similar activities to Corsairs, capturing ships and enslaving their crews, this has been framed as a form of warfare against Muslims rather than a profit-generating activity to deflect criticism and moralise the Order’s activities by both the Order and within the current discourse.\textsuperscript{149}
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The discussion of profit is typically framed to focus on the overall profit of the Order’s ships, but the Order’s naval activity was profitable to individual Brothers. To rise in the hierarchy of the Order, Brothers had to complete four Caravans, each Caravan was a six-month period on board a galley, this was required to gain a commandery.\footnote{Grima, The fleet of the knights of Malta, p. 188; Fodor, ‘Maltese Pirates, Ottoman Captives And French Traders, p. 225; Emanuel Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, the Hospitaller Knights of Malta 1580-1700 (Continuum, 2011).} The capture of slaves is given prominence within the Order’s histories and it appears that success at sea meant not only the defeat of the enemy but the capture of their ship and the enslavement of their crew.\footnote{Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanne Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, pp. 107, 321; Gauci, In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798, p. 146; Muscat, Slaves on Maltese Galleys, p. 10.} Brothers were required to engage in piracy and enslavement to rise in the Order as a result the Order promoted and was led by those who had fought the Order’s enemies at sea and produced large numbers of slaves for the Order, for example between 1547 and 1575 Fra Mathurin d’Auch Lescaut Romegas was involved in the capture and enslavement of over 5,000 people and was widely recognised as one of the Order’s greatest naval commanders.\footnote{This number in a minimum based on the information in the Biography of Romegas as for some engagements the number of slaves is not given but the number of oars on the ship, these have not been included as it is not clear how mean oarsmen are assigned to each oar, Biography of Romegas, document 39 of the Codice Trivulziano translated by Carmel Testa in Romegas, (Midsea Books Ltd 2002), p. 223, also reproduced in Vianello, ‘Uno stato di servizio di fra Maturino Lescout’, pp. 345-353.} The Order was able to use this to subsidise the operation of its fleet, H. J. Sire in The Knights of Malta outlines that many of the costs of maintaining a galley were borne by the captain and as a result; ‘The prize-taking urge was therefore provided not so much by avarice as by the need to finance one’s career as a knight. By using the ambitions of its members, the Order was thus able to maintain a fleet at a fraction of its real cost...’\footnote{Sire, The knights of Malta, p. 92.} Despite highlighting the importance to the Knights of capturing ‘prizes’, Sire on the same page argues the Order’s fleet did not engage in slave-raiding: ‘Nor did the fleet make slave raids on shore, though it often made not dissimilar attacks on strategic posts in which captives were taken.’\footnote{Sire, The Knights of Malta, p. 92.} Sire by arguing that the Knights did not engage in land-based slave raids, despite acknowledging the importance of taking captives, is still trying to distance the Order’s activities from those of Corsairs. Although attacks on strategic posts and slave raids are not mutually exclusive; in 1610 three Knights led a force that captured the Fortress De Laiazzo and plundered it, razing the fortifications to the ground and capturing more than 300 slaves.\footnote{De Boisgelin, Ancient and Modern Malta, Volume 2, p. 165.} This land attack on a strategic post involved the taking and enslavement of captives, similar to the Order capturing a galley of the Sultan in 1644, which was carrying 350 men and 30
women of high status, including one of the sultan’s concubines and a child the Order believed to be the Sultans son.  

The Order’s fleet undertook significant slave raids, Whitworth Porter in 1858 summarised the significance of this development regarding the Order’s principles: ‘The truth was, that the convent of St. John became eventually neither more nor less than a vast slave mart. When the demand was brisk, and the supply of slaves within the prison scarce, the cruisers of the Order scoured the seas; and woe betide the unfortunate Turk who came within the range of their vision. The war which they unceasingly waged against the maritime power of the Infidel, was maintained not so much for the glory of the struggle, or from religious conviction of its necessity, but because they found that by thus gratifying their privateering propensities, they were swelling at one and the same time their own private fortunes and the public coffers. Honour there was none; religion there was none; it was a purely mercenary speculation...’ This interpretation stands in contrast to most modern perspectives, Whitworths experiences may have influenced his work. Though Liam Gauci has similarly presented the Order as only a corsairing operation; ‘These raiders operated within a principality upheld by responsions coming from mainland Europe. A Europe duped into believing that the Prince of Malta was the defender of Catholic Europe...’ This interpretation fits with Victor Mallia-Milanes’ argument that in eighteenth century Europe there was no space for Christian ideology or crusade with regard to business and trade relationships but rather extreme pragmatism. Although Mallia-Milanes did not link this pragmatism to the Order’s operations, rather he argued that because there was no space for crusade the Order needed to give up its military function and return to its original objective of Christian charity, he did not consider that the Order’s focus on slave taking was already a pragmatic development that allowed the Order to adapt their naval activity to fit with a rise in mercantilism and decline in Christian ideology.
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160 Mallia-Milanes, Lo stato dell’Ordine di Malta 1630, p. 24, ‘Nell’Europa del Settecento , le imprese , i rapporti , ed i trattati commerciali non trae vano più la loro ispirazione dall’ideologia cristiana del medioevo europeo, ma piuttosto dalla nuova filosofia socio - economica del mercantilismo e dell’illuminismo. Il rapido cambiamento della realtà sociale , caratterizzata forse da un pragmatismo anche estremo , non poteva più concedere spazio alla crociata.’
To argue that the Order was only interested in financial gain ignores the restrictions the Order placed on targeting fellow Christians, for example the fifteenth century pilgrim Baumgarten reported how corsairs of Hospitaller Rhodes stopped the vessel he was on and upon finding the passengers and crew to be Christians only took some of the oars from the ship.161 While the naval activities of the Order did disturb Christian trade in the Mediterranean the Order would typically have justifications for this and from 1605 there was a route via which complaints could be addressed through the Tribunale degli Armamenti.162 As early as 1311 there are reports of the Order seizing Genoese and Venetian ships that traded with Muslims.163 In retaliation in 1354 a Venetian galley captured a ship containing the Hospitaller Grand Master’s belongings, including his clothes, books and his personal slaves.164 Both Venice and Genoa successfully sued the Order for wrongfully seizing their ships.165 To prevent the Order from disturbing trade, Turkish vessels would purchase passports or place a Christian in charge of the vessel.166 For example, in 1626 the Order captured the cargo vessel Peregrinus; it had been captured from an Algerian but its owner was from the Netherlands.167 This appears to have been an issue that grew worse throughout the period as Thomas Freller notes that complaints by European merchants about the damage done by Christian corsairs in the sixteenth century resulted in restrictions being placed on the Maltese corsairs in the seventeenth century.168 Greek merchants were in an unclear position as they were both Christians and Ottoman subjects, although they could still gain protection for their shipping if they were able to prove their Christian identity.169 According to Roderick Cavaliero, the Order targeted Greeks only in the eighteenth century: ‘The claims of Greek traders that they had been depredated by Maltese armateurs first became insistent in 1702.’170 The inquisitor on Malta became involved in

163 Luttrell, ‘The Hospitallers of Rhodes Confront the Turks 1306-1421’, p. 84.
164 Luttrell, The town of Rhodes 1306-1356, p. 185.
165 Luttrell, ‘The Hospitallers of Rhodes Confront the Turks 1306-1421’, p. 84.
167 AOM 57 folio 167r-v ‘Nam etsi dicta navis sit erepta Argierensi, non tamen fuerat ea facta Argirensium eam ob causam quod iuste nostril hostes non essent eo tempore quo clintulum nostrum piratice privarunt ea’, transcribed in Johanna Maria Van Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, (Brill 1998), p. 125.
168 Freller ‘Adversus Infideles: Some Notes On the Cavalier’s Tour, the Fleet of the Order of St. John, and the Maltese Corsairs’, pp. 405-430.
169 Greene, Catholic pirates and Greek merchants, p.115.
championing the case of unjustly raided Greeks but the Grand Master denied that there was any cause for the inquisitor to interfere. In 1747 a blank five-year passport was sold on Malta by Mathew Zammit to a Turkish cargo ship, demonstrating that the Order’s attacks on Turkish shipping were still a problem for merchants.

Apart from cases of the Order wrongfully seizing ships, there is some evidence that the Order also wrongfully kept captives as oarsmen who should have been released; if a Muslim slave converted and became a Christian they were not freed, but the Order was not meant to enslave Christians. In 1587 it was reported that some recently captured slaves serving on the galleys were Christians. Johanna Maria Van Winter drew attention to a set of letters from the Netherlands written to request the release of seamen who had been captured from Barbary pirates by the Order’s fleet and then placed as oarsmen on the Order’s ships. In 1629 the Grand Master was petitioned to free Jean Nicolas, who had been captured by Turks in 1627 then captured by the Order in 1628 and remained enchained as a galley slave. Also in 1629 there were petitions for the release of Henrii Roeloffs and Jan Janseen, both of whom had similarly been captured by Muslims, then when captured by the Order remained serving as galley slaves. A similar petition had been sent in 1622 for the release of some subjects of Holland. It would appear that the Order took slaves that had served on Muslim vessels and kept them enslaved but now in the Order’s service, this suggests the Order’s slaveholding interests had eclipsed their mission of protecting Christians.

Indeed, the Order might attack targets specifically for the purpose of gaining slaves to be sold or ransomed, such as women and children, who could not be exploited for labour as galley slaves. These targets included villages which would have had no strategic value; in 1549 the Order captured

171 AOM 1464, Perellos to Sacchetti, 28 April, 1703. ‘Speriamo che quando Sua Beatitudine havra riconosciuto le giustificationi e scritture da Voi presentateLe in prova che questo nostro Consolato di Mare non sia stato altrimente istituto per defatigare i Greci, e levor l’ appelio a cotesta corte, sara restata persuasa, che le dOl’lianze, benche portate a nome dei Greci, sono state inventioni ed artificii soliti dell’Inquisitore per inquietarci.’, included in Cavaliero, ‘The Decline of the Maltese Corso in the Eighteenth Century’, pp. 224-238.
173 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 46.
174 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 46, references AOM 97 folio 105.
175 Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, p. 22.
176 AOM 57 folio 181r-v ‘Qu’elle est faicte pour un subject de cet Estat lequel de tout temps a entretenu bonne correspondence amitie et neutralite avec Vostre Ordre outre que la notoire innocence du prisonnier accompagnie d’une continuelle et insupportable misere doit trouver quelque lieu a la compassion et faveur de ceux qui font profession de sauver et soulager les affligez’, transcribed in Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, p. 125.
177 Henrii Roeloffs, AOM 57 folio 182r-v; Jan Janssen, AOM 57 fol 186r-v, transcribed in Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, p. 126.
178AOM 57 folio 180, transcribed in Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, p. 124.
70 people from the village of Rapita in Barbary. In 1552 the 4 galleys of the Order along with several smaller ships and three private galleys owned by Brother Leone Strozzi attacked Zuata, guided by several of the Order’s slaves who had been promised their freedom; although the forces of the Lord of Tripoli Murad Agha disrupted the raid, 150 slaves were taken including women and children. There were further attacks on villages; in 1559 70 slaves were taken from the village of Tallameta and 80 slaves from the village of Zuega in 1563. In 1567 Fra Mathurin d’Auch Lescaut Romegas sacked the town of Zuaga to obtain slaves to work on the fortifications of Valletta, although only 60 people were captured, mostly women and children. In 1587, 5 galleys of the Order attacked the village of Monsalada in the Caramania canale, taking away 200 slaves. Slave raids against non-military targets should not be considered as separate from the Order’s attacks against military targets, as the Order also took slaves as part of attacks on military targets. In 1601 the Order raided a fortress in Morea called Pasaba and took 500 people including women and children.

The Order would not have been able to transport these slaves unless they planned for this and ensured they had the extra capacity to transport these people. This appears to be similar to the slave-raiding warfare undertaken by the Teutonic Order in the Baltic in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Liam Gauci highlights an example from 1778 where Guglielmo Lorenzi captured 98 people and had to purchase an additional vessel to transport them, as a result of poor conditions.

---

180 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 155, ‘Nel 1552 i cavalieri di Malta - che l’anno prima erano stati scaccitati da Tripoli d’Occidente - decisero un attacco corsaro alla località di Zuara, a ovest di Tripoli, <per guadagnar un buon supplimento di schiavi per le galere, e per lavorar intorno alle fortificazioni> maltesi. Quattro galere dell’ordine e una decina di legni minori si unirono a tre private del cavalieri fra Leone Strozzi, designato al comando. Sbarcati un po’ discosto dalla città e guidati nel cammino da alcuni mori, gia schiavi a Malta, ai quali era stata promessa la liberta… del gran numero di musulmani catturati si riusci alla fine a portarne via solo un decimo circa <fra huomini, donne, e fanciulli, perciocch’ in quello scampiglio, e nella difficilta grande dell’imbarcamento, la maggior parte se ne fuggirono>.
181 Vianello, ‘Uno stato di servizio di fra Maturino Lescout’, p. 351 raid against Tallameta, ‘…Lanno seguente con le due gallere del gran Maestro valleta esendo capitano della patrona il cavalliere sant’aubino, guascone, nel golfo della Citra in un luogo nominato tallameta prese un casale con settanta schiavi tra huomini donne et figlioli et sopra tripol di barberia piglio un caramossale con cento et renta negri et vinti duoi turchi,’ raid against Zuega ‘Lanno appresso sopra il secco di paulo in barberia piglio duoi saltie et duoi garbi con sessanta mori et quel estate ancora con duoe gallere et un galiota piglio il casale di zuega la vigila di san gio.’
182 Testa, Romegas, p. 99.
183 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 156, ‘nell’agosto 1587 le cinque galere, guidate da un cavaliere francese, attaccarono nel canale di Caramania il borgo di Monsalada, portando via 200 schiavi.’
several died before reaching Malta.\textsuperscript{186} To prevent this recent captives would sometimes be ransomed on the spot.\textsuperscript{187} That the Hospitallers were capturing large numbers of slaves further weakens the assumption that the Order’s navy was not profitable, as these slaves had a value and many of them especially women and children would have been ransomed or sold.

Alonso de Contereras, while serving on the ship of the knight Gaspard de Monreal at the start of the seventeenth century, recounts a naval engagement with a Turkish galley: ‘We attacked it, and the Turks flung themselves into the boats and made for land to save their freedom. The captain ordered us to go after them, offering ten crowns for every slave.’\textsuperscript{188} This suggests that the Order was willing to pay its crews to secure additional slaves; the defeat of an enemy ship alone was not a suitable victory. The Order was not the only group capturing slaves in the Mediterranean; it was a part of the usual naval activities. At the end of the sixteenth century prior to coming to Malta, Alonso de Contreras as a soldier on a Sicilian galley took part in several naval engagements against Muslim corsairs including the capture of 90 Turks near Lampedusa.\textsuperscript{189} Although for the Order such victories were important as part of justifying their continued activities, as Ivan Grech outlines, ‘...the importance of such feats for the Order, both from a practical and from a propagandist point of view, can be sensed from the baroque triumphalism with which Hospitaller victories and exploits in the taking of slaves were officially chronicled by the Order without the slightest hint of Catholic remorse or Christian empathy for the vanquished.’\textsuperscript{190} The same triumphalism and lack of empathy for the vanquished continued to be expressed into the twentieth century by the English Order of St John, also known as the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem. In 1902 the history of the English Hospitaller written by the Genealogist of the Order, W.K.R Bedford, and the Librarian of the Order Richard Holbeche, outlined the heroic exploits of the Order in the Mediterranean, ‘Before its [the Order’s] ships afforded protection to the commerce of the Mediterranean, hundreds of Christian slaves laboured to death in giving wings to the fleets of their oppressors; but when the Rhodian galleys turned the tables, the daring pirate from Algiers or Goleta often found himself

\textsuperscript{186} Gauci, \textit{In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798}, pp. 74-76.
\textsuperscript{187} Gauci, \textit{In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798}, p. 158
\textsuperscript{188} First reference to Gasper de Monreal, Alonso de Contreras, \textit{The life of captain Alonso de Contreras: knight of the Military Order of St John native of Madrid written by himself} (1582-1633), p. 22, This is likely referring to Gaspar de Monreal, who was appointed captain of the San Giacomo in 1605 and retained his post for 2 years, Vann, ‘The Fifteenth Century Maritime Operations’, pp. 215-220; Contreras, \textit{The life of captain Alonso de Contreras: knight of the Military Order of St John native of Madrid written by himself} (1582-1633), p. 32.
\textsuperscript{189} Contreras, \textit{The life of captain Alonso de Contreras: knight of the Military Order of St John native of Madrid written by himself} (1582-1633), p. 23 The date is not clear in the text although it is noted that the Viceroy of Sicily was the Duke of Maqueda, this is most likely a reference to Bernardino de Cardenas who was Viceroy from 1598-1601, it was prior to 1601.
\textsuperscript{190} Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, p. 87.
condemned to take the place of his quondam captive.' This view justifies the Order’s use of slavery because they were enslaving pirates who kept Christian slaves, the focus is also shifted to the rescued captives: ‘For these rescued folk ‘wasted with misery’ the knights provided every comfort...’ The focus on the freeing of slaves rather than taking of slaves has often continued to be highlighted in the historiography but also by the Order itself. In 1601 the Order produced a biography of Fra Mathurin d’Auch Lescaut Romegas, this included a detailed breakdown of the naval activities of Romegas and notably highlighted the number of people Romegas was involved in the enslavement of, rather than the number of Christian captives he freed. Between 1547 and 1575 Romegas was involved in the capture and enslavement of over 5,000 people while only 505 Christians are mentioned as being freed. This biography was translated by Carmel Testa and included in his work Romegas; despite this discrepancy in numbers Testa starts the text noting that Romegas was a ‘...savior to many Christian slaves.’ Within the list of Romegas’ engagements the scale ranges from the capture of three ships and the enslavement of 400 Turks in 1560 to the capture of 8 Turks on a small ship near Cicilia in 1568. In 1575 Romegas alongside the Marquis Santa Cruz and the galleys of Naples sacked the island of Cherchem, resulting in the enslavement of 1000 people; it is not clear how many of these slaves were received by the Order although it is noted that 142 were assigned to the Galera Capitana.

The Order did free enslaved Christians, and sometimes in large numbers; in 1528 Brother Claudio Gimel freed 150 Christians that had previously been slaves on a captured galley, whose crew he

---

192 Bedford, Holbeche, The Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem being a history of the English Hospitallers of St John, their rise and progress, p. 20.
193 This number in a minimum based on the information in the Biography of Romegas as for some engagements the number of slaves is not given but the number of oars on the ship, these have not been included as it is not clear how mean oarsmen are assigned to each oar, Biography of Romegas, document 39 of the Codice Trivulziano translated by Carmel Testa in Romegas, (Midsea Books Ltd 2002), p. 223, also reproduced in reproduced in Vianello, ‘Uno stato di servizio di fra Maturino Lescout’, pp. 345-353.
194 Testa, Romegas, p. 2.
195 Vianello, ‘Uno stato di servizio di fra Maturino Lescout’, p. 351 Capture of 400 slaves, ‘Lanno appresso con le due gallere in Caramania vicino della citta di sattalia piglio un vassello carrigo di sapone, vinti duoi turchi et una germa con ottanta turchi et quell’istesso anno piglio duoi caramossali et il galione di sattalia che messe in fundo et quel viaggio porto da quattrocento schiavi.’, p. 352, Capture of 8 or 10 slaves ‘L’anno appresso nell’isola della favigliana piglio duoi bergantini con cinquanta turchi et lanno medesimo in compagnia delle gallerie della Religione piglio un altro bergantino a lisola delle correnti in Cicilia et ripigliaron una seyti ciciliana presa da turchi con otto o diece schiavi.’
enslaved to reinforce the Hospitaller squadron.\(^{197}\) Similarly, in 1550 the Order captured the galley of
a Christian renegade corsair, freeing 60 Christians and enslaving 55 Turks.\(^{198}\) Also in May 1589
Brother Chamesson liberated 400 Christian slaves found aboard two Turkish galleys.\(^{199}\) While the
Order did free enslaved Christians the enslavement of Muslims was far more important to the Order.
Fontenay highlights that even the Pope encouraged the Order to target locations in Africa rather
than loot ships as this did little harm to the Ottomans.\(^{200}\) In 1623 the Order had captured four
Muslim holy men, in retaliation the Franciscan friars in the Holy Land were threatened, Pope Urban
VIII requested that the Order release the Muslims, but the Order refused until the Franciscans paid
to ransom them.\(^{201}\)

This section began by outlining the costs involved in the operation of the Order’s galleys. The high
cost was not prohibitive to the Order’s activities, the number of galleys in operation was increasing,
which suggests that the Order was able successfully to absorb those costs. As previously stated,
Earle refers to the Order’s fleet as a navy rather than as corsairs; one of the reasons for this was
because the Order’s galleys did not produce profit.\(^{202}\) There should be no expectation that the
galleys would have been anything other than a cost to the Order, as the Order had lands to support
its operations. Unlike the Corsairs the Order’s galleys did not need to be profitable, this allowed the
Order’s galleys to attack targets the Corsairs would not. The section has questioned the cost of the
galleys; much of the income that was produced by the naval activity of the Order was not deducted
from the cost of their operation. This income was produced by capturing ships, cargo, and slaves;

\(^{197}\) ‘Le Galere della Religione in tanto, al ritorno, che fatto haueuano,da sbarcare il Cardinale
Campeggio; hauendo scoperta vna Galeotta Turchesca alle Pomeghe di Marsiglia, in alto mare finalmente, do
po lunga caccia la presero. E rimorchiandola, con molta allegrezza arriuarono a Nizza, doue il Com mendatore di
Blodès Fra Claudio Gimel Capitano di dette Galere, hauendo fatto impiccare all’an tenna il Rais, e gli Ufficiali
della Galeotta, secondo l’antico uso della Religione, di castigare in tal modo i Corsali Infedeli, e particolarmente i
Rinegati; rinforzò le Ciurme delle cinque Galere, con nouantacinque Schiaui, frà Turchi, e Mori presi; E diede
libertà a cento e cinquanta Christiani, che Schiaui sopra detta Galeotta al remo vogauano.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della
Sacra Religione*, volume 3, p. 67.

\(^{198}\) Testa, *Romegas*, p. 26; ‘E liberati furono da 60 christiani, ch’iui Schiavi si trouauano’, Bosio, *Istoria Della
Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano* volume 3, p. 277.

\(^{199}\) Pozzo, *Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta*, volume 1, p. 313
‘Con essi poi, e con parte delle sue genti havendo armate il Chamesson ambedue queste Galere, & aggiuntele
alla sua squadra, si diede a corseggiare con maggior animo per tutti quei mari, e secondandolo la fortuna
incontrò, e prese alcuni altri Uascelli Turcheschi, doue fece 260. schiaui, ritrouando in vno di essi, oltre dierse
altre ricchezze, 4000. sultanini d’oro, e 90 pezze di broccato di molta valuta.’

\(^{200}\) Fontenay, ‘Corsaires de la foi ou rentiers du sol? Les chevaliers de Malte dans le “corso” méditerranéen au
XVIe siècle’, p. 366 ‘...le Saint-Pere en personne, superieur de l’Ordre au spirituel, se montrait parfois tres
severe, et le delegue apostolique etait souvent charge de rappeler au Grand Maitre qu’il serait plus utile a la
chretient?e < d’attaquer quelque place en Afrique, ce qui rappellerait les corsaires chez eux >, plutot que
d’insulter l’Archi pel, car < piller les biens et les navires des particuliers n’a jamais cause de veritables
dommages a la monarchie ottomane et ne sert qu’a l’irriter sans lui faire de mal.’

\(^{201}\) Muscat, Cuschieri, *Naval activities of the knights of St John 1530-1798*, p. 123, no reference provided for
this event.

much like a Corsair, the Order raided non-military targets specifically for the purpose of obtaining slaves, such as the raid against the village of Monsalada in 1587 where 200 slaves were captured. Of all the Order’s activities these are most evident to have been slave raids. The Order must have expected to capture people in these raids; this was not a ship’s crew captured at sea where their ship could be used to transport them back to Malta, the Order had to include provision for bringing these slaves to Malta as part of organising the raid, which is likely why 5 galleys were used.203 The Order also took slaves as part of its raids against military targets; slave-raiding was not a side activity that the Order undertook but rather a fundamental part of all their naval operations, and through the prerequisite to complete four Caravans to advance in the Order it was something that was required for Brothers to engage with.

_Forzati, Buonavoglia_ and the conditions on the galleys

This section will outline the other two groups that rowed the Order’s galleys alongside the slaves, the _Forzati_ and the _Buonavoglia_. Towards the end of the eighteenth century a fourth type of oarsmen appeared, the _Marinari de Remo_, literally meaning ‘sailor of the oar’ this group engaged on the galleys because of shortages of forced labour.204 Within the existing discourse the _Forzati_ and the _Buonavoglia_ have often been presented as rather homogenised groups similar to slaves, although different slaves could be in vastly different situations depending on a variety of factors, such as the likelihood of being ransomed, the same was true of the _Forzati_ and the _Buonavoglia_. 205 This section will highlight the wide-ranging differences in circumstances within these groups even while rowing the same oar side by side.

Convicts sentenced to row the galleys were known as the _Forzati_, literally meaning ‘the forced’, typically the smallest group of oarsmen, making up 15.5% of the oarsmen in 1590, which dropped to 9.4% in 1632 and further to 8.7% in 1669.206 Despite the small number of _Forzati_ they were nonetheless significant, and unlike the slaves, the Order was unable to capture more of them through naval activity. Individuals could be sentenced to row the Order’s galleys as a punishment for a wide range of crimes.207 In 1572 the Grand Master banned all Jews from Malta; those that disobeyed were forced to row the Order’s galleys, while the women and children were forced to

---

203 Bono, _Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitu e commercio_, p. 156, ‘nell’agosto 1587 le cinque galere, guidate da un cavaliere francese, attaccarono nel canale di Caramania il borgo di Monsalada, portando via 200 schiavi.’
204 Grima, _The fleet of the knights of Malta_, p. 269.
206 Percentages based on the numbers available in Appendix 3.
labour on public works projects. In 1558 the punishment for wearing embroidered trousers was 4 years of rowing, in 1583 the sentence for sheltering a criminal was rowing for life. Joseph Muscat views this sentencing as a deliberate attempt to increase the number of Forzati oarsmen stating; ‘These were certainly cruel and excessive punishments symptomatic of the times and of the mentality of those who projected methods to recruit non-paid oarsmen on the galleys.’ In 1597 the Grand Master asked the Inquisition to mandate perpetual galley service, instead of death sentences. This suggests that a lifetime as a Forzato oarsman was considered a substitute for death which has parallels to slavery. Georgio Scala was sentenced to row for 2 years in January 1599 after failing to complete his penance ordered by the Inquisitor in 1598. Sentencing criminals to serve in galleys was not unique to the Order; Joseph Muscat and Dionisius A. Agius observe that the ‘... same situation prevailed in the Papal States, France, Spain, Naples, Messina, and Venice and Muslim countries, as well.’

Rowing galleys as part of Penal servitude was introduced in Spain during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. When the Order came to Malta in 1530 it would appear that a similar practice was swiftly adopted and that the Order sought Forzati from beyond their territory; in 1535 Brother Francesco de Claramonte was instructed to accept Forzati between the ages of 20 and 26 who had been procured by another Knight in Savoy. The Order’s use of Forzati preceded Venice, where their use only began in 1545. In 1551 the Order purchased slaves and Forzati in France. Dal Pozzo details that

---

208 Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovannì Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 50 ‘Per giusti motiui fu dato lo sfratto general da Malta a tutti i Giudei sotto pena a gli huomini della Galera, & alle Donne, e fanciulli d’esser mandati a trauagliare all’opere della Signoria.’; Testa, Romegas, p. 144, references AOM 93 folio 48 ‘piccioli e grandi donne et figliuoli’


211 Brogini, Malte, p. 90, references AOM 99 folio 130v.

212 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, p. 26.


214 Muscat and Agius, ‘Slaves on Land and Sea’, p. 370; In Spain, ‘... a series of laws beginning in 1530 gradually extended galley service to all kinds of offenders...’, these Forzati were male; female criminals were not sentenced to row, Pike, Penal servitude in early modern Spain, pp. 5-6.

215 Pike, Penal servitude in early modern Spain, p. 4.


217 Lane, Venice, a Maritime Republic, p. 368.

218 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 344, references AOM 427 folio 260v.
In 1577 the Order purchased Forzati as oarsmen in the port of Marseille. The Order sought to purchase two hundred Forzati from the Papal states in 1591 and again in 1593. The Order was often given Forzati oarsmen, in 1556 Naples gave the Order 200 Forzati. In 1561 French Forzati were given to the Order in Marseille upon the completion of their new galley the Saint Marta. Additionally in 1597 the Order was given 50 Forzati by the king of France and in 1651 the Order was given 250 Forzati by Pope Innocent X. The Order continued to be given Forzati throughout the period.

219 In October 1656, the officials of the Hospitaller squadron were instructed to buy oarsmen ‘in qualsivoglia loco che si potra fare de Buonavoglia purche siano atti al remo’, AOM 1646, folios 364-365r, 7 Oct. 1656, discussed in Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, p. 90; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 146, ‘Dall’al tra parte il G. Maestro, e consiglio non sofferendo di vede re così scema la squadra loro dopo la perdita della Galera S. Paolo, commisero al Commandator Fr. Carlo de Grasse, Brianson di procurar in Marsilia la compra d’un nuono scaso, e passando alla Corte supplicare S.M. Christianissima di quel che soccorso di Forzati, come sovente ne facea gratia, i quali ottenuti, e con essi, e con qualche numero di gente di capo, ch’iui assoldar doveva, armata la Galera, se ne unisse con celerita in Malta. La qual commissione fu da lui interamente eseguita; ma con lunghezza, e dilazione tale, che tardo fin a due anni prima di trouarsi in issato d’ogni cosa.


221 Brogini, Malte, frontière de chrétienté, p. 90, reference AOM 425 folio 221v.

222 E perché in Marsiglia s’era fatta fabbricare, per conto della Religione, una Galera nuova; e dal Rè Christianissimo ottenuti s’erano tutti i Forzati, che per compiuto armamento di essa erano basteuoli; fu ordinato al General Melac, che quando fosse licentiatto dal Generale dell’Arma Cattolica, passa re se ne douesse in Prouenza; per condurre quella Galera nuova; e per imbarcare i danari, che l’Caualier F.Stefano Calderon portaua di Spagna: Commandandogli, che vi douesse andare con tres Galere solamente, rimandando in Malta S. Marta, e la Corona, che già furono del Commandator Beines; per euitar ogni intrico, e garbuglio, che per la moltitudine de’Forzati Francesi, che v’erano sopra; e per le pretensioni del Fratello di detto Beines, nascere potessero.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano volume 3, pp. 833; Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 30.

223 ‘Che compartir douesse le Ciurme, così vecchie, come le nuove, che consisteuano in vn buon numero di Forzati, che l’Rè Christianissimo donati have va alla Religione, & in molti Schiauii nuovi, ch’a quest’ effetto sopra le Galere portava, in modo che tutte le cinque Galere, ch’a Malta ritornar doveuano, fossero egualmente ben armate.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano volume 3, p. 833; Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 30.

224 Grech, ‘Dealing with Manpower Shortages in the Mediterranean’, pp. 90-91; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 391 ‘Nel mese di Genaro del seguente anno 1597, essendo ri- accogli: tornato in Malta il Commendator Fr. D. Federico de Britto, vno de tre Ambasciatori spediti in Francia a congratularsi col Re Christianissimo della sua riconciliatione con la Santa Sede, e per parte sua, e de Colleghi facendo relatione, della sua Ambasciata, certificò il G. Maestro, & i Consiglieri, che’erano stati da Sua Maestà con somma benignità accolti, e con affettuose espressioni assicurati, che non meno ch’ i Re suoi Predecessori hauerebbe tenuto special cura, e protettione della Religione, e che non hauerebbe, mancato di farle tutte le gratie, e fauori possibili: Per caparra de’quali hauea offerto di dare per servitio della Religione 50 Forzati, e di confermare i suoi Priuilegi, di che tutto il Conuento infinitamente se ne rallegrò, ordinando ch’a S. Maestà se ne rendessero humilissime gratie.’; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, Volume 2, p. 192 ‘Trovavasi in questo tempo la nostra Ciurma molto fiacca, e diminuita, mentre impiegata, per tanti anni nel soccorso di Candia, haveva come abbandonato l’esercito del corso, che soleva dare abbondanti proventi di prede, e di sciavi. Per tale
throughout the Order’s time on Malta Forzati provided a source of labour for the galley fleet.

The Order wanted Forzati who were young and whose sentences were long. For example, in 1585 the Order rejected 40 Forzati because they were either too old or only had 3 years left on their sentence.226 In Spain a minimum age of 17 was established in 1566 with an average sentence of 4-6 years, a sentence of fewer years was deemed inappropriate.227 This suggests that the Order felt that oarsman took several years to become adequately skilled, so a Forzati with a short sentence would be unsuitable. In 1625 Brother Luigi Megalotti was told to bring Forzati to Malta that had at least 6 years left on their sentence and were between 18 and 40 years old.228 This rejection of Forzati over the age of 40 highlights how physically demanding being an oarsman was. Wettinger outlines that in 1651 the Papal states sent the Order 293 Forzati, but only 12 years later 168 of them had been freed because they had finished their sentences, 62 had died, 9 had been freed but returned as Buonavoglia.229 It is unclear how 62 of them had died, but for only 12 years that represents a loss of 21% of the original number, a loss of 1.75% per year this highlights the poor conditions oarsmen endured on the galleys. This is an isolated example and mortality rates vary considerably, Herbert S. Klein identified New World slave ships in the eighteenth century where the slave mortality rate was at times less than that in this example, although often far higher.230 This is true also for the oarsmen of the Order, when a tidal wave sank three of the Order’s ships all the chained rowers drowned, that voyages slave mortality would have been particularly high. There is not enough data to produce similar comparisons to those of the New World. Salvatore Bono highlights a list of Muslim slaves rowing in the galleys of Doria in 1587, the list identifies 87 galley slaves, on average they had been enslaved for 12 years, with half having been enslaved for less than 10 years, a third for 10 to 19
years, 11 had been enslaved for between 20 and 29 years. While the Order may have desired Forzati with long sentences from abroad, it is clear that shorter sentences were given out for Maltese Forzati, for example Georgio Scala who was only sentenced to two years. Muscat suggests that short-served Forzati would have been placed at the outside end of the bench near the side of the galley as that required very little experience. This position was also the most dangerous and could explain why so many Forzati died, and why despite the Order using relatively few Forzati oarsmen they often sought to obtain more.

Within the historiography there is a general agreement that Forzati oarsmen were treated like slaves; Muscat and Agius state that ‘Forzati condemned to life sentences on the galleys were held to be socially dead and treated like slaves.’ The Forzati oarsmen were chained to the same bench and performed the same tasks in the same conditions as slaves. Penal slavery was used on galleys across Europe and was a way for a state to legally enslave Christian Europeans. Debra Blumenthal noted that in fifteenth century Valencia penal servitude was one of the principal sources of slaves, alongside corsair activity and trade. The overlap between the two groups may be why H. J. Sire considered the oarsmen to be made up only of slaves and Buonavoglia. Wettinger suggests that there was a distinction between slaves and Forzati in ‘...they [Forzati] could not be bought or sold...’, although this is problematic as there is evidence of the Order purchasing Forzati. Additionally Forzati had a value, in case of a Forzato escaping there was a 100 scudi fine. The Order was engaged in the trade of Christian Europeans who were effectively treated like slaves. Wettinger also notes that Forzati ‘...had to be set free on the termination of their sentence.’ but that also does not appear to have always been the case: in 1572 several Forzati complained that their sentences had
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231 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p.168 ‘In un elenco di musulmani al remo sulle galere del Doria nel 1587, figurano 94 nominativi ma e inverosimile che fossero soltanto questi. L’elenco e comunque interessante poiche di 87 schiavi si dice anche dove e quando furono presi o ‘havuti’, per acquisto o cessione gratuita (un quarto circa). In media erano schiavi da circa 12 anni; piu in dettaglio: quasi la meta [42] lo erano da meno di 10 anni, un buon terzo da 10 a 19, ma undici avevano sopportato la dura condizione servile da 20 a 29 anni [due superavano rispettivamente 31 e 36 anni].’
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finished but they were still forced to row. This was not unusual in many Christian states due to shortages of slaves and new Forzati, indeed it seems that a significant number of Forzati were held beyond their sentence. Ruth Pike in her discussion of the Spanish navy in the sixteenth century laments that ‘...the illegal retention of prisoners after the completion of their sentences was one of the worst abuses of the galleys...’. Appealing such illegal extensions of sentences could prove problematic, for example in 1657 a Forzato named Damaschino Di Giovanni demanded his freedom, yet no copy of his sentence could be found and the Treasury claimed he had received a life sentence. This may have been an error rather than an intentional attempt to keep a Forzato beyond his sentence, in such a situation the Order could easily extend a finite sentence, this highlights the power the Order had over the Forzati similar to their control over slaves. Sometimes Forzati had to serve because of the logistics of when the sentence finished, in 1659 Rocco Rizzo’s sentence finished while the galleys were at sea; he continued to row for 4 months after his sentence had ended, until the galley returned to Malta, although he was paid as if he had been a Buonavoglia for his additional service.

There is an important difference between slaves and Forzati: not all Forzati had to row. Indeed, some Forzati were able to provide oarsmen to row in their place. For example, in 1621 Pasqual Bezina a Maltese Forzato sent his slave to row in his place for 10 years under the condition that he would not leave the island and if the slave died he would send another. In 1640 a similar case occurred: Giovanni Garnier pleaded that he was unfit to row and was allowed to send a slave to take his place on the galleys for 6 years again under the condition that he did not leave Malta during that
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240 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 32; Brogini, Malte, p. 90 ‘Ainsi, en 1572, des forçats ayant deja purge leur peine se plaignirent d’etre maintenus a la rame...’, references AOM 93 folio 41v.
241 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p.109 ‘Negli stati cristiani fu avvertita quasi constantemente e in modo pressante l’esigenza di avere uomini da mandare <in galera>. il bisogno di galeotti - così come di schiavi - fece si che le autorità sollecitassero i magistrati a fornire un adeguato numero di condannati; a questi poteva poi ben accadere, quando la penuria di galeotti era senza rimedio, di essere trattenuti al remo anche al di là del termine di tempo della propria condanna.’
245 Muscat and Agius, ‘Slaves on Land and Sea’, p. 370 ‘...the forzati were treated like slaves...’; Pike, Penal servitude in early modern Spain, pp. 20-21 ‘once aboard the galleys, the differences between slaves and convicts were further muted.’ Referring to Spanish Forzati. ; Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 32 ‘...there was little practical difference between the condition of the convicts and that of their companions, the slaves themselves.’
246 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 33, references AOM 664 folio 44v; Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 120.
In 1610 Michele Farrugia of Qrendi was attacked by 4 slaves and maimed one for life; as a result he was sentenced to row in the slave’s place. Instead he purchased a replacement slave to row in his stead and also bought the maimed slave ‘...to do with him what he liked’. This situation was not unique to Malta, and a similar system of replacement existed in Spain. On Malta the ability to provide a substitute appears to have only been for those Forzati who were originally from Malta, highlighting the difference in situation for a Forzati from Malta with a short sentence compared to a Forzato with a life sentence. Additionally this process of substitution, while underscoring a fundamental difference between a slave and a Forzato, also suggests that the Order was willing to accept a slave in place of a Forzato suggesting that they were interchangeable from the perspective of the Order. As a further example of this interchangeability, when in 1608 a Forzato on a life sentence escaped from the galley the San Luigi, the Captain Chevalier Arteman de Than had to supply the Order with a slave as a substitute.

The Buonavoglia unlike the slaves and the Forzati had chosen to row the Order’s galleys; although they were ‘free’ men compared to the Forzati and slaves their choice to row was typically the result of debt or desperation. The Buonavoglia were required to row for a set number of years and in return they were paid a lump sum with which to settle their debts; although they now had a debt to the Order, they rowed until that debt was paid off. The Buonavoglia was debt slavery, Suzanne Miers has discussed that slavery and debt slavery often existed side by side, while debt slavery should end with the repayment of the debt often the debtors were never able to repay their debts so remained enslaved for their lives. The status of the Buonavoglia is not clear: Jean Dumont in 1699 detailed that there were Maltese who sold themselves to the Order for their lives, after which point they were treated as slaves and sailed chained. Although the Buonavoglia were trusted
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247 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, p. 33, references AOM 665 folio 91rv; Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 120.
248 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 532, references AOM 663 folio 154rv.
251 Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 109 ‘e i Buonavoglia, uomini liberi che si erano offerti spontaneamente come rematori perché soprapposti dai debiti, spesso di gioco, o perché spinti dalla disperazione di non trovare altro modo per campare.’; Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 120.
252 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 106; Muscat and Agius, ‘Slaves on Land and Sea’, p. 369.
more and were allowed to serve unchained they were considered a protection against mutiny by the *Forzati* and slaves.\footnote{Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 106; Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 120; Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, pp. 29-37, references AOM 665, folios 206r-v, 209v, both 14 January 1645.} Grima outlines that the *Buonavoglia* had more freedoms than the Order’s slaves or *Forzati*, they were allowed to sleep in their own homes if they were married, although the *Buonavoglia* were still restricted, if they left their homes after dark they would be sentenced to three years rowing the Order’s galleys without payment and chained to the deck.\footnote{Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys (c. 1600-1650)’, p. 123.} The difference between these two conceptions of *Buonavoglia* was likely related to the length of time the *Buonavoglia* served, some had to sail for the remainder of their lives whereas many *Buonavoglia* only had to serve for a certain number of years after which point they no longer owed the Order a debt and were free.\footnote{Wettinger notes several cases of *Buonavoglia* being freed for repaying their debt.\footnote{Wettinger, G. (1965). *The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the rule of the Order*. Journal of the Faculty of Arts, 3(1), 29-37, AOM 666 folio 117, AOM 667, folio 7.} Not all *Buonavoglia* were from Malta, in 1606 an agent of the Order was to recruit 150 of them from France and Spain.\footnote{Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the Rule of the Order’, pp. 29-37.} It appears that some of the *Buonavoglia* were donated to the Order as Dal Pozzo records the donation of *Buonavoglia* from Sicily in 1603 and 1625.\footnote{Wettinger, G. (1965). *The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the rule of the Order*. Journal of the Faculty of Arts, 3(1), 29-37, references AOM 1385; Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the rule of the Order’, pp. 29-37.} This further suggests that the *Buonavoglia* were debt slaves as they were being donated to the Order. It is likely that the conditions for gaining new *Buonavoglia* were similar to that of *Forzati* and slaves, from 1596 all *Buonavoglia* were required to be over twenty years old and show they had the ability and strength to row.\footnote{AOM 1760 folio 355 ‘Item perche sogliono accorder nelle galeere alcuni *Buonavoglia* giovani che non sono atti a vogare al remo e tirare il soldo di continuo senza servire, et in questo mezzo ben spesso cascano ammalati di sorte che di necessita bisogna licentiarli per inutile. Pertanto ti ricorda che piu non si possa...’} This was because some *Buonavoglia* were unable to row and to prevent the Order from...
being defrauded. 262 This was reissued in 1625 as Buonavoglia that were unable to row continued to
be a problem for the Order. 263 In 1660 Paolo Corrao was freed because he was no longer able to row
due to infirmities after fifty years of service. 264 Salvatore Bono notes that in Italy privately owned
slaves were paid at the same rate as Buonavoglia and were counted among the Buonavoglia despite
being slaves. 265 It appears that some Buonavoglia attempted to escape, as anyone found to have
aided a runaway Buonavoglia had to repay the Buonavoglia’s debt and row for ten years. 266

In Spain the number of Buonavoglia declined as the galley squadrons grew and the price of paying
the Buonavoglia increased. 267 The number of Buonavoglia on the Order’s galleys also declined from
almost a third of the oarsmen in 1590 to approximately a fifth in 1632 and 1669. 268 As already
discussed the change in rowing system meant that fewer skilled oarsmen were required and by 1632
there was only one Buonavoglia per bench. The role of the Buonavoglia as the skilled oarsmen in the
key position is often presented within the discourse without consideration. 269 The Buonavoglia were
likely used in these key positions because unlike the slaves they were mostly Europeans with whom
the Order could communicate easily and because of their greater level of freedoms than the other
oarsmen; those from Malta would have had ties to the island so would have been less likely to flee.
While the Order’s Forzati would have also likely been Christian Europeans, many had long sentences
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262 AOM 1760 folio 355 ‘Item perche sogliono accorder nelle galere alcuni Buonavoglia giovani che non sono
atti a vogare al remo e tirare il soldo di continuo senza servire, et in questo mezzo ben spesso cascano
ammalati di sorte che di necessita bisogna licentiarli per inutile. Pertanto ti ricorda che piu non si possa
accorder alcun Buonavoglia che non sia di anni venti ad altro e che li signori capitani et Riveditori li facciano
vistare se sono sani e tatti a vogare accio la Religione non resti defraudata.’, transcribed in Grima, ‘The Rowers
on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 121, also references AOM 99 folio 119v-120v, AOM 1759 folio 415.


264 Wettinger, ‘The Galley-Convicts and Buonavoglia in Malta during the rule of the Order’, pp. 29-37, Aom 666
folio 117, Aom 667, folio 18.

265 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p.158 ‘La distinzione peraltro
si complica e resta non del tutto chiara a proposito degli schiavi-Buonavoglia, come vengono indicati nei
documenti della marina pontificia, ma il fenomeno e presente anche altrove. Si tratta di questo: nella difficulta
di trovare sufficienti uomini atti al remo vengono presi in affitto musulmani appartenenti a proprietari privati,
corrispondendo a questi un importo pari al compenso dei Buonavoglia o altrimenti concordato. Si accresceva
così, talvolta in misura apprezzabile, il numero dei musulmani a bordo d’una nave cristiana, ma essi sfuggono
alle eventuali statistiche poiche sono indistintamente compresi nel gruppo dei Buonavoglia, di norma cristiani
e liberi.’
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and were treated like slaves by the Order. Despite the additional freedoms and trust that many Buonavoglia had, Grima notes that the term was a grave insult highlighting the dishonour linked to the status. This is not surprising as Buonavoglia still had to endure the conditions on the Order’s galleys alongside the slaves and Forzati, as a result there were cases of Buonavoglia attempting to flee, anyone found to have helped a Buonavoglia to escape would be sentenced to ten years rowing and take on the debt of the escaped Buonavoglia.

On the rowing benches there was a complex social hierarchy based on which social group each rower was categorised in and where they sat on the bench. The Order’s oarsmen were made up of Buonavoglia, Forzati and Slaves; a mix of these groups would sit on each bench. For the majority of the Order’s time on Malta the galleys had 5 men to a bench who all shared the same oar: usually there was at least one Buonavoglia, as the number of Forzati per galley was typically low, it was likely there would have been only one Forzati, so the rest of the men on the bench would have been slaves. These three groups were made visually distinctive from one another to denote their differing status: Forzati had a shaved head and beard, Buonavoglia also had shaved heads but were permitted to grow a moustache, Slaves grew a tuft of hair. In 1656 Stefano Dell Bella drew a galley slave on Malta: the image is included in appendix 1, and the slave’s tuft of hair is clear, additionally despite his face being somewhat obscured there is no evidence of a moustache. This system of visual distinction also highlights the male dominance of the Order’s slave system, women were not sentenced to row for crimes or debt so did not become Buonavoglia or Forzati otherwise the requirement to grow facial hair for identification may have been an issue. The Italian galleys used a similar system for identification of the different groups of oarsmen.

This visual distinction between the Buonavoglia, Forzati and Slaves is often mentioned within the Hospitaller discourse within the context of the Order’s galleys but the impact of these identities is missed. Within the wider slavery discourse the importance of hair as a form of control is more widely known, Patterson notes that the shaving of a slave’s head is found in the great majority of slaveholding societies because of the cultural significance of hair: ‘There is hardly a culture in which
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274 Appendix 1 - Stefano Dell Bella, Galley slave hauling a ship’s cargo, 1656, The National Museum of Fine Arts (Mużew Nazzjonali tal-Arti), Malta, inventory number; HMZA 00180.
275 Bono, Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici, p. 158 ‘Era opportuno che l’appartenenza dei galeotti all’una o all’altra categoria fosse riconoscibile a primavista; per questo era prescritto che i Buonavoglia portassero i baffi, i forzati fossero invece rasati sia sul viso che nel capo, e gli schiavi, infine, tenessero un solo ciuffo al sommo della testa.’
hair is not, for males, a symbol of power, manliness, freedom, and even rebellion...The shorn head is, conversely, symbolic of castration—loss of manliness, power, and “freedom.” Even in modern societies we tend to shave the head of prisoners, although the deep symbolic meaning is usually camouflaged with overt hygienic explanations. The link to hygiene has been made within the Hospitaller discourse, Paul Cassar noted that ‘Incidentally, these signs of servitude helped to combat lice infestation which was responsible for typhus epidemics in all navies.’ This was more recently echoed by Grima. Additionally Palmer has downplayed the significance of these identifies entirely; ‘Visual marking, however, did not alter the fact that whether Muslim, Christian or Jew, the sale and circulation of unfree labour in the Mediterranean world made captive Slavery, captivity and galley rowing in early modern Malta galley rowers all but indistinguishable from each other in terms of their lives and their possible routes to freedom.’ This is incorrect, different rowers were in very different situations, two slaves on the same oar could be in vastly different situations, one could be in the process of being ransomed and in contact with their family, the other could have converted to Christianity and as a result be better treated. Regarding conversion, some Muslim slaves became Christian, the slaves who wrote letters included as part of the trial of Georgio Scala had become Christians and this appears to have negatively affected their family ties, in their letters they complain that their families had not written to them since their conversion. Muhammad states ‘Nor have I seen from you, never, neither a letter nor an answer, since the day I became a Christian’. Ali presents a similar situation, ‘Since the day I became a Christian how many years (have passed) without seeing from you either a letter or an answer.’ Conversion did not change their status as galley slaves, although did impact their chances of being ransomed, this will be discussed more in chapter 7, additionally baptised slaves were given better rations. Emanuel Buttigieg notes that ‘A particularly visible denominator of hierarchical differences and arrangements, both on the galleys and in the Convent, was food.’ Through differences in hair and food the Order enforced distinctions between the different groups of oarsmen.
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Even within the Buonavoglia and Forzati there could be differences depending on whether they were serving life sentences in which case they were treated similarly to slaves, but for those serving only limited sentences and from Malta they could sleep in their homes when on Malta and gain freedom by simply serving the years required of them, options unavailable to the slaves. These visual distinctions remained even when the oarsmen were not at sea and would have prevented the Buonavoglia, Forzati and Slaves from passing as free. It is also notable that this system would also have made it difficult for Forzati or slaves to pass as Buonavoglia, as that would require growing a moustache. In 1663 Skippon noted that in the slave prisons some slaves worked as barbers.284

Given the importance of facial hair to masculine identity, the allowance to the Buonavoglia to have a moustache apart from allowing them to be visually distinguished from the Forzati and Slaves was also a mark of their higher status.285 Buonavoglia had other privileges beyond facial hair; some were left unshackled if they were trusted.286 Additionally the Buonavoglia, as the pacesetter, was the furthest from danger.287 Meanwhile the 5th rower was in the worst position; it required the least experience but was nearest to enemy attacks, and Muscat and Agius argued that this position would have been the most uncomfortable as the rower would be unable to stretch out his arms and back as well as the others.288 It is likely that the 5th rower would have been either a recently captured slave or Forzato recently assigned to the galleys as the position required the least experienced.

The Buonavoglia were expected to monitor the other oarsmen on their benches for signs of rebellion.289 Using slaves of different statuses to police each other was not unique to the Hospitallers, this is comparable to the use of African ‘guardians’ on New World slave ships, ‘guardians’ were slaves that helped to discipline and control other slaves. Captain Phillip produced a detailed account of the use of guardians from his 1693-94 voyage, 30-40 gold coast slaves were purchased for this reason.290 This meant that the ‘guardians’ were already separated from the other slaves because they had been purchased from a separate region. Similar to how the Buonavoglia as debt slaves who were typically Christians were separate from the Order’s Muslim slaves that were typically captured in battle and also in similar numbers. Stephanie Smallwood outlines the

284 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 621; Wettinger, Slavery in Malta, pp. 414-415.
significance of this system; ‘Bringing members of the slave cargo into alliance with ship captains and sustaining that relationship for the duration of the ocean crossing, the guardian system produced complex social relationships in a setting where they should not have existed. It triangulated what presumably should have been an unambiguous and fixed binary between African and European, black and white, captive and captor. It was one thing for slaving captains to turn to slaves for assistance in emergencies at sea. It was something quite different to plan slaving voyages with the expectation that members of the slave cargo empowered with resources and liberties that could support rebellion would reliably and predictably agree to align their interests with those of the captain for the entirety of the voyage.’

This is similar to what was occurring on the Order’s ships, it is convenient to view the galley slaves, debt slaves and penal slaves as one homogenous group in opposition to the Order who forced them to serve but the reality was far more complicated. Despite the apparent occupational sameness there was a complex social structure and division of labour.291 There were differences between the groups and within the groups that mean there were divisions which hindered rebellion. This will be discussed further later in this chapter. The haircuts forced on the rowers were part of a system of control that discouraged rebellion by highlighting the divisions between the different types of oarsmen.

Regardless of the status on the bench, conditions onboard were extremely poor, as W I Rodgers highlights, oarsmen: ‘... were chained permanently to their rowing positions, their personal condition was filthy and it was said that the odour of a galley could be perceived a mile or more leeward.’292 Ruth Pike highlights that these conditions, although unsanitary, would have been typical of shipboard life, suffered by all the passengers and crew.293 The task of rowing itself was physically challenging and the oarsmen would have to row for long periods of time: ‘Sometimes a galley cruised under oars for 15, 20 or 23 hours chasing a prize, it could cover a distance of 50 and sometimes up to 289 km without interrupting rowing.’ 294 In such situations, to ensure continuous speed, half the oarsmen would rest and eat while half rowed. In 1770 Patrick Brydone noted that the oarsmen rowed for ten or twelve hours without a break.295 In 1694 Otto Friedrich von der Groben

291 Hershenzon, *The captive sea*, p. 30; Robert Davies, *Christian slaves, Muslim masters; White slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800*, (Palgrave, 2003), p. 73.
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published an account of his travels titled ‘Orientalische reise-beschreibung des brandenburgischen adelichen pilgers’. Groben described the conditions on board the Order’s galleys: ‘The benches were hardly two feet wide and six feet long. On this narrow space, the five slaves had to work, eat, drink and sleep.’ Muscat and Agius include the space of the bench and the deck that the oarsmen would have had access to and estimate it to be an area of ‘…not more than 2.3m by 1.25m’ for them to sleep on. The area allotted for the oarsmen on a Hospitaller galley was comparable with the area allotted for slaves being transported to the New World. In 1799 Lord Liverpool found that on average 5 to 6 square feet of deck area was allotted per slave. For the oarsmen their bench was the world they could interact with, they would be chained to the bench and would remain there day and night. This highlights the subordinate status and dehumanisation of the oarsmen, reduced to simply engines to power the ships with no regard for their wellbeing but rather the ability to operate effectively. Although being chained to the deck was not unusual for Early Modern navies and occurred on Italian and Spanish galleys.

Within the Hospitaller Naval discourse rather than focus on the dehumanisation the remaining value of oarsmen as a tool has been used to argue that their treatment was not unduly harsh, thus Earle states that; ‘...it seems unlikely that they would be allowed to starve or die of exposure unnecessarily.’ Similarly, Grima argues ‘...slaves were considered as a commodity which was not to be capriciously thrown away.’ Despite earlier in the same work outlining that oarsmen could not take cover during battle because they were chained in place, a sign that their importance as an engine was greater than their value as a commodity. Chaining the oarsmen to the deck and preventing them from being able to take over was deliberate, as the oarsmen would have had to
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stop rowing in order to take cover and this would have negated their purpose as oarsmen which was more important to the Order. Muscat and Agius argue that the Order did not mistreat its slaves; ‘...it was in the interest of the knights to keep the slaves awake and perform their rowing duties well.’

Part of their justification for this is that ‘...no slave is recorded as dying on a Maltese galley because of the rowing operations.’ This comment is misleading and is based on a very specific focus, in the footnotes it is explained that Muscat and Agius found no reference to a slave dying of heart failure through hard work at sea in the Order’s log books. This comment was made by Muscat in an earlier work with the same footnote. Although even within this specific focus there are examples to the contrary; In 1616 Francesco Giarnnello, the ships’ doctor for the galley San Lorenzo was made to pay the treasury the price of two slaves that had died on board the San Lorenzo, as he had accepted them as fit to row when they were not. Additionally Wettinger notes that in 1742 a galley slave, Acmet bin Mamut of Bizerta, died of heart failure two days after a severe beating. There was an inquiry but the crewman was acquitted, which Wettinger commented on; ‘...the final result, a complete acquittal, cannot be considered as anything but disturbing and certain features were very disquieting.’ Furthermore, as previously noted, the galleys oarsmen were unable to take cover and Muscat in an earlier work noted that captured slaves were placed on the bench to replace slaves who had died in battle. Slaves were sometimes killed on the Order’s galleys by the crew; in 1710 Henrco Grench, a sailor beat a slave to death and had to give the Order two slaves in return. While slaves being worked to death was something that the Order would have specifically wanted to avoid; there was an expectation that oarsmen would become unable to row during a voyage, and each galley kept reserve oarsmen for the purpose of replacing those that were unable to row. Given that the galleys were required to keep a minimum of twenty reserve oarsmen per 260 oarsmen, highlights the expectation that some oarsmen would become unable to row, through injury or death, as part of the galley’s operations.
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Joseph Muscat and Andrew Cuschieri argue that as there were statutes that forbade the Brothers from beating the galley slaves unnecessarily, ‘No knight could molest or beat a slave or order him about the galley.’ Muscat and Cuschieri link excessive beatings to dishonouring the captain and lowering the morale of the crew, rather than because of the value of the slaves. Presenting the Order’s slaveholding as less violent than other comparative slave systems is a means of moralizing the Order’s slaveholding, similar to arguments that the Order did not engage in slave raids discussed earlier in this chapter. This approach can be seen in Joseph Muscat’s comment; ‘Most probably Muslim slaves in Valletta were treated better than in any other foreign city.’ This argument is largely moot, as regardless of the slaves treatment they were still slaves being forced to labour by the Order and highlighting comparatively better conditions does not change that, secondly this better treatment is not clear in sources; the Order’s historian Vertot acknowledged the cruelty of Romegas toward galley slaves. Vertot reported that when Romegas was accused of being cruel to the galley slaves, Romegas claimed this was a reprisal for the treatment of Christian slaves by Muslim corsairs. Vertot was not convinced and stated that ‘...his temper, which was naturally cruel and violent, had perhaps contributed as much to it as his politics.’

Additionally, while there were restrictions against unnecessary violence some violence was considered necessary, Palmer outlines that ‘...it remained a commonly held belief that one must beat a slave in order to get him to row hard.’ This appears to have been the case as Otto Friedrich von der Groben detailed: ‘...if one of the galley slaves did not obey perfectly the signs of the whistle, he was flogged with a flexible stick until his back streamed blood. He was not allowed to scream or shout. If he did, the comito would hit him until he lost consciousness...If the comiti felt that the slaves were not rowing fast enough to catch up with a Muslim vessel, they would call the soldiers and knights, who would let their swords do the convincing.’
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Order’s slaves is at odds with what is presented by Muscat, he specific notes Jean Mateilhe’s 1757 account of being on a French galley and seeing a slaves arm be cut off and then used to beat another slave, ‘Fais comme j’ia souvent vu faire aux galeres de Malte.’ as being ‘..diametrically opposite behaviour remarked by Bosio.’ \(^{321}\) The example that Muscat is referring to is Bosio detailing a case from 1556 where Morat Rais a Christian renegade cut the arm off a Christian oarsman. \(^{322}\) Rather than being opposite behaviours, these are simply two unrelated events but regardless highlights that Muscat felt that such an action could not have occurred on one of the Order’s ships. Contrary to this Wettinger details an example from 1625 where Gabriello Pulis, a boatswain on the Santa Rosolea, discovered that several oarsmen were only pretending to row while the galley was being chased by a stronger force; in response Gabriello cut the arm off one of them, and he was not punished for this action. \(^{323}\) While this example occurred over a hundred years before Jean Mateilhe’s account, it shows that such cases did occur and supports that Jean Mateilhe could have witnessed such behaviour on the Order’s galleys in the eighteenth century. The reason for this continued softening of the Order’s treatment of its slaves within the Hospitaller discourse is unclear, it is possible that European and Christian influences continue to cause some historians to identify with the knights more than their slaves. Joseph Muscat’s Christian beliefs and links with the Sovereign Order of Malta, he was awarded the Order pro Merito Melitensi in 2001, this may have unconsciously made it difficult for him to focus on the harsh and inhuman treatment of slaves by the Order resulting in some contradictions within his works. \(^{324}\) For example contrasting the two unrelated examples of Bosio and Jean Mateilhe, additionally on the same page within Slaves on Maltese Galleys, he both highlights the issue with sweeping statements; ‘Sweeping statements or general remarks are to be treated as such or, better still not consulted at all.’ \(^{325}\) Despite this Muscat makes several sweeping statements with very little supporting evidence such as claiming that slaves in Valletta were better treated then in other cities. \(^{326}\)

The treatment of the slaves was so poor that it caused some of them to commit suicide; in 1629 as part of an enquiry into a slave’s suicide also from the Santa Rosolea it was stated that it was normal for a slave to receive a hundred or more lashes of the whip, but in this instance, no one was found


\(^{323}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 354.


guilty.327 Direct comparisons regarding the harshness of these sentences are difficult to make, as noted in the previous chapter the fifteenth century mariner Michael of Rhodes noted that oarsmen on Venetian galleys would be lashed from stern to bow for blaspheming.328 Although, in 1860 the use of the lash was limited to 50 lashes in the British navy a number that was higher than the limit of 39 lashes that could be given to slaves on Trinidad in 1800.329 In 1642 there was another case of a slave committing suicide, this time on the Santa Ubaldesca; the slave in question, Deli Ogli, had jumped into the sea while wearing chains; the ship had been in harbour so he was not chained to the deck. It was believed that his suicide was due to the poor treatment he received from several members of the crew who were found guilty of mistreating him and as such were seen as responsible for his death; they were made to repay the Order the value of Deli Ogli.330

Joseph Muscat and Dionisius Agius within, Georgio Scala and the Moorish slaves, make the notable comment; ‘...secondary sources may be biased towards presenting a good picture of the slaves’ treatment on shore and at sea.’331 The reason for this bias in the secondary sources is not addressed, within the footnote for this argument Muscat and Agius note several earlier works but contrast with that of Whitworth Porter ‘...one can hardly accept his biased remarks against the behavior of the knights towards their slaves.’332 This perhaps is in reference to Whitworth Porter’s description of Brother Oswald Massingberd from Lincolnshire in 1534 having killed four chained galleyslaves as part of a plot to kill the Grand-Master; Porter outlined that before the council Massingberd stated, ‘In killing the four slaves I did well, but in not having at the same time killed our old and imbecile Grand-Master, I confess I did badly.’333 Despite this crime Massingberd remained a member of the Order, although lost his commandery; this appears to have not had a lasting impact as in 1552 he beat a Maltese nobleman over a slave girl; an incident that will be discussed further in chapter 7. Regarding the killing of four slaves, Porter’s description of this event is not unique, having been included in a more recent work by Gregory O’Malley.334 Additionally, Whitworth Porter described
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being a slave on the Order’s galleys: ‘No existence can be conceived more utterly cheerless or more hopelessly miserable than that of the Moslem captive, whose only change from their daily slavery on the public works was to be chained to the oar of a galley’.335 This is in contrast to the galley slavery described by Muscat and Agius; ‘...the open air on the galley was, ironically, a relief from the heat of summer in the cities. Good drinking water was available on board to their heart’s content and, if submissive enough, time passed away peacefully till they were faced with enemy shipping.’336 An idealized version of galley slavery that is at odds with the primary source’s descriptions.

Muscat and Agius note that: ‘...how slaves were treated on board the Order’s galley is difficult to judge owing to the paucity of primary sources.’ 337 Although this fail to meaningfully engage with the primary sources contained within the same volume. Within, *Georgio Scala and the Moorish slaves*, two of the Arabic letters written by galley slaves are transcribed.338 These letters were written by Muslim slaves on Malta to their families in Sfax, Tunis, sometime prior to the trial of 1598. 339 These letters present a very different perception of being a galley slave, in Muhammad’s letter to his brother, he states that ‘The captive of the ghurab [Galley], when he goes out of the ghurab, is like going out of hellfire and entering paradise.’340 Additionally Ali describes being a galley slave in similar terms: ‘For he who is the captive of the ghurab is like him who is staying in hell.’341 Given the lack of surviving sources by slaves describing the conditions onboard the Order’s galleys these accounts are very significant, Joseph Muscat and Dionisius A. Agius described them as ‘...unique because, so far, in the history of slaves in Malta we have no other direct information from the slaves themselves about how they were treated.’342 Despite the significance of these accounts within the historiography they
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have for the most part been disregarded; while Muscat and Agius, highlight the importance of these accounts, they present a very different interpretation of the conditions on board the galleys.  

Additionally when analysing the content of these letters El Mustapha Lahlali and Dionisius A. Agius question the comparison to hell and suggest that it may have been an exaggeration by the slaves in hopes of motivating their families to ransom them. Although it is clear from other sources that conditions on board the galleys were extremely poor, in the early eighteenth century Jean Marteilhe upon finding out that he was condemned to serve as a French galley slave made a similar comparison; ‘Oh Heavens! Exclaimed I, surely I am fallen into Hell itself...’ Since this memoir was not written until after he had been freed it seems unlikely that Jean Marteilhe was exaggerating in hopes of being ransomed. Similarly in 1590 Edward Webbe published his account of being enslaved for five years on an Ottoman galley, the conditions described are remarkably similar to those of the Order’s galleys; ‘First, we were shaven head and face... And by one of the feet is each slave chained with a great chain to the galley, and our hands fastened with a pair of manacles... Thus, as I said before, I remained five years in this miserable estate, wonderfully beaten and misused every day. There have I seen of my fellows when they have been so weak as they could not row by reason of sickness and faintness; where the Turks laid upon them as on horses, and beat them in such sort, as oft times they died. And then [they] threw them into the sea.’ These conditions and how Webbe describes them are very similar to what is known about the conditions on the Order’s ships and also how the Order’s slaves describe their treatment.

In 1690 Jean Dumont visited Malta and stated that ‘There is nothing more miserable than those who serve on the Galleys.’ Muscat and Agius, suggest that being a galley slave may have been better than being a slave on Malta; ‘...living in the slave prisons must have been unpleasant beyond
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imagination; so the open air on the galley was, ironically, a relief from the heat of summer in the cities.'

Again this is in opposition to the situation outlined in the primary sources, in the letter written by Muhammad he laments his situation and highlights the inhuman conditions of the galleys; ‘I am not a land captive. I am the captive of the ghurab... How is it that a human being could be a captive of the ghurab?’

It appears that Muhammad would have preferred to have been a slave in Malta. Galley service was used as a punishment by private slaveholders; from 1631 the Order only accepted those who were suitable to row and would provide no payment in return for these oarsmen, although they would clothe and feed the slaves. Despite this, the practice continued and in 1669 the Order refused to clothe or feed those slaves sent to the galleys for only a few days of punishment because their work was of such poor quality. Given that the private slaveholders were not paid for their slave’s labour, and the Order refused to feed or clothe the slave, it would have cost the private slaveholder to have their slave punished through naval service; despite this the punishment service continued and Godfrey Wettinger identified slaves being sent to the galleys for punishment as late as 1740.

What was a punishment for land slaves on Malta constituted the normal conditions for the galley slaves, it is remarkable that Muscat and Agius in their attempts to minimise the negative conditions have gone so far as to argue that to be a galley slave was preferable, when the opposite appears to have been the case.

Muscat also specifically highlighted the Order’s medical care for its slaves as part of the justification of ‘better’ treatment the Order slaves received. Paul Cassar outlines this history of the Order’s medical care for slaves: the earliest reference to hospital treatment of slaves occurs in 1573, and in 1583 the Grand Master decreed that galley slaves would be admitted into the Old Infirmary at Birgu. By 1592 the Old Infirmary at Birgu was turning into an isolation hospital and the galley slaves were transferred to the new infirmary at Valletta. Although this level of medical care was not usual, there was a hospital for galley slaves built in Naples in 1670. Indeed, that galley slaves required so much medical attention as to need their own ward in the Holy Infirmary highlights their poor
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treatment and conditions. In the late sixteenth century the Venetian navy investigated the suffering of its oarsmen, who had a 60% mortality rate. There was a lack of food and clothing, and due to sleeping in the open air the oarsmen suffered frostbite, sometimes necessitating amputations. Within the wider study of slavery there is a general consensus that medical care is not a sign of humanitarianism, as Finley argues; ‘one also attended to an injured cow and mended a damaged cart.’ Alabama’s 1852 legal code required the provision of medical care for slaves, Marten Seppel argues that such requirements were highlighted by pro-slavery writers as evidence that slaves lived in better conditions than free labourers.

Agency and resistance of oarsmen
The Order’s oarsmen lived together on cramped benches, in conditions that accepted that on every voyage some would become unable to row through injury or death. They were dehumanised, status-marked visual through their hair, able to be beaten by the rest of the crew. Although they were people with agency and intellect who, while their choices were limited, could still take steps to change their situation, often through extreme and desperate steps. As noted previously the oarsmen were divided between Forzati, Buonavoglia and slaves, additionally these were not homogenous groups. Within each group some individuals were more likely to be freed than others, Forzati with short sentences, Buonavoglia close to repaying their debts, slaves in contact with kin that might ransom them. For these individuals a hope of leaving the galleys existed, although this was not true for all oarsmen; in 1765 Antonino Grillo Of Messina asked to be freed, at the time he was 62 and had been rowing for the Order since his capture four years previously, but he was told that he would remain on the galleys for the rest of his life, without any likelihood of ever becoming free. This harsh treatment was because Antonino was a captured Christian renegade; captured Christian renegades were sentenced to galley service regardless of their age. In 1626 the renegade Giorgio di Marion was condemned to row and remained a galley slave until 1654 at which time he was sold to the Prior of Bagnara on the condition that the Prior would never free him. Earle notes the case of a 80-year-old slave from Damiatta who petitioned for his freedom in 1682, he had been a slave for
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Given the Order’s age restrictions regarding Forzati, the choice to have elderly enslaved Christian renegades serve on the galleys appears to have been as a punishment. Beyond Christian renegades galley slaves in general found it particularly difficult to organize their ransoms. This was partially a result of their situation, which made it more difficult to develop relationships with free people who could send messages abroad, this will be explored more in the chapter on ransom. Additionally oarsmen were always in high demand, as Peter Earle notes, ‘States which ran galley-fleets had a constant preoccupation with trying to keep their rowing benches manned and were extremely reluctant to let a fit young man go.’ As a result slaves could spend long periods of time rowing the Order’s galleys with no hope of being freed, this alongside the conditions on the galleys encouraged resistance and even rebellion.

The Order sought to control the bodies of their oarsmen, this can be seen through chaining them to the deck, controlling their hair and food, but the oarsmen sought to subvert this control this could be done in minor ways such as purposefully rowing slowly or only pretending to row, which as previously discussed was highlighted by Otto Friedrich von der Groben in 1675. Additionally the oarsmen could feign illness, it was the role of the First Lieutenant to inspect slaves that claimed sickness to see who was faking. Some oarsmen even went so far as self-harm, to make themselves unfit to row. In 1674 the punishment for this was death, in 1713 the punishment was changed, if a slave was found to have injured himself to escape galley service his nose would be cut off for the first offence, his ears for the second offence and he would be hanged for a third offence. It is not clear what motivated this change, although it would appear that some oarsmen who maimed themselves were still able to row, thus sentencing them to death was a cost to the Order; Wettinger notes that in 1784 the municipal code of Malta stated that Forzati or slaves who maimed themselves to avoid work on the galleys would be condemned to the galleys for the rest of their lives if they were still capable of galley service. This allowed the maimed oarsmen to remain on the galleys and would have provided a deterrent to others considering injuring themselves to avoid rowing.
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Such extreme actions to avoid galley service should not be surprising, as previously mentioned in the seventeenth century there were cases of galley slaves committing suicide.\(^{371}\) The extent to which suicide was an act of rebellion has been debated within the wider slavery discourse; while suicide can been seen as Michael Gomez has described it, ‘...the ultimate form of resistance.’, Terri Snyder has highlighted the complex nature of suicide, an action that has deep social and religious meaning, and so resulted from a complex range of motivations beyond just resistance.\(^{372}\) The conditions the slaves endured would have impacted this, as Diane Sommerville concludes, ‘Quite simply, suicide ended personal torment. It ended suffering.’\(^{373}\)

Oarsmen would also attempt to flee; in 1606 three of the Order’s galleys, the San Michele, the San Giorgio and the Capitana, were wrecked at the Island of Zembra in the Gulf of Tunis after a violent storm; the crews endured fifteen days of attacks before they were rescued, and in this time 40 of the crew were killed and all 540 slaves escaped.\(^{374}\) In 1630 eight slaves, four of the Capitana and Santa Rosalia along with four privately owned slaves, were prevented from escaping from Malta in a skiff by several Maltese who were awarded eight scudi as a reward.\(^{375}\) It was not just the slaves that sought to escape. In 1628 four Buonavoglia escaped from the San Antoni and in 1673 nine Buonavoglia were sent to round up twenty-two escaping slaves from the Santa Maria, but one of the Buonavoglia instead took the opportunity to escape himself.\(^{376}\) Another strategy was violent revolt, with galley slaves attempting to take control of the vessel. However, despite the large number of slaves, generally slave uprisings on galleys were infrequent. This was partly because of the diversity of oarsmen, as the Christian Forzati and Buonavoglia would have little to gain from being captured by Muslim ships and would likely have been enslaved.\(^{377}\) With regard to Forzati and Buonavoglia, Wettinger states ‘Neither of the two were normally so desperate as to prefer Muslim


\(^{376}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, pp. 361-362, AOM 664 folio 147(1628), AOM 668 folio 61 (1673).

\(^{377}\) Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitu e commercio*, p. 109 ‘Daun ammutinamento e da una ribellione provocata dagli schiavi musulmani nell’intento di recuperare la liberta, riparando in un porto musulmano, i forzati non avevano invero nulla da guadagnare e i Buonavoglia tutto da perdere poiche sarebbero essi stessi divenuti schiavi.’
freedom to Christian servitude.’ This diversity of oarsmen was no accident, the Order ensured there was a mix of types of oarsmen on each bench, as has already been discussed the Buonavogila were expected to monitor other oarsmen for rebellion. Additionally not all of the Order’s slaves were Muslim, and baptised slaves would not have expected to be well treated when captured by their former coreligionists, causing further disunity among the slaves. Ruth Pike highlights that uprisings on Spanish galleys usually involved a conspiracy between the different groups and such cooperation would have been impeded by the differences in religion. It is likely that language barriers also hindered the oarsmen from cooperating; this did not affect the performance at the oar as the Order commanded its oarsmen through whistles. Regardless the Order took steps to prevent slave uprisings; if the crew left weapons unattended near the slaves they would be lashed and condemned to row for three years without pay. This ruling was outlined in the Chapter General on 1598 although remained an issue, as the ruling was reissued in the Chapter General of 1604 and 1631.

Rebellion tended to occur as a result of external factors, such as the ship being engaged in battle. For the Knights of the Order naval defeat could result in death or enslavement, while for their galley slaves such a defeat could result in freedom. Muscat and Agius note that ‘A slave on a Maltese galley knew that in a naval battle his own people were only a few hundred meters away and yet he was powerless to help them.’ Yet it appears that this was not always the case and the galley slaves could take actions to aid their co-religionists; in 1570 when the corsair Ulugh Ali attacked the Order’s fleet, Bosio reports that the slaves of the captured Saint Giovanni had intentionally rowed slower so that the ship would be captured and they would be freed. In 1548 there was a slave uprising on

380 Muhammad and Ali whoses letters were part of the trial of Georgio scala were both baptised slaves, Zammit and Lahlali, ‘The Letters of the Moorish slaves in sixteenth-century Malta: A translation, and a linguistic analysis’, p. 290, includes transcription of Aim, Proc. 16A, Folio 89 Recto, left column, p. 295, Aim, Proc. 16A, Folio 90 Recto, right column.
384 Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys (c. 1600-1650)’, p. 116, references Chapter General 1598, AOM 293 folio 103r-v; Chapter General 1604, AOM 294 folio 117v; Chapter General 1631 AOM 296 folio 140v.
386 ‘San Giouanni rimasa essendo a dietro, e scostatasi dalla Capitana... gli Schiavi, i quali per desiderio d’essere liberati, rallentauano la voga...’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano* volume 3, p. 857.
the galera *Caterinetta* while it was being pursued by Muslim ships, the galley was run aground to prevent it being used by the enemy and allow the crew to flee.\(^{387}\)

In 1639 Grand Master Lascaris Castellar boasted how the management skills of the Order’s maritime officials prevented slave rebellions on galleys.\(^{388}\) Fearing revolts many Mediterranean fleets limited the number of slaves on the galleys.\(^{389}\) Cases of uprisings on Turkish vessels appear to be linked to Christian slaves making up the majority of the oarsmen. Lous De Boisgelin outlined two such examples: in 1741 a group of Christian slaves who composed the crew of a Turkish galley rose up and took possession of the vessel and sailed to Malta. The commander was the Pasha of Rhodes, one of the greatest men in the Ottoman empire.\(^{390}\) Similarly in 1760 when the bashaw Mehemet disembarked with most of his crew at Stamio, the Christian slaves left on board stole the vessel and set sail for Malta.\(^{391}\) In 1556 the galley of the corsair Ysuf Conciy was boarded by the Knight Romegas; Ysuf killed two knights but was struck by one of his oarsmen: ‘Every one of them gave him a blow ; some were so furious, with revenge, that they tore him with their teeth; there was not one but would have a piece of him, so that before he was got to the last bench, there was scarce the least bit of him left.’\(^{392}\) It is likely that slave uprisings as part of naval defeats were under-reported as the loss of galleys would have been of more importance to the Order. On the other hand, highlighting cases of Christian slaves revolting against Muslim masters would have been used as evidence of Muslim cruelty to their slaves and justification of the Order’s activities.

\(^{387}\) 1548 ‘Percioche si trouò ch’vnò Schiavo Turco, desideroso della libertà, haveva tagliata una delle vette così pronta mente, che da alcuno non ò fù veduto; havendo egli le mani libere. Poscia’ìn quel repentina, & horrendo accidente, non s’hebbe tempo di metter gli le manette di ferro, e d’ordinar le debite cautele sopra gli Schiaui. Talmente, che vedendo il Commendatore Sangorrin di non poter saluarsi; co’l parere del Commendatore di Chantereine, e di quegli altri Caualieri antiani, fece far forza p er inuestir in terra, nel vicino lido di Baia, e di Cuma; sperando d’incagliare la Galera in modo, che rompendosi, non potesse Draguto quindi cauarla; e di far dalle genti, fuggendo in terra, saluare buona parte del danaro.’, Bosio *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 3, p. 258; Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 399.


\(^{389}\) Hershenzon, *The captive sea*, p. 28.


\(^{392}\) Vertot, *The history of the Knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem, styled afterwards the Knights of Rhodes and at present, the Knights of Malta*, Volume 2 p. 185; Vertot, *Histoire des chevaliers Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jerusalem, apelles depuis chevaliers de Rhodes, et aujourd’hui chevaliers de Malthe*, volume 4, pp. 417-418 ‘Le Corsaire le recut avec le meme courage, & tua deux Chevaliers de sa main: mais etant tombe sur un banc de sa chiorume d’un coup que lui porta Romegas, ses esclaves, pour se venger des mauvais traitemens qu’ils en avoient recus, ne virent pas plutot le Malthois maître du vaisseau, que fans qu’il s’y opposat, ils firent passer le Corsaire de main en main. Chacun lui donnóit un coup; plusieurs meme pour assouvir leur vengeance, le dechiroient ave les dents: il n’y en avoit point qui ne voulut en avoir quelque member: & avant qu’il fut parvenu au dernier banc, a peine en resta-t-il la moindre partie.’
‘Now we are slaves...Sir, we are slaves.’

For the Knights of the Order enslavement was not simply something that they did to others but was a personal risk for them as well, as they lived and operated in an area where enslavement was a constant risk. The fear of enslavement appears to have been constant for the crews of the Order’s galleys, as Alonso de Contreras several times describes that in moments of fear his crew state ‘Now we are slaves’, ‘Sir, we are slaves’.393 On the 15th of July 1570 the corsair Ulugh Ali with a fleet of 20 galleys attacked the Order’s fleet; only one galley escaped, the Saint Maria della Vittoria; the Galera Capitana was run aground and the crew escaped; both the Saint Anna and the Saint Giovanni were captured. In one day the Order’s naval force was almost destroyed and 80 Brothers were enslaved or killed; Bosio provides a list of 63 names of those Brothers who were lost, of whom nine died in slavery.394 Although the Order’s fleet recovered its strength quickly, as the Viceroy of Sicily provided the Order with 2 galleys, there is some evidence that within the Order being enslaved was a fate that the Brothers feared.395 The risks of galley service appear to have impacted the operation of the galleys: in 1649 Grand Master Lascaris complained to the Order’s ambassador at Rome that there were too few Knights willing to man the Order’s galleys because they were not willing to risk their lives.396 The very real danger of enslavement is illustrated by the fact that in 1551 the majority of Gozo’s population was enslaved; the inhabitants had tried to send their women, children and elderly to Malta on two large boats but Grand Master D’Omedes had them sent back, believing that the men of Gozo would fight better if they were defending the lives of their families.397 Louis De Boisgelin details the account of a Sicilian man who had been living in Gozo and preferring death to slavery for himself and his family, had murdered his wife and two daughters before charging at a group of Turks, ‘...where, after wounding several, he at last met with the death he so eagerly

395 ‘Il Marchese di Pescara Vicerè di Sicilia in tanto, compatendo alla disgratia, che la Religione nella - perdita delle tre Galere patita haueua, & approuando la pia, e generosa risoluzione fatta dal Gran E Maestro, di rimetterle su quanto prima possibile gli fosse, per aiutar il soccorso di Cipro; si mostrò in effetto in quest’occasione più che mai amoreuole, e verso questa Religione deuoto. Percioche,tosto ch’vdit ha bebe l’Ambasciata fattagli dal Commendator Fra Don Antonino di Bologna; fece si, che dalla Regia Corte accommodati, e consegnati furono a Ministri della Religione in Messina, due Buchi di Galere, a scelta loro...’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano, volume 3, p. 862.
397 Testa, Romegas, p. 28.
sought. The Governor of Gozo was stripped, bound like a slave and forced to carry his own furniture aboard the enemy ships. In the same year the Order lost Tripoli, resulting in the enslavement and death of a large number of Knights, including twenty-five who had been imprisoned for insubordination but were released to reinforce Tripoli in preparation for the attack. Nevertheless, enslavement was not a fate from which there was no return; the Order’s own ransom market was evidence of that. This may appear to be parallel to Orlando Patterson’s definition of slavery as social death and natal alienation. Although returning was not guaranteed, a person’s status and wealth prior to being enslaved could increase the probability of a successful ransom but the outcome was not certain. Patterson outlines that while slaves were separated from their identity prior to enslavement that did not mean that they did not have a past, the key point is that the slave’s social relations were not formally recognized and could be ignored by the slaveholder. Bosio details that prior to 1535 members of the Order who were captured were executed in retaliation for the Order hanging Christian renegades. The importance of prior status to facilitating ransom will be discussed further in the chapter on ransom.

An unusual exchange between the Muslim commander Dragut and Brother de Valette, who would later become Grand Master, highlights the ease with which individuals could lose and gain their freedom. In 1541 de Valette was freed in exchange for a Turkish captive named Abreami Casdaghi who had been taken by the Order; de Valette had been captured in 1540 and spent a little over a year rowing a Muslim galley. Also in 1540 Dragut was captured by Andrea Doria, an admiral of the Emperor Charles V, and spent three years as a slave rowing a Christian galley. During this time the

398 Boisgelin, Ancient and Modern Malta, Volume 2, p. 41.
399 Boisgelin, Ancient and Modern Malta, Volume 2, p. 40.
400 Testa, Romegas, p. 32.
401 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, pp. 5-9
402 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, pp. 5-9
404 Testa, Romegas, p. 21; ‘...dopo hauere il Commendatore Fra Gioianni di Valletta, detto Parisotto, com prata, e ben armata la Galeotta, ch’era già del Capitan Garibaldo Genouese; se n'era con essa andato allo seccagne di Barbaria; e ch'incontrato essendosi nel far del giorno, sopra Groppo d'Asino, in due Galeotte, non punto minori della sua; le quali erano del Zoppo Rinegato Candioto, e di Cara, Mostafà; haueva con ambedue combattuto, con tanto valore, che le haueva poco men che rimesse; con grandissima mortalita de'Nemi ci; quando la disgratia volle, che gli fu traboccata la sua Galeotta; onde ferito, e preso ne rimase. E quindi alle Gerbe condotto; doue dopo essere stato in dura schiauitudine poco più d'vn'anno, fu contracambiato nella Xercia, vicino a Tripoli, con Abreami Casda gli Turco, che dal Gran Bagliuo d'Alemagna era stato preso all'Isola di Ciarelli; essendo egli parente del Rais, al quale il detto Valletta era toccato in sorte.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Ilustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano, volume 3, 1535, p. 212.
405 Testa, Romegas, p. 21; ‘E’ non essendosi potuto contenerdi dire, che niun'altra cosa tanto lo crucciaua, quanto l'esser stato preso da vn Cassaccia; Fució riferito a Gianettino, il quale se n’adirò,e sdegnò in tal maniera,che dopo hauere dati alcuni calci nel mostaccio a Draguto; ordinò al Comito, che mettendolo alla catena, lo facesse vogare; e lo trattasse, come il più vile, e minimo Galeotto, e Schiauo di tutta la Ciurma; non
now free de Valette confronted the enslaved Dragut ‘Senor Dragut, usance da guerra’ (Senor Dragut, custom of war’) to which Dragut replied ‘Y mundanca de Fortuna’ (‘Change of Fortune’). Dragut was aware that his situation was not permanent and in 1543 he was ransomed for 3,000 scudi, he continued to cause problems for the Order, in 1544 he captured a galleon of the Order carrying 70,000 crowns to fund construction of defences in Tripoli and in 1548 he captured another galley of the Order, this time carrying 20,000 ducats and 25 members of the Order. They were later exchanged for Turkish slaves held by the Order, although Brother Giovanni Turi Camus had preferred death to slavery and fought until he was beheaded. Dragut again faced de Valette during the siege of Malta in 1565; de Valette was now Grand Master and Dragut was one of the Ottoman commanders, Dragut died during the siege. This is not the only example of members of the Order losing and then regaining their freedom; the Captain General of the fleet in 1644 Gabriel de Chambres Boisbaudrant had been enslaved and ransomed for 800 scudi. Guglielmo Lorenzi, a corsair commanding the La Vittoria, a galley owned by Grand Master Emmanuel Pinto was enslaved in 1770 to be freed in 1773. This is noteworthy as it means that often significant members of the Order had first-hand experience of being enslaved and serving on galleys, or enduring conditions very similar to the conditions the Order’s slaves endured.

Conclusion
The primary military activity of the Order on Malta was naval, the operation of galleys to restrict Muslim trade was a key focus of the Order. Oarsmen were fundamental to the operation of the Order’s galleys, and slaves made up the largest group of oarsmen. The proportion of slaves on the Order’s galleys only increased during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as did the number of galleys the Order operated further increase the demand for slaves. To obtain slaves the Order
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406 Testa, Romegas, p. 22; Vertot, The history of the Knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem, styled afterwards the Knights of Rhodes and at present, the Knights of Malta, Volume 4, p. 102; Pierre De Bourdeille de Brantôme, ‘Mémoires’, In Collection Universelle des Mémoires Particuliers Relatifs à l’Histoire de France, Volume 67,(Imprimerie et fonderie D’ Orizet, 1806), p. 95 ‘Mais pour tout cela, il ne perdit pas courage, comme j’ay ouy raconteur a monsieur Parisot, grand maistre de Malthe, qui, le voyant un jour ainsi a la Cadene, avant qu’il fust grand maistre, et luy aussi qui l’avoit veu ainsi auparavant a la Cadene; monsieur le grandmaistre luy dit: Segnor Dragut, usance de Guerra! Il luy respondist: Y mudanca de fortuna’
407 Testa, Romegas, p. 23; Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano, volume 3, p. 258.
409 Frelle and Dolores, Padre Ottomano and Malta; A Story of the 1001 Nights, p. 1.
410 Gauci, In the name of the Prince Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798, p. 76.
411 Muscat, Sails Round Malta, p. 31.
undertook slave raids and the Order engaged in wider slaving networks, purchased slaves from abroad, additionally the Order’s slave-raiding produced slaves that were sold abroad.412

Serving alongside the slaves were the Buonavoglia and the Forzati, these were often Christian Europeans and the Forzati for the most part were treated as slaves especially those with life sentences.413 Although in some cases Forzati and Buonavoglia could send slaves to serve in their place; this is similar to the system of substitution that operated on Rhodes with the Servitudo Marina. Despite the similarities in conditions and activity there was still a hierarchy based on which task each oarsman performed and which group they belonged to; these differences were physically apparent from the different distinguishing marks, the Buonavoglia’s moustache, the slave’s tufts of hair. This chapter has identified the complex situation the Order’s oarsmen found themselves and the different means by which the Order encouraged divisions between the different groups as a means of control.

The Order’s use of slaves and forced labour on galleys at times exceeded that of other naval powers in the Mediterranean; the Order’s benches were manned by proportionately more slaves than Italian or Venetian benches.414 The Order was purchasing Forzati from abroad to man the rowing benches before the first use of convicts on Venetian galleys in 1542.415 Regardless, much of the existing historiography has been framed in such a way as to distance the Order from the violence and slave-raiding it was involved in. This chapter has sought to identify the flaws in these arguments and counter them. These arguments are multifaceted presenting flawed interpretations that are counter to what is outlined in the primary sources. This is either the result of a failure to engage with the sources, or a lingering bias within the discourse, such as the arguments focusing on profit to distance the Order from corsairs and slave-raiding, despite being involved in very similar activities.416 These flawed interpretations are widespread and given the limited focus on Hospitaller slavery within the Hospitaller discourse these interpretations continue to be repeated, stagnating the discourse. For example, the argument that the conditions and treatment of the Order’s slaves were


413 Muscat, *Sails Round Malta*, p. 61 Aom 1759 f30, Dal Pozzo 1 p.477


416 Muscat and Agius, ‘Slaves on Land and Sea’, p. 378. ‘…how slaves were treated on board the Order’s galley is difficult to judge owing to the paucity of primary sources.’
better than that of other slaves. The Order’s system of galley slavery was comparable to other contemporary examples and has parallels with New World examples.
Part 2, On Land

Chapter 4, Urban slavery on Malta

This chapter will outline the use of slaves in the urban context of Malta and to a lesser extent Rhodes. Urban slavery appears to have been less common and less documented on Rhodes; a statute of 1357 decreed that no Turkish slave could be kept within the fortified town of Rhodes. Although regulations were put in place on Rhodes that restricted what slaves could sell, which suggests slaves had been involved in trade, likely to a far lesser extent than on Malta. The restrictions placed on the Order’s slaves in Rhodes were similar to those on Malta and addressed similar issues, such as making it easier to identify slaves by having them wear iron rings and restricting their movement to prevent escape. Most of the urban slaves on Malta worked in Valletta, the most significant urban centre for the Order and the location of many of the enterprises operated by the Order that used slaves. Many of the trends identified in the previous chapter regarding the approach to Hospitaller slaveholding in the existing historiography can also be seen in this context, such as arguments that the Order’s slavers were kept in less harsh conditions than other slaves. Additional there is often a focus on the activities of the Order that downplays or ignores the significance of slaves. There have been some more recent works that have more clearly outlined the importance of slavery to the Order, this chapter will build on those works and highlight the prominence of slaves and their role in the Urban context. Much of the existing research on urban slavery in Malta focuses on the more well-documented eighteenth century; this chapter will highlight evidence for earlier examples of urban slavery in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.
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1 AOM 69 Folio 21, ‘Item pro euitandis scandalis et periculis, que in nostro castro possent evenire et per consequens toti terre, Statutum est, ne fratrum Conuentus ullus teneat nec tenere debeat in seruicio suo inantea sclauum turcum illi uero qui eos presentialiter tenant infra sex menses ipsos aliqualiter a se abicere teneantur, Nec interea illos cum eorum equis quesitum paleam seu herbam extra debeant destinare saluo tamen et retentor quod in unquaque albergia pro eius seruicio possit haberi unus.’, transcribed in Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes 1306’, p. 86.
2 NLM Libr ms 153 Folio 101, discussed in Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 418.
4 Spiteri, Fortresses of the Knights, p. 53.
5 Palmer, ‘Slavery, captivity and galley rowing in early modern Malta’, p. 4.
6 The study of Urban slavery in Malta has been based heavily on the work of Wettinger, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, Examples of works that made use of Wettinger include Gaetano del Rosso,
This chapter will start by addressing the difficulties in estimating the number of slaves on Malta. Secondly, the variety of tasks undertaken by slaves separate from the Order will be outlined, such as the involvement of slaves in witchcraft. The use of slaves by the Order specifically will then be discussed: the construction of fortifications was of particular significance although it is evident that the Order’s slaves were not only used for menial labour, as some slaves were skilled craftsmen. Finally, there will be a discussion of the restrictions placed on the Order’s slaves; some of these restrictions were implemented as a result of escape attempts while others were a means of alleviating concerns that the slaves were a corrupting influence on the people of Malta.

Number of Slaves
Slaves were part of the fabric of Malta, and visitors to the island wrote about them. More recently, Malta has been compared to the pirate cities of North Africa. Similar to the discussion of the Servitudo Marina, an understanding of how many slaves the Order held and what proportion of the population were slaves is important to understanding the impact on the society of Malta. The labour provided by urban slaves was key to the function of the Order’s activities. In Wettinger’s words: ‘Most of the government departments or institutions, such as the bakery, hospital, dockyard, even the Grand Master’s palace and the armoury also depended to a greater or lesser extent on slave labour.’ Although the number of slaves on Malta is difficult to assess; few of the available estimates cover the entire enslaved population and even estimates from similar dates can provide drastically different numbers.

Joseph Muscat estimates that the population of Malta in 1530 at 20,000 this is in line with Russell Palmer’s estimate of 22,000 for 1535. One of the reasons why it is difficult to get a precise estimate is that the number of slaves on Malta could fluctuate rapidly. In 1531 the Order captured 800 women from Modon, this single influx of slaves represented approximately around 4% of the island’s population. This was in addition to the other slaves the Order already held, the Order had arrived on Malta with 3 galleys which would have used slaves as oarsmen. Wettinger estimates

---

7 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 621.
9 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 295.
10 Muscat, Sails Round Malta, p.63; Palmer, Captives, colonists and craftspeople, Kindle edition, location 650.
11 Vertot, History of the knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem styled afterwards the knights of Rhodos and at present the knights of Malta, Volume 4, p. 12 ‘There is no expressing the riches they carried off out of this city; but that which gave the inhabitants still greater pain, was their transporting on board their galleys or ships, upwards of 800 married women and maidens, whom they made prisoners and slaves.’; ‘Chiamavasi l’una
that between 1557 and 1568 in 22 voyages the private vessels of the Grand Master captured 2,833 slaves.\textsuperscript{12} Again, many of these slaves would have been sold, which complicates the issues of estimating the stable slave population whose labour was required by the Order.

Francisco Balbi di Correggio reported that the Order had 1,500 slaves prior to the siege of Malta in 1565.\textsuperscript{13} Approximately 500 slaves died during the siege, which may have had a lasting impact on the Order as Wettinger highlights a 1582 report to the Pope that stated there were 600 slaves on the Order’s galleys and 200 in private ownership, a total of 800 slaves.\textsuperscript{14} Carmelo Trasselli estimated the population of Malta in 1590 as 28,864 and the population of slaves as 1,405, almost 5\% of the population of Malta, this is based on the census undertaken in that year by Diego della Quadra for the Viceroy of Sicily.\textsuperscript{15} The majority were galley slaves, with only 620 slaves reported as serving on Malta.\textsuperscript{16} Although Carmel Cassar estimated that ‘In 1590 slaves numbered around 3,000.’\textsuperscript{17} Cassar’s number appears to be based on misreading an article by Trasselli which outlines that the number of slaves and galley crew in 1590 was 2,806 people.\textsuperscript{18} George Sandys visited Malta in 1610 and reported that the Order had more than 1,500 slaves.\textsuperscript{19} Palmer estimated the population of Malta in

---

\textsuperscript{12} Numbers from Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 34, based on Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urbinate Lat 833, Relazione dell’Isola di Malta et Relazione dal primo di Giugeno fino al primo di Dicembre Anno 1568, folios 137-221.

\textsuperscript{13} Correggio, \textit{The siege of Malta 1565}, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{16} In Trasselli’s figures it is clear that certain members of the Order receive a wheat ration for their servants, when calculating the amount of wheat the Order consumed the 620 land slaves are counted separately, Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese del secolo xvi’, pp. 474-80.


\textsuperscript{18}Trasselli outlines the numbers clearly in table E included in the article, the total number of galley crew including slaves was 2186 and the total number of land slaves was 620, together this is a total of 2806 of which only 620 are land slaves and 785 are galley slaves, Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese del secolo xvi’, pp. 474-80.

\textsuperscript{19} George Sandys, \textit{Sandys Travels: Containing an History of the Original and Present State of the Turkish Empire: Their Laws, Government, Policy, Military Force, Courts of Justice, and Commerce. The Mahometan Religion and Ceremonies: a Description of Constantinople, the Grand Signior’s Seraglio, and His Manner of Living: Also, of Greece, with the Religion and Customs of the Grecians. Of AEgypt; the Antiquity, Hieroglyphicks, Rites, Customs, Discipline, and Religion of the AEgyptians. A Voyage on the River Nylus: of Armenia, Grand Cairo, Rhodes, the Pyramids, Colosuss; the Former Flourishing and Present State of Alexandria. A Description of the Holy-Land; of the Jews, and Several Sects of Christians Living There; of Jerusalem, Sepulchre of Christ,
1614 at 38,429, thus slaves would have made up about 4% of the population, this is in line with the estimates of Salvatore Bono.\textsuperscript{20}

Estimates for the seventeenth century vary considerably, Frans Ciappara provides a number of 3,000 slaves in 1630.\textsuperscript{21} An estimate provided by the Order in 1632 states that the population was 55,541 of which there were 1,284 galley slaves and 649 privately owned slaves, approximately 3.5%.\textsuperscript{22} In 1664, Philip Skippon estimated there were some 2,000 slaves who belonged to the Order and some 200 owned privately.\textsuperscript{23} The difference in the number of privately owned slaves might be an issue of classification, as it is not clear whether domestic slaves used by individual members of the Order were classed as privately owned. These discrepancies can be attributed to a range of factors such as the variable size of the Order’s slave population, issues with the accuracy of these estimates from visitors to Malta and a lack of official estimates from the Order. Overall this can make it difficult to judge the significance of slaves to the Order. Both Bosio and Dal Pozzo outlined that large numbers of captives were being brought to Malta by the Order, although neither provided numbers for the slaves captured by Corsairs. Peter Earle and Godfrey Wettinger both note that there is a surviving, although incomplete, register of slaves captured by the Order from the years 1659 to 1661 which records 500 slaves being brought to Malta.\textsuperscript{24} In 1685 after the fall of the Greek town of Coron, more than 500 slaves were brought to Malta according to Dal Pozzo. 25 Many of these slaves would likely have been ransomed but before their ransom many would have been slaves on the Order’s galleys and others would have worked for the Order in Valletta. Corsairs and merchants would bring slaves

\textit{Temple of Solomon; and what Else Either of Antiquity, Or Worth Observation. Lastly, Italy Described, and the Islands Adjoining ; as Cyprus, Crete, Malta, Sicilia, the Æolian Islands ; of Rome, Venice, Naples, Syracusa, Mesena, Ætna, Scylla, and Charybdis ; and Other Places of Note,} (Printed for J. Williams Junior, 1673), p. 183, ‘…they having at this instant above fifteen hundred of them…’

\textsuperscript{20} Palmer, Captives, colonists and craftspeople, kindle edition, location 656; ‘…1 500 erano agli inizi del Seicento, oltre il 4 per cento della popolazione.’, Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitu e commercio, p. 194.

\textsuperscript{21} Ciappara, ‘Christians and Muslims on Malta in the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries’, pp. 204-215.

\textsuperscript{22} Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 33, referring to NLM, Libr ms 162, folio 127rv, the information is provided in more detail in table 17 on p. 344 of the same text; Fontenay, Michel, Maria Flavia Marzialetti, and Benedetta Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).’, Quaderni Storici 36, no. 107 (2) (2001), pp. 391–413. 395

\textsuperscript{23} Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, p. 621.

\textsuperscript{24} This register is referred to as the Tribunale degli Armamenti by Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 168; Wettinger refers to this register as the Tribunal Armamentorum, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{25} Wettinger, ‘Coron Captives in Malta, An Episode in the History of Slave-dealing’, pp. 216-223; Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 2, p. 573-574 ‘Il numero degli Schiavi rivelati ascese a 1336., de quali secondo la conventione fatta in Roma tra l’Pontefice, e l’Inviat di della Republica Lando, ne fu fatto un giusto ripartimento tra la Republica, e gli Ausiliari, e ne toccò alla Religione la quarta, parte, cioè 334 , del qual numero il terzo se ne contribui a i Pontifici. Però a Malta ne pervennero poi con le Galere, e con altri Bastimenti di più di 500., & il Tesoro per sentenza della Camera de’ Conti li confiscò a tutti quelli, che non potero giustificare d’haverli comprati dopo fatto il publico ripartimento.’
to Malta entirely separate from those of the Order and sell those slaves in Malta. The number of
slaves appears to have been increasing in the seventeenth century as the Order had to construct
additional housing, these slave prisons or *bagnos* were also built around the same time in Livorno
and unlike North African *bagnos* were a single structure.26 Skippon described the slave prison in
Valletta in 1663, ‘...a fair square building, cloister’d round, where most of the slaves in Malta are
oblig’d to lodge every night.’27 Within these buildings Christians and Muslims, slaves and convicts
lived together, further highlighting how these statuses were conflated.28 The conditions within the
slave prisons and how they restricted slaves will be discussed in more detail within this chapter. This
increase in the number of slaves on Malta appears to have continued into the eighteenth century, as
in 1716 Giacomo Capello details that there were 6,000 slaves on Malta.29 The number of slaves
appears then to have decreased during the eighteenth century and by 1749 the Order was reported
to have had about 4,000 slaves.30 This decrease continued and Napoleon found 2,000 slaves on
Malta in 1798.31 While the number of slaves as a proportion of the population of Malta was
relatively small the vast majority of these were in the ports of Valletta.32 Michel Fontenay, Maria
Marzialetti, and Benedetta Borello have estimated the population of Valletta in 1632 as 22,000
approximately 8000 adult males, meaning that one in four adult males was a slave.33 Additionally, it
is worth noting that the number of Hospitaller Brothers living on Malta was also very limited,
approximately 600, as such there were far more slaves on Malta.34

Slaves working for themselves

Slaves on Malta performed a variety of tasks such as shoemaking, sail-making, selling goods such as
water and meat, slaves engaged in trade throughout the Order’s time on Malta. That slaves were

26 Palmer, ‘Slavery, captivity and galley rowing in early modern Malta’, pp. 1-18; Nadalo, ‘Negotiating Slavery in
a Tolerant Frontier’, pp. 275-324; Mossensohn, ‘Medical Treatment in the Ottoman Navy in the Early Modern
Period’, pp. 542-568.
27 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 620.
28 Nadalo, ‘Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier’, p. 291
29 Giacomo Capello, Decrittione di Malta Anno 1716, A Venetian Account Edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes,
(Bugelli Publications, 1988), p. 56 ‘Vei ne saranno nell'isola circa 6 mila; sono impiegati in ogni funzione di
fattica; alle fortificationi, agli arsenali, alle megazzeni, alle galere.’
30 Thornton, Memoir on the finances of Malta, p. 51.
31 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 585.
32 Colombo, ‘La Setta Malvaggia Dell'alconaro, Emmanuelle Sanz, S.J. (1646-1719) e il breve trattato per
convertire i turchi’, p.468
33 Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni
(1530-1798).’, p. 395, ‘Icirca 2.000 schiavi pubblici e privati presenti sull'isola nel 1632 erano quasi tutti
concentrati nell'agglomerato portuale, che riuniva circa 22.000 abitanti a de Valetta, Vittoriosa, Senglea e
Bormula. Se toglia- mo da questa cifra le 3,700 persone censite come appartenenti al «Con- vento» e alle
galere, più altre 300 per una stima (arbitraria, lo ammet- to, ma molto verosimile) del pleitrico clero maltese,
rimangono 18.000 anime per la popolazione civile, cioè circa 4.000 adulti di sesso maschi- le. Ciò
significherebbe che dei circa 8.000 uomini (maltesi, cavalieri e schiavi) che potevano passeggiare, verso il 1630,
sulle banchine del porto di Malta, liberamente o con i ferri ai piedi, uno su quattro era uno schiavo.’
34 Palmer, Captives, colonists and craftspeople, kindle edition, location 855.
able to sell goods as individuals is not surprising and occurred similarly in Spain and Italy.\textsuperscript{35} The details of how the system operated and what jobs slaves performed are unclear, although from the documents it is possible to identify some specific tasks they performed. Slaves appear to have been involved in usury, as in 1598 Brother Manule de Couros of the Priory of Portugal obtained permission to establish a fund to suppress usury which was practised by slaves and Jews.\textsuperscript{36} It is not clear to what extent the Order’s slaves engaged in earning a living individually. Most of the Order’s slaves had assigned work; a decree of 1650 allowed under-employed slaves of the Order to earn their living on the streets as done by privately owned slaves.\textsuperscript{37} Such work had been previously banned to the Order’s slaves in 1631 and again in 1648, although Wettinger questions the effectiveness of those bans stating, ‘..the prohibitions remained largely ineffective, and that the practice continued to exist among the privately and the publicly owned slaves ...’\textsuperscript{38}

Trade took place with the slave prisons; while visiting Malta in 1663 Skippon describes several trades taking place including barbers and tailors.\textsuperscript{39} This is an interesting example of the overlap between freedom and control, the prisons themselves were meant to separate slaves and convicts from the rest of Maltese society and restrict their freedom, but within these buildings, the slaves were able to express their agency and engage in trade. In 1740 a slave asked to be transferred from the prison at Vittoriosa to Valletta to be a barber.\textsuperscript{40} In 1671 Domenico Magri observed that the coffee brewed in the slave prisons was very popular with the knights and other persons of quality.\textsuperscript{41} The coffee industry on Malta developed ahead of the rest of Europe, brought to Malta by slaves and able to thrive within the slave prisons.\textsuperscript{42} Nathaniel Cutajar and Mevrick Spiteri have identified Ottoman coffee cups found in the inquisitor’s palace and items for coffee preparation found on a palace


\textsuperscript{37} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 411, references AOM 258 folio 227.

\textsuperscript{38} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 412, references AOM 296 fol 165v (1631 ban), AOM 116 folio 177v (1648 ban).


\textsuperscript{40} Earle, \textit{Corsairs of Malta and Barbary}, p. 176, references AOM 650 folio 132.

\textsuperscript{41} Domenico Magri, \textit{Virtu del kafe}, (Per Michele Hercole, 1671), p. 3, ‘li Caualieri dunque, & altre persone qualificate ogni mattina fi trasferiscono al Bagno dellii schiaui per gustare quel decotto nelle officine publiche, o vero lo manipolano nelle proprie cafe per afficurarfi meglio della sincerita dell ingrediente non fallificato’; Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 543.

inventory from 1798.43 This is a clear example of slaves impacting their captor’s society, through their interactions with those who engaged their services.44

It can be difficult to identify the activities that slaves were able to engage in, by reading against the grain the tasks slaves were banned from provides some insight into the types of tasks slaves undertook before such bans. Wettinger highlights that in 1537 slaves were forbidden from selling cloth, leather, ironware, vegetables, and fruit under the penalty of 25 strokes of the lash which, as Wettinger notes, was identical to the provision issued by the Order in Rhodes in 1509.45 That the same restrictions needed to be issued twice suggests that the bans were not always effective. In 1574 the sale of various types of animal meat and eggs by slaves was prohibited.46 The regulation of the slave’s activities outlined by the Order following the slave revolt of 1596 specifically outlined that slaves could sell goods only in the main square of Valletta, they were banned from renting rooms and were forbidden from selling food, drink or high-cost goods, to avoid the numerous thefts and inconveniences that resulted from the trade.47 It seems likely that before this the slaves had more freedom to engage in trade and did sell food and drink. The ban on selling high-cost goods to avoid theft suggests the slaves were stealing goods to sell, possibly this was a means to fund their ransom. That the trade had to be banned, rather than individual slaves punished suggests that these thefts were numerous and highlights the discontentment of slaves, they made use of their freedom to trade as a means to resist the controls of the society which enslaved them.48 Alex Lichtenstein while examining theft conducted by slaves in the antebellum South identifies the practice of theft as ‘...a crucial pressure point of class-conflict which threatened the slaveowners' hegemony in the ideological and economic spheres...’49 Although in those cases, the theft was often food to supplement the slave’s rations rather than high-cost goods. This difference could be related to setting, high-value goods would have been easier to locate, steal and sell in Valletta than on a plantation. Especially with regard to selling the items, food stolen to be consumed does not require a buyer. In South Carolina, a statute passed in 1740 prohibited slaves from buying and selling goods in Charleston without express permission from their master restricting their economic activities in

45 Provision issued on Rhodes in 1509, NLM Lib ms 153 folio 101, discussed in Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 418.
46 Rosso, ‘Slaves, corsairs and the Order of Malta in the 16th-17th centuries’, p. 101; Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, pp. 418-424.
49 Lichtenstein, ‘That Disposition to Theft, with Which They Have Been Branded’, p. 415.
very similar ways to the controls implemented by the Order.\textsuperscript{50} It is unclear how significant the slaves' trade activities were. Slaves would have lacked storage space as they were unable to rent rooms.\textsuperscript{51} Bono links these restrictions to shopkeepers complaining of the competition caused by slaves although his evidence is not related to Malta specifically but Genoa and Naples.\textsuperscript{52} Overall it is clear that in the seventeenth century the Order's slaves participated in selling goods and earning a living separate from the Order.

In 1574 Sabbato Hebreo Phisico, a freed slave was granted a certificate as a doctor.\textsuperscript{53} He may have provided medical care while he had been a slave, although most cases of slaves providing remedies tended to be based on superstition. Muslim slaves on Malta were sometimes credited with magical powers and were thus thought able to fight disease and curses such as the ‘evil eye’.\textsuperscript{54} This is not surprising as slaves because of their status as outsiders have been connected to having magical powers in a range of different contexts including the New World.\textsuperscript{55} Alexander Bonnici links the large number of Muslim slaves brought to Malta to the prominence of superstitious beliefs: ‘While the capture of slaves somewhat helped to mitigate the extreme poverty of the island, it became harmful to the people’s spiritual welfare because the slaves communicated to the Maltese their magic beliefs and practices. Consequently, Malta overflowed with superstitions, scripts, mixtures and philtres.’\textsuperscript{56} This set up by Bonnici presents the spreading of superstitions as a negative effect of using slaves to mitigate poverty, this approach implies that the poverty of the slaves does not matter. Bonnici does acknowledge that in most cases the Maltese themselves sought out Muslim slaves for magical cures rather than slaves promoting their own beliefs.\textsuperscript{57} This highlights the impact the slaves could have on the society that enslaved them, much like the increased popularity of coffee as a result of the presence of Muslim slaves.

Frans Ciappara argues that the restrictions placed on slaves were due to fears of their corrupting influence, concluding ‘The church and the Hospitaller government, therefore, circumscribed slaves’ lives so as not to contaminate Christians with their beliefs and so that error did not creep into the

\textsuperscript{50} Lichtenstein, ‘That Disposition to Theft, with Which They Have Been Branded’, p. 429.
\textsuperscript{51} Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 176.
\textsuperscript{52} Bono, Schiavi Una storia mediterranea, pp. 162-164 ‘Negoziianti e osti cominciarono però a protestare per la concorrenza che subivano e le autorità disposeero alcune limitazioni e proibizioni...’
\textsuperscript{53} AOM 435 folio 245v, also discussed in Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 332.
\textsuperscript{54} Alexander Bonnici, ‘Superstitions in Malta, Towards the Middle of the Seventeenth Century in the light of the inquisition Trials’, Melita Historica, 4(1966)3, p. 147-149; Emanuel Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, the Hospitaller knights of Malta 1580-1700, (Continuum, 2011), p. 170.
\textsuperscript{56} Bonnici, ‘Superstitions in Malta’, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{57} Bonnici, ‘Superstitions in Malta’, p. 156.
ways of Christian society.’ 58 This was not a situation unique to Malta; in Valencia, there were attempts to separate the Christians from the Muslim Mudejars. 59 The slave prisons on Malta can be seen as a means of physically containing the slaves and their influence. The Inquisition appears to have been particularly interested in investigating superstition involving slaves and free Christians; most of the surviving evidence is from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. 60 Emanuel Buttigieg notes that in 1603 the Inquisition investigated the use of love magic by Brother Vincenzo lo Monte to make a Christian slave named Francesca love him. 61 Between 1646 and 1649 while Anthony Pignatelli was Inquisitor there were 46 cases dealing with superstition; of those cases 20 of the accused were counselled by slaves. Typically the slave would provide magical words or potions to gain another’s affection or ward off the evil eye. 62 In 1647 Pauline Hagius concerned for the health of her daughter sought out a cure for the evil eye in the slave prison of Valletta; an elderly slave agreed to help her, came to her house and performed a ritual over the girl. 63 Clearly, free people could enter the slave prison and interact with the slaves; this is not surprising since this allowed private persons to hire slaves or engage with them in trade. That a Christian woman was able to enter the slave prison and then arrange for a slave to visit her house is notable, but this situation was a concern for the Inquisition that later investigated these events. In 1648 an 81-year-old slave named Chag Hali who worked on the fortifications was questioned by the Inquisition regarding spreading superstitious remedies among Christian women. 64 Magical healing was unlikely to employ many slaves, although was a way for elderly slaves to make a living. Many of the occupations available to slaves were physically demanding which made it difficult for elderly slaves to find work, it seems that magic was a potential means to generate additional income. Elderly women were more often associated with magical healing across Europe, possibly for similar reasons. 65

Federico Borromeo, Inquisitor in Malta from 1653 to 1654, dealt with 6 cases where Muslim slaves attempted to corrupt people, selling spells and other superstitions; there appears to have been a mix of privately owned slaves and those owned by the Order, additionally it is noted that some had

58 Ciappara, ‘The date palm and the olive tree; safeguarding the catholic frontier in Malta 1595-1605’, p. 268.
61 Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 153, references A.I.M C.P. vol 169 case 81 ff 1-2, 30 March 1603.
63 Bonnici, ‘Superstitions in Malta’, p. 150.
64 A.I.M, Processi, MS. 61, N. 94, folios 440-441 reproduced in Bonnici, ‘Superstitions in Malta’, p. 175 ‘io mi chiamo Chag Hali, detto Chang Chut, figlio del quondam Chatset da Damiata, sono d’anni 81, mahomettano schiavo della religione e travaglio nelle nuove fortificazioni’
65 Cassar, Witchcraft, Sorcery and the inquisition, p. 33
to be taken from the galleys and private ships and delivered to the Inquisitor.\textsuperscript{66} The number of slaves involved in magic was no doubt small, although this highlights the perception of slaves as different, magical, outsiders additionally there was a demand for these services from the population and despite the Inquisition’s attempts to punish those involved these interactions persisted.

Urban use of Slaves by the Order
Many of the Order’s slaves were involved in tasks on land for the Order. Construction was a key aspect of the Order’s use of slaves, Yvonne Friedman notes that the Order used forced labour for construction even before the fall of Acre in 1291.\textsuperscript{67} This continued on Rhodes as Felix Faber noted the use of Turks in iron fetters to rebuild the city when he visited the island following the 1480 siege.\textsuperscript{68} Giacomo Bosio reports that in 1516 the Order made use of slaves both those owned by the Order and those privately owned to construct fortifications on Rhodes.\textsuperscript{69} In preparation for the 1522 siege of Rhodes, the Order had slaves preparing defences and fortifications.\textsuperscript{70} During the siege slaves were sent to repair the fortifications; when some of the slaves hesitated due to the danger they faced the Grand Master ordered them to be hanged and others to have their ears cut off as a means of encouragement.\textsuperscript{71} This example highlights the brutality with which the Order would respond when slaves resisted. The conditions were similar during the siege of Malta in 1565: the Order’s slaves were ordered to work in exposed positions and when the slaves refused their ears were cut

\textsuperscript{66} Federico Borromedio, ‘Relazione di Malta e suo Inquisitorato del Cardinale Federico Borromeo’, in Malta Letteria, 02 (1927)6, p. 189 ‘Le cause pero che riguardano piu frequentemente il Tribunale si riducono a sei casi perche o souo d’infedeli che fatti schiavi vanno per la Citta sotto pretesto di vendere mercanzie capaci del loro miserabile stato, disseminando presso le donne e persone semplici, superstizioni, incantesimi, rimedi per amare e altre simili vanita; o sono di persone che cadute al laccio di questi perversi hanno concorso nel crederle ed esperimenterarle ed insegnarle ad altri; ovvero sono di rinngadati distinti in due sorta, l’una di quelli che volontariamente compariscono, l’altra di quelli che o pigliati dalle Galere o Vascelli corsari si consegnano all’Inquisitore, o che ripatriando sorto nomi e abiti mentiti vengono denunciati, nel che si come giova molto che il Fiscale o Notaro stiano bene avvisati cosi per quelli presi da Vascelli corsari, che talvolta per essere atti nella fatica, o li nascondo o recusano darli, e necessario ricorrere al Gran Maestro perche faciliti l’obbedienza col suo braccio solito ad ottenerli con esemplar prontezza.’

\textsuperscript{67} Friedman, \textit{Encounter between enemies}, p. 113.


\textsuperscript{69} AOM 82, Folio 191, July 7th 1516, ‘E deputati hauendo sopral’opere delle fortificazioni, i Bagliui di Manoasca, e di Lurei ; ordinò , che tutti gli Schiaui, così de’ Religiosi, come de’ Secolari, alle dette opere lavorar dovessero.’; Luttrell, \textit{The town of Rhodes 1306-1356}, p. 167 ‘...it was cheaper to use slave labour to build walls...’; Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano} volume 2, p. 615.

\textsuperscript{70} Vertot, \textit{The History of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, Volume 3}, p. 167, ‘The slaves of Rhodes, and such as belonged to the private persons, were employed in hollowing the ditches, and in the fortifications.’

\textsuperscript{71} Porter, \textit{A History of the Knights of Malta}, volume 2, p. 272.
A third of the Order’s slaves died during the siege, Muslim slaves worked in exposed positions, Francisco Balbi di Correggio justifies this by suggesting that the Order thought the Ottomans would have been less likely to fire on Muslim slaves. Despite the Sultan’s claim that the invasion of Malta was to free Muslim captives the expectation that the Ottomans would not attack fellow Muslims was unreasonable, if that was the case the Ottomans would not have engaged Hospitaller galleys in combat as many of the oarsmen were enslaved Muslims. It is difficult to ascertain precise figures for casualties during the siege, Correggio estimated that there were 500 Knights of which 250 died. Sire states that ‘...there were perhaps 5,000 dead within the walls including 219 of the knights...’. A greater proportion of slaves died than civilians, Cassar states that 2000 civilians and slaves died, following Correggio’s estimate of 500 slave death, this means that 1500 civilians died. Given that the slaves were not in combat roles that so many died highlights the harsh conditions and danger they faced, Correggio notes that the cloaks of dead slaves were filled to make sandbags to repair the defences, it appears that even in death the Order found uses for its slaves, further highlighting the dehumanisation of the slaves by the Order.

The number of slaves involved in construction varied, during times of threat it would grow considerably; in 1547 the Grand Master recalled all privately-owned slaves to work on Fort St Angelo. This also occurred in 1635 as a result of an invasion scare, in the same year the Council ordered that there should be 300 slaves working on the fortifications of I-Isla and 300 working in the ditches of Valletta. This highlights the Grand Masters’ ability to commandeer privately owned slaves. Wettinger details that some slaves would have been constantly employed in construction which increased to many hundreds during times of danger, but despite this ‘They left little trace of themselves in the surviving records of the order, which were mainly concerned with the high administrative levels dealing with policy and the planning and financing of the fortifications.’ Nevertheless, it is possible to uncover some details from manumission documents and other sources.

---

72 Correggio, The siege of Malta 1565, p. 54.
73 Correggio, The siege of Malta 1565, p. 105.
74 Correggio, The siege of Malta 1565, p. 30
76 Sire, the Knights of Malta, p. 71.
78 Correggio, The siege of Malta 1565, p. 123.
79 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo. p. 297, references AOM 887 Folio 102v.
80 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 299, references AOM 218 folio 176rv, 179v.
81 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 296.
82 AOM 417 Folio 247v, also discussed in Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 297.
on Sundays had existed for some time and was widely enforced both before and after this period and in the New World. Having slaves work on Sundays highlights how the exploitation of slave labour overruled the Order’s Christian identity. In 1543 it appears that the Order’s architect Nicolo Flavari was involved in teaching the Order’s slaves construction skills. A slave that served Nicolo Flavari and was freed in 1547 after several years of service. The Order’s slaves that were skilled in construction were sometimes required to pass on those skills as part of their manumission. In 1588 two stone masons, Ali Achamet Ogli and Mostafa Algi Ogli Ataglieli were freed on the condition that they each serve for another 6 years and train additional slaves in their craft. The requirement to train other slaves in their skills highlights that the Order was ensuring that those skills were still available within the enslaved workforce after these men were freed. Additionally, the Order does not appear to have considered the social standing of those slaves assigned to construction, as the judge Mustafa Efendi while enslaved by the Order from 1597 to 1599 worked digging a moat and carrying stone for construction. Bono notes that in 1704 the enslaved Tunisian Rais Morat wrote in a letter that he was labouring from morning to evening moving earth and stone with his feet chained.

After the 1565 siege of Malta, all available labour was needed for the construction of Valletta: Bosio states that 8,000 people were involved in the construction of Valletta in 1566 although these would not have all been slaves, as the Order had large numbers of stone cutters, masons and craftsmen

---


84 AOM 419 folio 212v published in V. Bonello, ‘Primo Architetto dell’Irdine a Malta’, *Melita Historica*, vol 1, No. 1 pp 3-6. ‘llì ha fatto imparare a multi schiavi de V.ill.ma et R.ma S.ia l’arte del muratore et per face li camini, cisterne et ogni altra cosa di boni masestri’

85 AOM 420, Folio 100 ‘schiavo e servo per piu anni di maestro Nicolo Flavari, prothomaestro dell’architettura nostra’; V. Bonello, ‘Primo Architetto dell’Irdine a Malta’, *Melita Historica*, vol 1, No. 1 pp. 3-6 ‘nel 1547, il flavari libera uno schiavo. il possedere uno schiavo e gia un insizio sufficente de posizione sociale molto al di sopra del semplice muratore come oggi lo intendiamo’

86 AOM 444, Folio 246v ‘servus nostra religiosis artem fabei cementarii docere tenearis & obligatus’, ‘nec alici modo quibus sex annis elapsis et decursis et dictis duobus servus in dicta artem faberi cementarii.’; AOM 444 Folio 246v-247 ‘sex annurus aliquem servum dictae nostrae religiosis Artem tuam vulgo dictam pirriatoris docere tenearis et obligarus’


brought over from Sicily.\textsuperscript{89} This number has been disputed, Wettinger suggested 4,000 workers.\textsuperscript{90} Wettinger based his number on a petition from the clerk Antonio Pellegrino from 1587 who refers to 4000 workers having been involved in the construction of Valletta. Stephen Spiteri notes that Francesco Laparelli who designed Valletta estimated that 4000 labourers would be needed.\textsuperscript{91} Regardless there is no clear estimate of how many slaves were involved. It was a vast undertaking that stretched the Order’s resources, in 1567 Romegas sacked the town of Zuaga to obtain slaves to work on the fortifications of Valletta.\textsuperscript{92} In the same year, the galleys were kept in Malta over winter instead of going to Sicily so that their crews, which would have been mostly enslaved oarsmen, could be employed in construction.\textsuperscript{93} Despite this Spiteri makes no mention of slaves being involved in the construction, that his work does not address the impact of slaves is surprising when it goes to such detail regarding building materials and techniques.\textsuperscript{94} This lack of engagement with the use of slave labour highlights how easily slaves can be overlooked within the discourse and results in a view of Hospitaller Malta where slavery is absent. In contrast, Whitworth Porter emphasizes the importance of slaves to the construction of Valletta: ‘The ramparts of that city [Valletta] have been reared amidst the anguish and toil of countless thousands, torn from their homes and their country, and condemned to drag out the remainder of their miserable existence as mere beasts of burden, labouring to rear those bulwarks which were to be employed against themselves and their country’.\textsuperscript{95} More recently Joseph Muscat also highlighted the role slaves played in the construction of Malta’s fortifications, ‘Looking at the massive fortifications round Malta, one is bound to recall the great efforts of those slaves caught at sea or elsewhere and who were used to build them.’\textsuperscript{96}

Compared with the hundreds of slaves involved in construction the Order’s other uses of slaves were relatively small scale. Slaves could be found even in the most sensitive areas, despite the obvious security concerns slaves were assigned to the armoury, Wettinger has discussed the use of slaves in the armoury in detail. In 1648 four slaves worked in the armoury, but this number grew and included

\textsuperscript{89} ‘Talmente, che gli Artefici, gli Operarij, & i Guastatori, erano già cresciuti in tanto numero,che non meno d’otto mila persone, intorno alla fronte della nuova Città, ordinariamente lauorauano.’ ; ‘Capitani Pietro Greco, e Vito Lamea; i quali due Capitani,erano stati deputati dal medesimo Vicerè di Sicilia Don García di Toledo, con sue patenti, e con grande autorità di poter mandarà Malta qual si voglia Muratore, Tagliator di pietre, & altri simili Artefici,’ Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano} volume 3, p. 781.
\textsuperscript{90} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 298 Wettinger bases his number on AOM 443 Folio 98, A petition from the clerk Antonio Pellegrino from 1587 who refers to 4000 workers having been involved in the construction of Valletta.
\textsuperscript{91} Spiteri, \textit{Fortresses of the Knights}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{92} Testa, \textit{Romegas}, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{93} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 298, references AOM 431 folio 268.
\textsuperscript{94} Spiteri, \textit{Fortresses of the Knights}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{95} Porter, \textit{A History of the Knights of Malta}, volume 2, p. 276.
\textsuperscript{96} Muscat, \textit{Slaves on Maltese Galleys}, p. 1.
both skilled and unskilled labour. In 1669 woollen cloth was given to those slaves in the armoury who were master craftsmen. After the 1749 slave conspiracy the slaves in the armoury were replaced by free labourers; 13 slaves were replaced by four free workers. Wettinger comments that ‘It is interesting to find that it was believed that the work of the whole thirteen of them could be done by four Maltese workers...’ Wettinger may be implying that paid Maltese workers were more efficient, although this ignores the situation the reduction in the number of slaves is due to security concerns, not efficiency. Additionally, this reduction in the number of workers was short-lived, as only 7 years later the Order again made use of forced labour in the armoury and brought in convicts to clean it.

Slaves were also employed in the Order’s hospital on Rhodes and Malta, a further point of overlap between the Order’s mission and the use of slave labour. In 1414 a Hungarian slave named Helena was freed in recognition of her services in the hospital on Rhodes. A tartar named George was freed in 1453 in recognition of his service to both the late Brother Bernard de Rochabruna and the hospital. The Order employed 10 slaves in the Sacred Infirmary in 1588 and by 1648 this had increased to 29 slaves and 10 convicts. Skippon notes slaves working in the hospital in 1663, he states ‘One morning we saw two slaves bring a bier into the middle of the hospital-room whereon stood the several dishes of meat etc.’ The regulations of the hospital from 1725 detail that 44 slaves work in the hospital. The use of slave labour was not only pervasive but also increasing during the Order’s time on Malta. This also suggests a level of trust, the Order allowed slaves to care for them while injured. Additionally, this further highlights the widespread use of slaves by the Order, even the Order’s mission of caring for the sick was being performed by slaves.

97 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 310, references AOM 116 folio 177, AOM 645 folio 35.
98 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 310, references AOM 116 folio 177, AOM 645 folio 35.
99 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 301
100 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 310, references AOM 6393 folio 51, AOM 651 folio 190-1, AOM 6652, folio 148v.
101 AOM 339, folio 295, summary in Luttrell, Slavery at Rhodes, p. 98, document 42.
104 Skippon, ‘an account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 620.
105 The regulations of the old hospital of the knights of St John at Valetta, from a copy printed at Rome and preserved in the archives of Malta, with a translation introduction and notes by W.K. Riland Bedford, (William blackwood and sons, 1882), p. 7.
Supporting the Order’s galleys created additional industries, Bosio references slaves involved in cotton manufacture for the sails of galleys in 1545.\textsuperscript{106} Pietro della Calibia set up the Order’s cotton factory, the slaves assigned to this labour were mostly women, children and old men, those not suitable for rowing or more physical occupations.\textsuperscript{107} Two sixteenth century manumissions refer to weavers, the first granted in March 1565 to Machamet Ben Amor on the condition of ten years additional service.\textsuperscript{108} The second was unconditional in 1568 to Ali Ben Ahmet of Bone who had served the Order for ten years ‘…in dicta arte textrina’.\textsuperscript{109} This industry is however poorly documented: Wettinger outlines the eighteenth century evidence for the use of slaves in the manufacture of cloth, here he concludes that many of the slaves were young and the Order used orphaned children ‘…an almost exact parallel in Malta to the use of charity boys in the cotton mills of contemporary England.’\textsuperscript{110} Although the cotton mills of England were not staffed by slaves, an 1832 report on the finances of Malta at the end of the seventeenth century suggests that the production of cotton sails occurred within the slaves’ prisons.\textsuperscript{111}

Several slaves worked in the smithy; in 1548 Romadano was freed having served the Order for twenty years ‘In arte ferrarius’.\textsuperscript{112} Romadano must have been obtained by the Order after the fall of Rhodes and come with the Order to Malta. The smithy slaves were also expected to train their replacements as part of gaining their freedom, similar to other skilled slave labourers; in 1568 Erecil Caradenis was freed on the condition of 4 years additional service and required to train another slave.\textsuperscript{113} In 1648 it is reported that 20 slaves served in the smithy, in 1669 four of the smithy slaves received better cloth as a result of their status as master-craftsmen.\textsuperscript{114}

Slaves worked in the Order’s bakery: a manumission of 1539 freed Solimano who had served the Grand Masters L’Isle Adam and Del Ponte, and was involved ‘…in conficiendo pane’, he was required to serve for another six years.\textsuperscript{115} Philippe Villers de L’Isle Adam was Grand Master from 1521-1534, as such it seems likely that Solimano was one of the slaves who accompanied the Order to Malta and

\textsuperscript{107} Muscat, \textit{Sails Round Malta}, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{108} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 314 references AOM 430 Folio 256rv.
\textsuperscript{109} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 314 references AOM 432 Folio 242.
\textsuperscript{110} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 317.
\textsuperscript{111} Thornton, \textit{Memoir on the finances of Malta}, p.19 ‘…other slaves were confined in prisons destined for them, wherein some were employed in making cotton sailcloth…’
\textsuperscript{112} AOM 421 Folio 219rv, also discussed in Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 311.
\textsuperscript{113} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 311, references AOM 431 Folio 44v.
\textsuperscript{114} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 311, references AOM 116 Folio 177; AOM 645 Folio 35, 76.
\textsuperscript{115} AOM 417 Folio 259, Freed in 1444 despite 6 years not having passed, AOM 419 folio 228v.
could have also served on Rhodes. Wettinger highlights that in 1546 Rhomadano Turcho was freed having been a ‘…panifico seu arte pistoria’. It is not clear where these slaves worked, as the great bakery of Valletta would not have been constructed, but the mention of serving previous Grand Masters in Solimano’s manumission suggests he may have been a personal slave of the Grand Master working in the Magisterial palace. The census of 1590 mentions slaves in the bakeries and in 1594 40 slaves were working in the Bakery. By the time of the 1749 slave conspiracy, 50 slaves worked at the bakery.

This overview of the employment of Slaves by the Order aims to highlight how ubiquitous slaves were to the Order on Malta. The Order’s slaveholding cannot be viewed as part of a single function such as rowing the galleys, slaves were involved in almost every aspect of the Order’s operations, and for members of the Order, slaves were thus involved in almost every aspect of their lives. Alongside this, slaves could be found throughout Valletta attempting to earn a living, selling goods, services and even offering supernatural services. As a result, the Order felt the need to place restrictions on their slaves. Frans Ciappara outlined many of the Order’s concerns regarding their slaves: ‘Slaves were a threat to the island through revolt or conspiring with foreign enemies. Also, they threatened the moral ordering of Malta by undermining respect for Christianity. Therefore the slaves were exiled to the prisons, made to look different, and restricted.’ A slave revolt soon after the Order came to Malta highlighted the importance of controlling the Order’s slaves. Additionally, while the number of slaves may have been low in relation to the population of Malta it was far more significant in relation to the urban population.

Restriction of Urban Slaves
The Order restricted the freedoms of its slaves to control their movements and interactions, making it harder for them to resist the Order’s control, as such slaves attempted to flee. Both Rhodes and Malta were islands so escape often involved gaining access to a ship, as such on both islands the Order issued restrictions to prevent their slaves from escaping. In 1501 in response to escape attempts new regulations were set out so that the port on Rhodes would be guarded day and night to prevent slaves from escaping, similar restrictions were in place in Malta as well. Stephen Spiteri
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116 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 320, the archive reference appears to be incorrect as the documents given are from prior to 1546.


119 Ciappara ‘The date palm and the olive tree; safeguarding the catholic frontier in Malta 1595-1605’, pp. 267-268.


121 ‘Ordinò, che rinforzare si douessero le guardie nelle Torri di San Nicolò, di Nailacco, e del Molo de’Mulini; e che si facessero le guardie di giorno,e di notte; accioche i Nemici il Porto improuisamente sforzare non
notes that ‘...the 200 miles of open sea separating Malta from the nearest landfall in North Africa did not deter slaves from seeking to get hold of small boats and making a dash for freedom.’

In 1601, during the feast of St Gregory, a group of 23 slaves armed with arrows and cutlasses made it to a boat and were making their escape when Alonso de Contreras caught up with them in a frigate; when they refused to surrender stating that they would prefer death, he fired a cannon at them breaking the legs of four of the slaves. Following this Grand Master Alof de Wignacourt decreed that a coastal fortification would be constructed to prevent such escapes, the project was delayed and in 1629 Commander Fra Alessandro Orsi paid for the tower himself, which became known as Orsi Tower to hinder slaves from escaping.

That development took place in response to a group of slaves escaping in 1602 is not surprising, restrictions were often increased following slave resistance even beyond Malta, South Carolina’s code of 1740 was enacted after the Stono uprising. Also following the slave revolt of 1596 on Malta stricter regulations were implemented, forbidding slaves from selling goods anywhere other than the main square of Valletta where it would be clearly visible, and they could not sell food, drink or high-cost goods. After the revolt of 1749 slaves were chained in pairs to further restrict their freedom. This was similar to the restrictions outlined in South Carolina’s code of 1740, slaves were banned from buying and selling goods, as Douglas Egerton outlines, ‘...to prevent human chattel from participating in the market.’ This reactive approach assumed that slave rebellion could be prevented by the slaveholder enforcing more control over the slaves, as Walter Johnson argues ‘...that is to say, those revolts were aspects of their [the slaveholders] own agency.’ This focus on

124 Spiteri, ‘Orsi Tower: A Forgotten Harbour Landmark’, pp. 201-211, Aom 100 folio 241 (1602), Aom 109 folio 164v (1629), ‘...che si difficultarebbe assai la fuga alli schiavi, ‘...che si difficultarebbe assai la fuga alli schiavi...’
the slaveholders can be seen within the Hospitaller discourse in how slave uprisings are addressed, for example in 1531 the Order implemented new restrictions after the slaves housed in Fort St. Angelo rose up and attempted to seize control of the Fort. The plan involved not only the slaves that were undertaking repairs to the Fort but also the slaves that served in the kitchens. Lorenzo Zahra when describing this event argues that the 1531 slave rebellion took the Order by surprise, 'They suddenly realised that within the slave population lurked an enemy that could destabilize the order.' This focuses on the revolt as an aspect of the Order’s control, it is not slaves taking action but rather the Order’s inaction, this undermines the agency of the slaves. Especially as it does not appear that this was a sudden realisation, the Order in 1531 was not unaware of the risks posed by their slaves; Vertot details that in 1522 a group of young knights started amusing themselves at the expense of a group of slaves resulting in a scuffle, and some members of the garrison saw this and believing it to be a slave uprising they slew a hundred and fifty of the defenceless slaves. Such a reaction suggests that the Order was aware of the dangers slaves posed. The Order’s historian Giacomo Bosio wrote about the 1531 uprising in 1621 and linked the uprising to outside influences, he outlines that those slaves in the Fort intended to defend their position until a fleet sent by the Sultan could reinforce them. Linking slave revolts to outside influences occurs within other slaveholding contexts as a means to shift focus and agency away from the slaves. Although such concerns may not have always been unfounded, Whitworth Porter details the case of a freed Muslim slave named Hali who after 10 years of captivity on Malta came up with a plan to capture Malta

---


133 ‘E poi con l’aiuto, e soccorso de gli altri Schiaui, che seruiuano alla cucina, & alla guardamangia, e de’Rais sopradet ti, che furon trouati con le squarcine sotto a gabbani, e con aprire la prigione à gli altri; ammazzando gli Agozini, & i Guardiani; doueuano fare sforzo d’uccidere tutti gli altri Christiani, & impadronirsi del detto Castello; il quale d’arme, d’artigliarie, di munitiioni, e di vettouaglie era per molti mesi ben fornito; sperando di mettere con l’artigliaria in fondo le barche, che la loro seguita hauessero; la quale in Barbaria se ne fuggiua, d’onde disegnauano d’hauer soccorso da Corsali, ch’alle Gerbe si trouauano; e così tenersi fin tanto, che mandata hauesse il Gran Turco ogni mediocre squadra di Galere, per rinforzar le guardie, & il presidio di quel Castello: Sperando almeno, che l’rendersi à patti (quando altrimenti fare potuto non hauessero) mancare non gli potesse; e d’essere tutti alle case loro li beri rimandati.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 3, p. 100.

through a slave uprising. In 1722 the Sultan sent a fleet of ten ships to support the uprising but while Hali had been away the Order had become aware of the plot and prevented it.\textsuperscript{135}

In the aftermath of the 1531 uprising several of the slaves were hanged and the remaining slaves were transferred out of the Fort, to be kept in the Borgo.\textsuperscript{136} Later in the same year a ship, the old carrack the \textit{Santa Maria}, which was being used as housing for the Order’s slaves due to a lack of space elsewhere, caught fire which resulted in the death of numerous slaves.\textsuperscript{137} The first slave prison in Vittoriosa was built in 1539 with a second prison in Valletta, completed in 1571 and a third Senglea in 1629.\textsuperscript{138} The continued construction of slave prisons suggests that the number of slaves held by the Order was increasing; the population of each prison is unknown, although David Borg-Muscat has stated that the prison in Valletta ‘...could easily house over 900 inmates.’\textsuperscript{139} In 1539 Grand Master Verdala ordered all non-Christian slaves to pass every night in the prison including those slaves paying their ransoms.\textsuperscript{140} Those slaves who had their ransom agreed had a period of conditional freedom, during this time they could still be forced to man the galleys despite the personal risks involved and from 1539 were required to sleep in the slave prisons.\textsuperscript{141} This restriction is similar to the movement controls that were enforced on New World plantations where curfews for slaves were common.\textsuperscript{142}

The issue of security appears to have been taken seriously not only by the Order but by the Papacy as well since this requirement for slaves to sleep in the prison infringed upon the usual privileges of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{135} Porter, \textit{A History of the Knights of Malta}, volume 2, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{136} ‘Perilche fece egli impiccare i due Rais, con dieci altri de’più Principali’, ‘E perche simile pericolo, per cagione de gli Schiaui al Castello, per lo innanzi auenire non potesse; fece poi fare abbasino nel Borgo, a dirimpetto del Castello, certe fosse, che si chiamano le Guue, doue la prigione de gli Schiauì fu trasferitaa.’ Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano}, volume 3, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{137} ‘Percioche collocate essendosi le Schiaue, e gli Schiauetti di Modone, ad habitate, e dormire sopra la Carracca vecchia, per mancamento di stanze; inaudutamente le fü davn Fanciullo, che per cauar poluere dalla camera delle munitioni andato v’era, appiccato il fuoco; la furia del quale repentinamente volar fece in aria la prima coperta della Carracca; la quale quasi intera andò a cadere in mezo al Porto, con alcuni Huomini sopra, che miracolosamente viui rimasero. Annegandosi alcune di quelle Schiaue, per la fretta grande, c’hebbero di fuggire quel fuoco; il quale non si potè mai estinguere, fin che tutta la Carracca so pradetta fin al fiore dell’acqua arsa, e consumata non hebbe.’, Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano}, volume 3, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{138} AOM 287 folio 43v; AOM 109 folio 214, noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61.
\textsuperscript{140} AOM 287 folio 43v; AOM 109 folio 214, noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61; Earle, \textit{Corsairs of Malta and Barbary}, p. 64; Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo} p. 64; AOM 287 folio 43v; AOM 109 folio 214, noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61; Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 65
\textsuperscript{141} references NLM 704 vol 2 Folio 103v et seq.
\textsuperscript{142} Earle, \textit{Corsairs of Malta and Barbary}, p. 177.
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the clergy, although the Inquisitor was exempt from sending his slaves to the prisons at night.\textsuperscript{143} It appears the requirement for slaves to sleep in the prison was often ignored as it was reissued in 1578 and again in 1582.\textsuperscript{144} In 1585 notices were placed in all the auberges and lodgings of the knights ordering them to send their slaves to the prisons during the night, on pain of confiscation.\textsuperscript{145} This was re-issued in 1602 and slaves in the private service of Knights were again ordered to sleep in the prisons.\textsuperscript{146} The need to repeat and re-issue of these regulations suggests that they were not being followed, although there is no evidence of what punishments or action was taken against slaveholders who did not follow the rules. The requirement must have been well known as even visitors to the island knew of it; Philip Skippon in 1663 described the slave prison in Valletta as, ‘...a fair square building, cloister’d round, where most of the slaves in Malta are oblig’d to lodge every night.’\textsuperscript{147} That this requirement had to be highlighted in the lodgings of the knights indicates that the knights themselves were not following this rule. The issue continued into the seventeenth century and slave owners were held responsible for their slaves; in 1639 the Bailiff of Venosa was blamed for robberies committed at night by a slave in his employment, as he was responsible for ensuring that the slave passed the night in prison.\textsuperscript{148} The requirement to sleep in the prison was not popular with the slaves and in 1596 a group of slaves refused to sleep in the slave prison and escaped Valletta leaving the city gates open.\textsuperscript{149} It appears that some slaves continued not sleeping in the prisons into the eighteenth century; Giacomo Capello writing from Valletta in 1716 noted that domestic slaves remained in the homes where they served overnight.\textsuperscript{150}


\textsuperscript{144} AOM 96 folio 43-43v, AOM 287 folio 43v, AOM 109 folio 214, noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle : l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61, also references AOM 95 folio 115; Earle, \textit{Corsairs of Malta and Barbary}, p. 64; Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo} p. 64.

\textsuperscript{145} AOM 96 Folio 43–43v, 44v noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôle: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque moderne’, pp. 49-61; Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{146} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 65 references AOM 100 Folio 241rv, AOM 210 Folio 45v.

\textsuperscript{147} Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 620.

\textsuperscript{148} Wettinger, \textit{Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo}, p. 66 references AOM 665 Folio 69; Also noted by Monsieur Du Mont in 1690, Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).’, pp. 391–413.

\textsuperscript{149} Brogini, \textit{Malte}, p. 664 ‘La lettre de Joanne Caloriti, argousin de l’Ordre, fournit bien plus de détails : refusant de dormir dans les prisons, ils s’évadèrent et vagabondèrent quelques jours dans la campagne maltaise à la recherche d’un navire pour s’enfuir et surtout incitant tous les esclaves qu’ils rencontraient à les rejoindre. Plus grave encore, ils dérobèrent les clefs de Valette et ouvriront de nuit les portes de la cité, enfreignant délibérément toutes les ordonnances magistrales qui interdisaient aux esclaves de vagabonder la nuit et aux membres de l’Ordre de laisser les portes de la capitale ouvertes.’

\textsuperscript{150} ‘La sera si chiudono nel Bagno, che e come un Ghetto alquanto sotterraneo con buone guardie. Quelli che servono nelle case, vi restano quando li padroni loro cosi vogliono.’ Capello, \textit{Decrittizione di Malta Anno 1716, A venetian Account}, p. 56.
Additionally, the restrictions of 1539 required all slaves to wear a 12-ounce iron ring on their legs. Similar restrictions had been set out in the 1510 *Pragmaticae Rhodiae*, slaves were banned from hiring rooms or shops and required to wear iron rings, the Order did not have a central slave prison on Rhodes, so instead slaves were banned from being outside after nightfall. The requirement to wear an iron ring was part of the Order’s strategy of ensuring that slaves were visually distinct from free people and to hinder escape, this was similar to the use of iron rings and chains in other slaveholding contexts, for example the 1403 Genoese legal code included restrictions for anyone found to have helped a slave remove such a chain or ring. In 1663 Philip Skippon noted that the slaves still wore iron rings. Alexander Bonnici has challenged the effectiveness of iron rings, as they were too light to impede a slave from fleeing, and that there were numerous other clearer distinctions of status such as haircut, concluding ‘However, due to their insistence, the Grand Masters were granted a decree of the Supreme Congregation, through which they obliged the slaves of the Inquisitor’s patentees to wear those useless rings around their legs!’ The use of rings and chains on slaves occurs throughout a range of slaveholding contexts. Given that slaves undertook tasks that required freedom of movement, especially in an urban context, a ring of sufficient size to impede a slaves escape would also have impacted that slaves labour, the purpose of the ring was far more than that; it dehumanised the slave and likened them to an animal, it would have had a physiological impact as the slave felt it and it would have been noticeable to visually demarcate them as a slave. From the sources it appears that wearing iron rings was significant to the slaves and was mentioned in two seventeenth century epistles written by Jewish slaves seeking ransom, ‘...he was taken captive by Gentile captors who came and injured his foot with fetters...’ and ‘They hurt his foot with fetters, and he was laid in iron, with bitter suffering...’ this detail was likely included as it would have been poignant to those reading these letters, these letters will be

---


154 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 621.


discussed further in chapter 7. Bono notes that in 1704 the enslaved Tunisian Rais Morat in a letter outlining the misery of his condition details wearing iron chains on his feet and that his beard was cut by the Order. The importance of hair as a visual demarcation has previously been discussed with regard to galley slavery. Emanuel Buttigieg notes the importance of facial hair for both Christians and Muslims as a sign of masculinity. For the slaves being shaved must have been emasculating and a visual sign not only of their enslaved status but of the powerlessness they had over their bodies.

In the seventeenth century the Order’s slaves were issued with clothes, which would have further identified them as slaves. The regulation of 1631 regarding clothing outlines those who were not entitled to it, for example privately owned slaves, which suggests that the Order’s slaves had been provided with clothing before this. While the issuing of clothes is not surprising, in 1648 it was ordered that the slaves’ shoes would have a chequered pattern to prevent their sale; clearly, slaves had been selling their shoes. Concerning clothing, Wettinger states, ‘One might reasonably expect it to have been a matter of pride for the knights and other masters of slaves to clothe decently those who were in personal attendance on them.’ While such an expectation is reasonable there does not appear to be any evidence for such a practice, although it does seem that there were differences in the slaves’ uniforms, Skippon in 1663 noted that Jewish slaves were distinguished from the rest ‘...by a little piece of yellow cloth on their hats or caps...’ The Order’s regulation of their slaves’ clothing and hair is similar to the fourteenth and fifteenth century sumptuary laws of Florence which were used to visually differentiate slaves and servants from the rest of society.

Despite these restrictions within the Hospitaller discourse the Order’s treatment of their slaves has often been highlighted as relatively kind with regard to the slave prisons Peter Earle has argued: ‘...They had their own mosques and priests, and their own judges to try disputes. Adequate provision was made for the care of the sick by the order in its nursing rather than fighting role. Stalls could be

159 ‘mi hanno tagliato la barba, e li mostacci...’; ‘Noi stiamo in Malta, e non ci e restate ne barba, ne mostacci, e stiamo con un cantaro di ferro alli piedi...’, Bono, ‘Schiavi musulmani a Malta nei secoli XVII-XVIII Connessioni fra Maghreb e Italia’, p. 91.
160 Buttigieg, Nobility, Faith and Masculinity, pp. 132-133.
162 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 118, references AOM 296 Folio 165 et seq.
163 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 118, references AOM 116 Folio 176.
164 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 120.
165 Skippon, ‘an account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 620.
set up, and freedom of movement within the prisons was considerable. Punishments for any transgression of the rules were, of course, very severe, normally a public beating in Valletta. On the other hand, arbitrary ill-treatment was unusual but was sometimes applied as a reprisal against similar ill treatment to Christian slaves in Barbary.\textsuperscript{167} This view dismisses many of the problems the slaves faced in the prisons and also implies any violence or cruelty was a ‘reprisal’, this view appears to excuse the Order’s actions by placing blame externally on Barbary pirates, the same argument that Vertot dismissed with regard to Romegas’s cruelty when writing in 1726.\textsuperscript{168} Additionally, this interpretation is at odds with the accounts written by those who experienced enslavement by the Order. Earle noted the lack of information concerning what life was like for slaves in Malta; ‘We do not have any descriptions of life as a slave in Malta by anyone who actually suffered captivity there, and Christian visitors were remarkably reticent about the whole institution of slavery in Malta.’\textsuperscript{169} The silence regarding slavery by visitors to Malta suggests that slavery was unremarkable to those visitors, many of whom would have arrived on Malta in ships rowed by slaves. Although when Giacomo Capello visited Malta in 1716 he detailed that the slaves were fed poorly and made to work extremely hard.\textsuperscript{170} The mosque that Earle mentions was not unusual, Daniel Hershenzon notes that Muslims enslaved in Italy and Spain also had access to mosques.\textsuperscript{171} A mosque is recorded in the slave prison in the late sixteenth century, and slaves in Malta were not forcibly converted and had a space for them to practise their faith.\textsuperscript{172} This was beneficial to the Order as it allowed Muslim slaves to retain their religious identity which facilitated ransom. The Order certainly provided medical care for its slaves: in the seventeenth century a surgeon lived at the slave prison, assisted by a resident barber and a slave barber, and galley slaves had their own ward in the Grand infirmary.\textsuperscript{173} This was not a sign of particularly good conditions but was a common occurrence in slaveholding societies, in
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Trinidad the Spanish slave code of 1789 required each plantation to have a slave hospital and plantation owners routinely contracted physicians for the medical care of their slaves.\textsuperscript{174} Despite that Anne Brogini has framed the medical care provided for sick slaves by the Order as reflecting the importance of the Order’s vows of Hospitality.\textsuperscript{175} Brogini has also placed the issuing of clothes and food to the Order’s slaves within the content of the Order’s focus on hospitality.\textsuperscript{176} Within most slave societies the slave owners provide their slaves with clothes and food; this should not be seen as part of the Order’s hospitality but a typical requirement for a slave system to function. Additionally, it does not appear that the slaves were particularly well fed, based on the comment by Capello in 1716.\textsuperscript{177} The cost of feeding and clothing the Order’s slaves rarely appears in the documents although steps were taken in 1647 to reduce the costs by selling all slaves that were not fit to work and ensuring those slaves not working for the Order were fed and clothed by their employers.\textsuperscript{178}

Peter Earle was writing in 1970 and since then more evidence has been discovered and been made more easily accessible, which includes some limited descriptions of life as a slave by those who were enslaved, as in 1598 as part of the trial of Georgio Scala his home was searched and Arabic documents were found.\textsuperscript{179} The documents were letters written by Muslim slaves on Malta to their families in Sfax, Tunis, sometime prior to the trial in 1598.\textsuperscript{180} These letters provide a first-hand insight into the situation of slaves on Malta. The first letter was from Muhammad to his brother Ali Bughirriyu, and violates the cultural code regulating the writing of personal letters; ‘This shows that the sender’s concern about the difficult prison conditions took priority over greetings to family members and relatives.’\textsuperscript{181} This violation could be a means of the sender highlighting their situation to the reader; Muhammad outlines the problems of his condition; ‘The lice and the bugs, the fleas, the disgrace, the ill-treatment...’\textsuperscript{182} Muhammad by listing disgrace alongside ill-treatment highlights
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\textsuperscript{179} AIM, (Archives of the inquisition, Malta), Processi Criminali, MS 16 A, Folio 85v ‘questi altri tre carti scritti in caratteri incogniti quali tutti’ transcribed in Moica Borg and Charles Dalli, ‘The Trial of Georgio Scala at the Inquisition in Malta in 1598’, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{181} Lahlali and Agius, ‘Writing private letters: Breaking with Islamic and literary Arabic traditions’, p. 335.
\textsuperscript{182} Letter from Muhammad to his broth Ali Bughirriyu in Sfax, Tunisia, AIM, proc 16A, Folio 89 translated in
the conflation of physical deprivation with dishonour, Orlando Patterson has identified these as key aspects to how a slaveholder manipulated and controlled their slaves. Muhammad was no longer a Muslim and complains ‘Nor have I seen from you, never, neither a letter nor an answer, since the day I became a Christian.’ Muhammad is not using a Christian name within this letter to his brother, but this does not mean that he has not been baptised; perhaps he is using his original name in this correspondence with his family as that would be more effective in reminding them of their connection to him. Muhammad also contrasts galley slaves with those on land, highlighting that land slaves were able to buy and sell. The other two letters are very similar, although following the cultural code regulating the writing of personal letters, both mention the poor conditions in the prisons. Both complain about the lack of correspondence from the families. Mustafa Efendi’s account of being enslaved on Malta from 1597-1599 provides additional insight into conditions in the slave prison. He described the air in the prison as unbearable, with troughs of filthy standing water. The prison itself he compares to a cave that immediately causes pain. He also complained about the quality of the food in the slave prison. As a result of the poor conditions he contemplates death and states that wishing for death is inadmissible, but death can overcome a
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183 Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, pp, 77-101.
lot. Correggio in his eyewitness account of the siege of Malta notes that prior to the invasion of Malta in 1565 a number of letters from Muslim slaves in Malta were read aloud to the council of Sultan Suleiman in which the slaves declared that death was preferable to life in captivity. Correggio was not at that council meeting, but that this anecdote was included suggests that the choice of death over enslavement was not viewed as unreasonable. A Jewish slave epistle from the seventeenth century states ‘...would that I have died as I left my mother’s womb, why did I not perish when I came out of the belly, so that I would not witness the evil that has befallen me?’ In 1724 the legal code of Grand Master Antoine Manoel de Vilhena gave special consideration to the economic loss caused by slaves using opium to commit suicide. It is clear from the accounts of those who experienced them that the conditions of the slave prisons on Malta were appalling but despite this, the negative conditions are still often played down within the existing Hospitaller discourse, El Mustapha Lahlali and Dionisius A. Agius present the conditions in the slave prisons in underwhelming terms; ‘Life for a shore-slave in the prisons of Valletta and Birgu was, to say the least, uncomfortable: the dampness, mosquitoes, lice, and bugs were severe trials.’ This view is presented in the same volume as the Muslim letters discussed above, and so discounts the first-hand experience of the slaves. Similarly, Lorenzo Zahra states ‘The Order being a religious order, considered the slaves as human beings and were not inclined to maltreat them.’ Anne Borgini, as mentioned above has suggested the Order cared for its slaves as a result of the Order’s vows. With regard to Hospitaller slaves kept in Acre, Yvonne Friedman states ‘...they therefore had to be kept in tolerable conditions so as not to impair their value as a labour force.’ Friedman in the previous sentence, however, described the underground prison in Acre as having few air holes and no windows. Additionally, Friedman is only considering their value in labour, not ransom. It is possible that these poor conditions were intentional by the Order as a means of encouraging swift
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ransom payment. These views romanticise the nature of the Order and projects the modern relationship between Christianity and slavery into the past. The humanity of slaves has been accepted in a wide range of Christian slaveholding societies, but this did not prevent them from maltreating their slaves. The slave prison in Valletta was still in use as a prison in the nineteenth century while Malta was under British rule. In 1825 the prison contained 211 prisoners the majority of these had work assignments, 50 cleaned the streets, 40 worked in the granaries, and another 50 worked a variety of trades such as cooks, tailors and barbers. Despite operating with far fewer inhabitants than it had when the Order controlled Malta, in 1837 Governor Henry Bouerie considered the prison unfit for purpose due to the lack of space and deplorable conditions.

The brutality of the Order’s slave system can be most clearly demonstrated in their reaction to the 1749 slave conspiracy. A large number of slaves, including galley slaves and slaves working in the household of the Grand Master had planned to poison members of the Order and rise up against the Order, the Order became aware of the conspiracy and punished those slaves involved. Eight galley slaves thought to be leaders in the plot were branded with the letter ‘R’ on their cheeks, this was minor compared to the punishment of the two ring leaders who suffered particularly brutal and public deaths, their flesh was torn off with hot iron tongs before being torn apart by four boats in the Grand Harbour of Malta. This punishment is surprisingly similar to the fate that befell a female slave from Tuscany in 1379 who poisoned her master, her flesh was torn with red hot pincers and she was burned alive. The use of the Grand Harbour of Malta as part of the execution was to ensure that the execution was seen by a large audience. Converted slaves were executed by beheading, rather than by the crueller form of execution, having their throats slit, this caused some
of the slaves involved to convert. Wettinger notes the coloured drawings of the punishments were added to the walls of the slave prison in Valletta. Alongside those slaves who were branded and would have served as living reminders, this ensured that the slaves were well aware of the punishment for rebellion. The impact of this event and the reaction to it was long-lasting, the event was detailed by Patrick Brydone visiting Malta in 1770, who noted; ‘The executions were very terrible. One hundred and twenty-five were put to death by various torments. Some were burned alive, some were broke on the wheel, and some were torn to pieces by the four galleys rowing different ways, and each bringing off its limb. Since that time, they have been much more strictly watched, and have less liberty than formerly.’ Following the conspiracy of 1749 slaves were chained together in pairs. Overall, there were few slave rebellions and besides some notable exceptions, those that did occur tended to be small groups of slaves and likely had limited planning.

The Order was aware that their slaves could be a threat and took steps to restrict them and monitor them which allowed the Order to find out about planned slave uprisings before they happened. The urban setting allowed the Order’s slaves to develop networks, this could be used to both facilitate ransom, as will be discussed more in the ransom chapter, or organise escape attempts. Additionally, while their movement was restricted, urban slaves, unlike galley slaves, were not chained to the deck. The reissuing of restrictions does show that the restrictions were not being followed; subverting the Order’s rules was a means of everyday resistance, a less overt form of rebellion. What remains consistent is the similarities between the Order’s slaveholding and other slaveholding contexts, even the brutal executions following the slave conspiracy of 1749 are comparable to Tuscany in 1379.

Conclusion
Slaves were involved in key aspects of the Order’s on-land operations, Dionisius Agius summarises the significance of slavery to the Order on Malta: ‘There were great benefits in keeping slaves as they were an asset to the state’s economy and her rulers. Slaves were employed to build the massive fortifications of the harbour cities which still stand today, or to row on galleys or engage in crafts and generally serve their masters wherever they were needed...’ The Order’s slaves were not simply used for manual labour but included many skilled individuals, and the Order took steps to
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ensure that skilled slaves had to pass on their skills to other slaves as part of gaining their freedom.213 This is clear with regard to construction where in 1543 the Order’s architect Nicolo Flavari taught the Order’s slaves construction skills.214 Although, it is difficult to detect how many slaves there actually were, the numbers fluctuated because the main producer and consumer of slaves was the galleys and military activity.

The Order’s approach to its slaves contained a fundamental contradiction. The Order made widespread use of slaves, their slaves performed a variety of tasks and were involved in all aspects of the Order. However, slaves represented a dangerous corrupting outside influence that had to be kept separate. The result was widespread restrictions on slaves; especially restrictions that ensured slaves were more easily identifiable and that they slept in the slave prisons. The restrictions placed on slaves both controlled the slaves and helped to mitigate these fears which is why new restrictions were often brought in after incidents such as slave rebellions. The most drastic restrictions were implemented after the failed slave conspiracy of 1749 where slaves were chained in pairs, not only limiting their movement but also their individuality.215 These restrictions highlight the slaveholder fears, fear of the social and economic networks that slaves were able, and fears of foreign intervention. Many of the same restrictions were reissued over and over, the same restrictions that the Order issued in Rhodes were being issued on Malta as a reaction to very similar situations. These restrictions and fears place the blame for slave rebellion on the slaveholder for a lack of vigilance, undermining the agency of the slaves.

Within the Hospitaller discourse those seeking to downplay the harshness of the Order’s slaveholding often highlight the lack of first-hand accounts of the experience of being enslaved on Malta and dismiss those accounts that do exist. This chapter has sought to focus on those accounts and to approach them with the view that their insights into the system are invaluable. Many of the separate and unrelated documents describe appalling conditions and treatment. Mustafa Efendi contemplated suicide, which must not have been uncommon as in 1724 the Order noted the use of
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opium by slaves as a means of suicide. When Alonso De Contreras asked the slaves fleeing Malta to surrender, they replied that they would rather die. In both the sieges of 1522 and 1565 slaves that refused to undertake dangerous repairs were threatened with mutilation. The prisons themselves were considered unsuitable while Malta was under British rule. Despite this many studies have attempted to sanitize the Order’s slave ownership and argued that the Order’s slaves were well cared for and not mistreated.

The Order not only used slave labour but it could be argued that they may have even preferred the use of slaves to freemen, the Order on Malta made widespread use of slave labour in industries and to perform tasks that in much of Europe were done by free people; for example, the manufacture of cotton sails in England was not conducted in slaves prisons but there does not appear to have been a consideration by the Order of an alternative until after the 1749 conspiracy the number of slaves in some key areas was reduced. William Henry Thornton in his 1836 memoir on the final years of the Order’s finances stated that the Order had ‘...a strong predilection for the employment of slave-labour...’ and only through the use of this labour ‘...it may be comprehended how the stupendous works undertaken by the knights for fortifying their strong-hold were accomplished.’ The greatest military achievements of the Order, its naval fleet and its fortress of Malta were achieved through the labour of slaves that far outnumbered the members of the ruling elite who captured them, enslaved them and controlled them. Throughout this chapter, the extent to which the slave system on Malta overlaps with other slaveholding contexts has been highlighted. The Order as slaveholders were not kinder than other slaveholders, their reactions were not different. The fundamental sameness is notable because it highlights the importance of understanding the wider slavery discourse to understand the Order as slaveholders.
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Chapter 5, The use of personal and domestic slaves

This chapter explores the Order’s use of personal slaves. Given the Order’s remit of Holy War it may seem surprising that they would choose to surround themselves with their enslaved enemies in a domestic setting. Stephen Bensch while discussing slavery in Catalonia and Aragon from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries outlines that Muslim slaves were not thought of as threatening rivals but as ‘...objects for domestic consumption, de-socialised and depersonalised through the humiliations suffered by being placed for sale on the slave block.’ 1 Debra Blumenthal highlights this issue of an internal enemy, ‘Confronted by an infidel enemy without as well as within, Valencian Christians viewed their slaves – some of whom had been Muslim corsairs – with intense ambivalence.’ 2 From the restrictions placed on the Order’s slaves and the slave resistance outlined in the previous chapter clearly that both the Order and the slaves were aware of the events that had brought them together, the slaves could and would take opportunities to escape or resist the Order, and the Order did not trust its slaves to sleep outside of the prisons at night. But despite these threats members of the Order owned personal slaves because such ownership was linked to status in the Order. Many of these slaves were purchased by individual Brothers, although some slaves were assigned to them because of their status within the Order. These personal slaves, unlike the Order’s other slaves, worked in isolated groups and had a closer relationship with specific members of the Order, often having been purchased to serve a specific individual. They would have been involved in a range of tasks, many of which could be viewed as domestic, although Blumenthal highlights that ‘...“Domestic” of course, is a vague job title.’ 3 The tasks of a domestic slave would often overlap with other slaves as the Order’s slaves undertook a variety of roles, and the slaves serving in the infirmary would have cleaned and completed ‘domestic’ tasks; the difference between those slaves serving in the infirmary and personal slaves was the personal connection to a specific member of the Order.

As a result of the personal nature of the relationship between specific members of the Order, privately owned slaves rarely appear within the archives of the Order apart from manumission documents that involved the treasury or the Grand Master. Consequently, very little work has been produced on private slave ownership within the Order, Wettinger focuses only on slaves owned by the Grand Master. 4 He observes that the ‘...small-scale private slave-owner is quite inadequately documented in the archives of the Order and of the tribunal dealing with the activities of the corsairs

1 Bensch, ‘From Prizes Of War To Domestic Merchandise’, p. 81.
2 Blumenthal, Enemies and familiars, p. 4.
3 Blumenthal, Enemies and familiars, pp. 82-85.
4 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 385.
based on Malta. This lack of focus within the Hospitaller discourse is despite the importance of personal or domestic slavery within other slaveholding societies. What limited attention there has been on the topic often seeks to downplay the significance of personal slaves and distance the Order from it; Anthony Luttrell notes that the brethren were ‘...served by their slaves in the semi-oriental society of Rhodes...’, which appears to characterise slave ownership as something exotic or foreign. Luttrell may be attempting to further distance the Order from slaveholding by suggesting that the ‘semi-oriental’ society of Rhodes influenced the Order which resulted in the further engagement with slave labour. George Cassar similarly attempted to blame external factors on the behaviour of the Order and claimed that the society on Malta corrupted the Order, arguing that: ‘Mingling more with the locals, they picked up local morals and attitudes...’ Although the use of enslaved people within domestic and personal contexts appears to have developed early within the Order. In 1296 Brother Pierre Flor de Camprodon sold a slave named Azmet to Brother Jacques de Ollers; this was an internal sale, suggesting strongly that Azmet had been purchased by Pierre and was his personal slave. Additionally, slave ownership especially of domestic slaves was common across Christian societies in the western Mediterranean, so should be expected in this context, especially as the Order appears to have followed many of the norms of other slaveholding societies.

This chapter will begin by outlining some considerations regarding the number of personal slaves, and their gender, which in regard to personal slaves is particularly significant. Secondly, the link between slaveholding and status within the Order will be explored. The Order’s use of personal slaves was like that of other medieval slaveholding societies in that slaveholding was closely linked with status and prestige, which became institutionalised within the Order. Thirdly the ownership of domestic slaves, especially female slaves, likely resulted in sexual exploitation by the Brothers; the evidence of this and the Order’s response will be outlined. Finally, there will be a discussion of manumission, focusing on testamentary manumission and issues of baptism.
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Demography of the Order’s personal slaves

The difficulties in estimating the size of the Order’s slave population have been highlighted in other chapters and remain true in this context. The number of personal or domestic slaves is particularly difficult to evaluate, indeed as John Gillingham has observed ‘...slaves primarily engaged in domestic work would have been almost completely invisible...' Similarly, within the context of medieval Venice Sally McKee argues that estimating the number of slaves is challenging because the evidence is misleading. The lack of evidence for the number of personal slaves should not be surprising as these slaves were often bought and owned by individual Brothers without the involvement of the Order; the Order only became involved with regard to manumission. However, even in those cases the Order was often simply confirming a testamentary manumission or some other complication, and it seems likely that many manumissions were not recorded within the Order’s archives. For example, Luttrell notes that the manumission of Georgio Bulgaro had not originally been written down and was only later, in 1381, recorded in the *libri bullarum*; it is not clear when he had originally been freed or what the motivation was for recording the manumission at that time. The records of the Order do not provide a full picture of the number of slaves the Order held, and with regard to domestic slaves, that picture is even more incomplete. Nevertheless, the number must have been significant as in 1576 the Grand Master ordered that all domestic slaves should assist in building the defences of Malta, suggesting they were a sizeable workforce.

Trasselli has detailed the grain ration for the Brothers from the census undertaken in 1590 by Diego della Quadra; each Brother was entitled to 4 *Salme* of wheat per year, more than would have been required for an individual, as the annual consumption per person would have been 1.33 *Salme*. The 13 Knights of the Grand Cross were each given an additional 12 *Tumoli* of wheat per month to feed 6 slaves. The Order was divided into regional groups based on linguistic differences known as Tongues or *Langues*, each of which had its own hall or auberge and the heads of each of the 7 Tongues were given 20 *Tumoli* of wheat to feed 10 slaves, which represents grain to feed a total of
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148 slaves.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, when Grand Master Verdalle died in 1595 he owned 230 slaves of which he freed 27.\textsuperscript{18} The number of non-galley slaves given by Trasselli therefore only includes those enslaved peoples working in industries on Malta directly for the Order. It does not include the significant number of slaves in private ownership, suggesting that the slave population was far higher than the 1,405 that Traselli estimated.

It is clear that some individuals in the Order owned large numbers of slaves, but it is not clear if the personal slaves of the Brothers would have counted as privately owned or as slaves in service to the Order. Some of the domestic slaves could have come from other parts of the Order’s slave system, and Wettinger highlights that ‘...unlicensed use of galley slaves by the officials was, of course, quite frequent...’\textsuperscript{19} In 1642 the mate of the galley the 	extit{San Francesco} kept one of the galley slaves in his private house, even while he and the vessel were at sea.\textsuperscript{20} In 1661 the lending of galley slaves to private persons was banned, which suggests that this had been occurring up until that date.\textsuperscript{21} In 1439 the slave Cosmas who had been owned by the late Brother Geraud de Cervilion, was freed on the condition that he served the Prior of the convent of Rhodes for 5 years; over those 5 years, the prior had to pay the treasury 25 ducats. It appears that the treasury was renting out Cosmas, profiting from the late Brother’s purchase.\textsuperscript{22} The chapter general of 1597 outlined that the Brothers were able to rent out slaves of the Order for their own uses.\textsuperscript{23} This system appears to have continued until the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{24}

The Order’s domestic and personal slaves appear to have been a mixture of enslaved people provided by the Order and of others purchased by individual Brothers. Personal slavery has far more references to Brothers purchasing slaves than in other parts of the Hospitaller slave system. For
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example, in 1447 a Bulgarian slave named Catherine was freed by the treasury after the Brother who purchased her had died.25 Wettinger outlines the slave sales registered in the deeds of the Notary Nicolo de Agatiis between September 1543 and August 1544, which recorded the sale of 66 slaves, 34 males and 29 females: of those sales, members of the Order were involved in the sale of 14 slaves and the purchase of 7; Brother Gugluelmo Bombast purchased a 30-year-old enslaved black woman, Brother Pia purchased 2 adolescent male Ethiopian slaves aged 14 and 15, Brother Johanni Antoni Pignuni purchased 2 women and 1 man all of whom were described as ‘white moors’, and Brother Zaccari Cackie purchased a 13-year-old enslaved girl. 26 Of course, the sale of these slaves may have been unrelated to personal or domestic slaveholding, but instead related to the Brothers selling enslaved captives. Nevertheless the purchase of slaves, especially enslaved women, and adolescent males, does suggest that they may have been used as personal slaves as it is unlikely there were purchased for hard labour, and would not have served on the galleys.

Engagement with the slave market gave individual Brothers access to a more diverse range of enslaved peoples than would have been available from those whom the Order captured in battle. Hospitaller slaves had varied origins; Couræs identified Bulgarian, Hungarian, Russian, Rhodian Greek, Cypriot, Berber, Tartar, Turkish, Armenian and Ethiopian.27 Such varied ethnic origins were typical of other Mediterranean slave markets, such as Ragusa; Iris Origo identified similar ethnic origins in medieval Tuscany. 28 Luttrell notes that Greek names seem to have been more common within manumissions before 1360, which may suggest that Greeks were favoured as personal or domestic slaves and that they were more likely to be freed, while there may have been slaves of other origins who were seldom freed and are therefore not visible in the records.29 Most notable is that the 7 slaves purchased by the Brothers in 1544 were predominately female. The Order typically enslaved captives taken in battle, who would have been disproportionately male, as there would have been fewer women on board the captured galleys. 30 Additionally, male slaves were always in high demand by the Order to labour as galley slaves, while enslaved women were typically sold to private buyers, many of whom were knights wishing to purchase domestic slaves.31

26 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, pp. 377-381.
30 Oarsmen were male and would have made up most of the crew, Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 21.
31 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 492.
Cross-culturally, domestic slavery was predominantly female in most medieval slaveholding societies. In the Ragusa slave market, men represented less than 10% of the slave trade, the rest were women and girls. Similarly, women made up 82% of slave sales in Venice and Genoa between 1360 and 1499. The extent to which domestic slavery was dominated by women cannot be over-emphasized, and it is surprising that the Order’s domestic slaves were not made up of a higher proportion of women. Michel Fontenay, Maria Marzialetti, and Benedetta Borello have estimated that female slaves made up just 8% of the slave population on Malta from 1659-63. Nevertheless, female domestic slaves do appear regularly in manumission documents. In 1386 Katherine Negre Scalua and her son were freed due to her service to the late Brother Rigotus de Nicossa, the preceptor of Barcelona. In 1438 a Jewish couple from Cyprus were licensed to purchase an elderly Saracen female domestic slave, it is stated that the enslaved woman could no longer bear children, this may have affected her value as she could not be a wet nurse, a common use for female slaves. Reproductive exploitation of slaves was endemic of New World slave societies. This is not evident in the Order’s slaves on Malta, likely because so many were male, however on Cyprus slaves were encouraged to marry; in 1454 slaves were traded between Hospitaller properties on Cyprus to correct the gender imbalance on individual properties and to facilitate slave marriages. This will be discussed more in the chapter on Agricultural slavery. In 1446 a French Hospitaller was accompanied

34 McKee, ‘Domestic Slavery in Renaissance Italy’, p. 307.
36 Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).’, p. 400 ‘In linea generale, le schiave erano in media più apprezzate degli schiavi (cfr. tabb. 1 e 2). Innanzitutto, perché erano più rare: appena l’8% del totale nel 1659-63...’
37 AOM 323 folio 212-212v, partially transcribed in Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, Register entry 37.
by an enslaved Greek woman in France.\(^{41}\) In 1347 Brother Franciscus of Acre was permitted to free two Greek slaves, a man and a woman, who would have been his personal slaves.\(^{42}\) Furthermore, as previously noted, in 1531 the Order captured 800 women from Modon.\(^{43}\) This raid no doubt resulted in an influx of female domestic or personal slaves.

Free people also worked as domestic servants, but similarly to domestic slaves, this is poorly documented. Joan Abela has examined the few surviving records and notes that the domestic servant was to reside in the home of their employer with clothes and food provided, as such the cost of maintaining a domestic slave would have been similar to a domestic servant.\(^{44}\) While a domestic servant would be paid a wage, a domestic slave would likely have received a peculium as this was a common feature of most slaveholding societies.\(^{45}\) It appears that domestic slaves were predominant rather than domestic servants, in 1690 Monsieur Du Mont noted that slaves serving as valets were a common sight.\(^{46}\) It appears that slaves may have been cheaper, in 1535 Alvarus Fernando from Lisbon was hired by Brother Antonio Tavares for 2 years in return for 1 gold ducat a month.\(^{47}\) In 1439 the treasury rented an enslaved man named Cosmas to the Prior of the convent of Rhodes for 5 years for 25 ducats, which would have equated to half the cost per month compared to hiring a servant like Alvarus Fernando in 1535.\(^{48}\) Writing in 1716, Giacomo Capello confirmed that the use of slaves by families in Malta constituted a saving for the slaveholder as compared to them employing

---

\(^{41}\) Luttrell, 'Slavery at Rhodes', p. 87; Charles Verlinden, L'esclavage dans L'Europe médiéval Volume 1, (De Tempel, 1955), p. 818.

\(^{42}\) Verlinden, L'esclavage dans L'Europe médiéval, volume 2, pp. 975-6, ‘Ainsi, le 20 juin 1347, le chevalier Franciscus d'Acre recoit l'autorisation diaffranchir (manumittendi et francos faciendi) <Dimitrium et Stamati eius sclavos>. Il s'agit apparemment de deux Grecs, un homme et une femme, serviteurs personnels du chevalier.’ ; AOM 317 folio 236’data est licentia fratri francisco dacre manumitendi et francos faciendi Dimitrium et Stamati eius sclauos etc in forma.’ partially transcribed in Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, p.92 Register entry 1.

\(^{43}\) Vertot, History of the knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem styled afterwards the knights of Rhdoes and at present the knights of Malta, Volume 4, p. 12; Abbe de Vertot, Histoire des Chevaliers Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem : appelés depuis Chevaliers de Rhodes, et ensuite Chevaliers de Malte, (Pelaguard et Lesne, 1839), volume 4 p. 20 ‘…huit cens femmes ou filles, qu'ils firent prisonnières & esclaves.’


\(^{45}\) Patterson, Slavery and Social Death, p. 182.

\(^{46}\) Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, 'Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).', p. 394 ‘…ni del signor Du Mont, viaggiatore francese che visitò l’isola nel giugno 1690: Quasi tutti i Maltesi hanno degli schiavi di proprietà da cui si fanno servire al posto dei valletti…’


paid servants.49 Although apart from the saving of having a domestic slave there would have other benefits for the slaveholder such as additional control and prestige.

Slave ownership as a sign of Status

Emanuel Buttigieg in his study of status within the Order has observed that ‘The predominantly male world of the Hospitallers in the Convent in Malta was characterised by an intricate configuration of the correlation of power with status, patriarchy, honour, credit, age, seniority and gender.’50 As a result of this correlation, control over commanderies was a key mark of status within the Order. Buttigieg highlights this with a quote from Brother D’Amor who asserted that ‘...he’d rather enjoy a good commandery for twenty years, than enjoy heaven for three years.’51 As mentioned in the chapter on galley slavery, to gain a commandery a Brother had to complete four Caravans on board a galley.52  

Brothers were required to engage in slave taking as part of military success at sea to gain status, it is not surprising that within the Order a link between slave ownership and status would develop, a similar relationship can be seen in early medieval warrior fraternities.53

Within the existing Hospitaller discourse the link between slave ownership and status has not been explored, despite being evident within the sources. Higher ranking members of the Order had more status, more wealth and more slaves; when Grand Master de Valette died in 1568 he owned 530 slaves, who were not all personal slaves, as he owned 2 galleys and so a number would have been galley slaves.54 Carmelo Trasselli provides a breakdown of the number of slaves on board the Order’s galleys in 1590 when the average number of slaves per galley was 126. Thus, it is likely that half of de Valette’s slaves were galley slaves, and a large number of the rest were personal slaves.55 Given that such a relationship between status and slave ownership is apparent, which will be further explored below, that this has not been addressed within the Hospitaller discourse is surprising. As noted in the chapter on galley slavery within the existing discourse some arguments and approaches have

---

49 Capello, Decrittione di Malta Anno 1716, A venetian Account, p. 56, line 155-156, ‘Un gran risparmio ancroa per le famiglie e il servirsi de schiavi, evitando la servitu pagata...’
50 Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 87.
51 Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 83, translating Cathedral Archives of Mdina, Malta, Archives of the Inquisition of Malta, Criminal Proceedings, Vol. 170, Case 102, n.p., 30 April 1610 ‘come luij tiene piu’ a charo de Godere una comedha buona per vinti anni, che godere il paradiso per tre annj’.
52 Grima, The fleet of the knights of Malta, p. 188; Fodor, ‘Maltese Pirates, Ottoman Captives And French Traders In The Early Seventeenth century Mediterranean’, p. 225; Buttigieg, Nobility, Faith and Masculinity.
53 David Wyatt, Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800 -1200, (Brill, 2009), p. 39 ‘In these societies direct exploitation and naked power were avenues toward honour, prestige and status. Slavery was not simply an institution concerned with the manipulation of labour and financial gain; it also had a strong psychological facet.’
54 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 384, references AOM 431 folio 259.
sought to distance the Order from engaging in slavery. It is difficult to make such arguments with regard to domestic slavery, which may have encouraged non-engagement. Similarly, arguments are made to justify the use of slaves on galleys, such as Ruth Pike’s comment; ‘In order to avoid a crushing economic burden there was no alternative but to depend on a servile rowing force.’ While domestic slaves may have been cheaper than servants, domestic slaves were not necessary to the Order’s operations but rather highlight the knights ‘...strong predilection for the employment of slave-labour.’ Additionally, it may be unpalatable for some historians to address that a Christian Order made such widespread use of slaves contrary to modern anti-slavery Christian doctrine.

These factors, combined with the overall lack of documentation contribute to why this topic has not been addressed.

The link between slaveholding and status within the Order is not surprising as this was the case in most slaveholding societies. Ruth Karras and Hannah Barker highlight the social value of slaves in Mediterranean society and cite a Mamluk saying; ‘...slaves, even if they consume your wealth, increase your prestige.’ Peter Earle notes that, ‘...slaves had a status value as well as an economic value in Islam.’ This is presented in contrast to Christianity, implying that slave ownership was not a symbol of status. A rather selective interpretation of Christianity that ignores the strong relationship between status and slave ownership present in multiple Christian societies, where the civilised Christian is often defined in contrast to non-Christian outsiders who can be enslaved.

Additionally within the medieval context that Earle is addressing this ignores the use of slaves to symbolise status and power by Christians, such as the monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner and the monument of the four moors in Livorno. On Malta, slaves served as valets, no doubt a

---

56 Sire, The Knights of Malta, p. 92; Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 10, ‘From the general silence on this subject one might assume that Christian Europe has had a collective feeling of guilt about the activity of its corsairs...’
57 Pike, Penal servitude in early modern Spain, p. 4.
58 Thornton, Memoir on the finances of Malta, p. 51.
59 Zahra, ‘The underground slave prisons at Vittoriosa’, pp. 53 -60 ‘The Order being a religious order, considered the slaves as human beings and were not inclined to maltreat them.’; Morris, ‘Emancipation in Byzantium: Roman law in a medieval society’, pp. 130-144, ‘Slavery is an anomaly in any Christian society.’; Muscat, Slaves on Maltese Galleys, p. 19
60 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, p. 79 ‘...in all slave societies.. the honor of the master was enhanced by the subjection of his slave...’
61 Barker and Karras, That Most Precious Merchandise, p. 71.
62 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 90
63 Patterson, Slavery and Social death, p.7; Wyatt, Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800 - 1200, p. 10
64 See appendix 4 for the monument of the four moors; Stephanie Nadalo, ‘Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier: Livorno’s Turkish Bagno (1547-1747)’, Mediaevalia, vol. 32 (2011), pp. 275-324.
display of an individual’s wealth. The relationship between increased status and increased numbers of personal servants was built into the statutes and regulations of the Order; the statutes of 1332 outlined that the Marshal was permitted to take four slaves from the treasury and the Grand Master had the right to possess thirty. As noted above, the Order provided rations to support Brother slaves; six slaves for Knights of the Grand Cross, and ten slaves for the head of each of the seven Tongues.

Within the slave manumission documents the rank of the slave’s owner is often provided, for example in 1347 two slaves, father and son, were freed; they had worked in the Grand Master’s house and were manumitted after paying Brother Guillelmu de Sparano, the Seneschal of the Master’s household, 29 gold florins. On the 22nd of August 1451, Grand Master John de Lastic freed the slave Georginus in return for services performed for the late William de Lastic, preceptor of Phinkas and Anoyira in Cyprus. On the same day in 1451, the Grand Master freed another slave that had served William de Lastic, Louis, who had been purchased by William de Lastic. The hierarchy of slave ownership within the Order was made evident in 1547 when the Grand Master ordered all privately owned slaves to work on Fort St Angelo; the Grand Master and his council were given an exemption from this and were each allowed to keep one personal slave. This in turn, suggests they each had control over multiple enslaved domestics and that it was more important for them to retain the use of one slave than other members of the Order because of their status. In 1436 Brother Joan de Vilagut the prior of Aragon was permitted to free a portion of his domestic

---

65 Fontenay, Marzialetti, and Borello, ‘Il Mercato Maltese Degli Schiavi Al Tempo Dei Cavalieri Di San Giovanni (1530-1798).’, p. 394 ‘…ni del signor Du Mont, viaggiatore francese che visitò l’isola nel giugno 1690: Quasi tutti i Maltesi hanno degli schiavi di proprietà da cui si fanno servire al posto dei valletti…’


67 ‘…inoltre I Gran Croce avevano diritto a 12 tumoli al mese per sei [criados]; y cada piller cabeca de lengua de siete que son, a 20 tumoli per dieci [criados]…’ Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese del secolo xvi’, pp. 474-80; Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy, p. 81.

68 ‘(1347) La meme annee, le 8 juillet, sont affranchise deux esclaves de Negrepont, pere et fils, appartenant a la maison du grand-maire.’ Charles verlinden, L’esclavage dans L’europe medieval, (Peninsula iberique, France, 1955) volume 2, pp. 975-6; Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, Register number 2, 3; AOM 317 folio 234v, 239v.


71 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 297 references AOM 887 Folio 102v.
slaves, thereby highlighting that he possessed a significant number.\(^{72}\) The Brother’s servants were not always slaves, while at sea the Captain-General was allowed 4 servants and the Captain 2, in this case, these servants could not be slaves, likely because of the risks in having slaves on the ship, but the relationship between having more servants and being of a higher rank is clear.\(^{73}\) Similarly, the 1428 lease of the preceptory of Cyprus to Brother Angelino Muscetulla and Brother Pedro Sarnes required the provision of six servants for the preceptor’s use when he visited every two years.\(^{74}\)

From these examples, not only was there a relationship between status and slave ownership but that relationship was explicitly outlined and facilitated by the Order.

Members of the Order encountered slavery daily; the Chapter of 1357 permitted each *auberge*, the hall where members of each Tongue ate, to keep one Turkish slave.\(^{75}\) The *auberge* was the focus of the communal life of each Tongue, and in 1590 the head of each Tongue was provided with rations by the Order to support 10 slaves.\(^{76}\) In 1585 notices were placed in all the *auberges* and lodgings of the knights ordering them to send their slaves to the prisons during the night, on pain of confiscation.\(^{77}\)

The *auberges* contained slaves, some of which appear to have been sleeping there. Brothers had to engage in naval service to progress in the Order, of which slave-raiding was a core aspect and being on a galley surrounded by enslaved oarsmen. Further progression allowed the Brother to be assigned additional slaves. The relationship between the Order and slaveholding was not simply accepted but encouraged, gaining additional slaves was a part of being promoted. From the monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner it would seem that the connection to enslavement was something that was respected.

In many contexts where slave ownership and status are linked there is an element of spectacle, slaves are used as a means of displaying wealth, this is often seen with regard to slaves that are used

---

\(^{72}\) AOM 352 folio 67 transcribed in Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, Register entry 47; Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaler slaves’, p. 110.

\(^{73}\) Aom 161 folio 113v, 118r-v, Grima, *The fleet of the knights of Malta*, p. 148.

\(^{74}\) Lease of the Preceptory of Cyprus for Seven Years to Fr. Angelino Muscetulla and Fr. Pedro Sarnes, AOM 384 folio 238v- 239v ‘Insper quod dicti arrendatores teneantur et debeant anno quolibet exponere et expendere florenos quingentos Rhodi in reparation et emendation prefaite preceptorie ad ordinationem et dispositionem ipsius preceptoris seu visitatoris, quem nos prefatus magister destinabimus ibidem de duobus annis in visitatoris, quem nos prefatus magister destinabimus ibidem de doubus annis in doubus annis. Et quod dicti arrendatores teneantur et debeant dare expensas dicto preceptorii seu visitatorii ipso applicato in Cipro visitation durante, videlicent dicto preceptorii cum VI equis et VI familiaribus seu servitoribus tantummodo.’ Transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, *Documents Concerning Cyprus*, Document 89.

\(^{75}\) Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes 1306-1440’, p. 86.

\(^{76}\) ‘...y cada piller cabeca de lengua de siete que son, a 20 tumoli per dieci [criados]...’ Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese del secolo xvi’, pp. 474-80; Abela, *Hospitaler Malta and the Mediterranean Economy*, p. 81.

\(^{77}\) AOM 96 Folio 43–43v, 44v noted in Brogini, ‘Une activité sous contrôlé: l’esclavage à Malte à l’époque modern’, pp. 49-61; Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 65.
to entertain guests.⁷-eight This appears to have occurred within the Hospitaller slave system as well; in 1482 The Ottoman Prince Jem was held on Rhodes before being moved to France, and while on Rhodes he purchased 20 slaves including a female Turkish slave formerly owned by Grand Master Pierre d’Aubusson, who sang to Prince Jem.⁷-nine The use of slaves for entertainment continued on Malta; included in Grand Master Verdalle’s 1595 testamentary manumission were seven musicians.⁸-ten Three of the Musicians were Indian slaves that Verdalle had purchased; Verdalle had chosen to purchase slaves that provided a luxury service, this purchase was a display of wealth, wealth derived from his status.⁸-one Similarly, Iris Origo highlights that Pope Pius II also had enslaved musicians.⁸-two The Grand Masters appear to have had slaves assigned to specific tasks; in 1511 a Turkish slave named Cusseo a gardener, was freed by Grand Master Emery d’Amboise.⁸-three The baptised slave Antonio Fornez was the coach-driver of Grand Master Nicholas Cotoner, he died in the Holy Infirmary in Valletta in 1679 aged 29, the cause of death was not recorded.⁸-four That the Grand Masters had slaves assigned to specific roles such as musician, gardener and coach driver suggested that they must have had large numbers of slaves to allow such specialisation.

Grand Master Verdalle had a servile artist, Filippo Paladini. In 1595 Grand Master Verdalle also requested that the Grand Duke Ferdinand I of Tuscany free the artist Filippo Paladini.⁸-five The example

---


⁸-four P. Cassar, ‘A note on three Libri Mortuorum of the Holy Infirmary, the Civil Hospital of Valletta and the Central Civil Hospital of Floriana (1677-1885)’, *Proceedings of History Week* (1981), pp. 86-93.

⁸-five Gioacchino Di Marzo, ‘Di Filippo Paladini Pittore Fiorentino Della Fine Del Secolo Xvi E De’ Primordi Del Xvii: Memorie Raccolte.’ *Archivio Storico Italiano* 9, No. 128 (1882), pp. 174–97, This letter exists in the Archive of
of Filippo Paladini is rather unusual, in 1587 the Grand Duke Francesco I of Tuscany condemned Paladini to the galleys.\(^8\) Keith Sciberras describes him as ‘...a galley slave and convicted criminal’, this conflates galley slaves and convicts sentenced to the galleys, Forzati.\(^9\) Paladini was likely a Forzato rather than a slave as he was not named in the slaves freed by Verdalle, and Verdalle did not purchase Paladini, which is why a letter was sent to Ferdinando I to request Paladini be freed.\(^8\) In 1589, Verdalle commissioned Paladini to serve as an artist, notably creating a series of frescoes depicting events from Verdalles life.\(^8\) How Verdalle became aware of Paladini or arranged for him to be an artist on Malta is unclear. For 6 years Paladini served Verdalle, he may not have been a slave but he was not free, as it was only on his death bed that Verdalle requested that Paladini be freed by Ferdinando I.\(^9\) This is significant as it highlights not only that the Grand Master made use of servile labour, usually slaves, for luxury roles but that this could include fellow European Christians in some circumstances. Additionally, Verdalle took no steps to change that situation fully benefiting from the services of Paladini until his death, while in a position of dominance over Paladini who was not free and who likely could have been returned to the galley at the Grand Masters’ whim.

It appears that the importance of slave ownership in relation to status drove some members of the Order into debt. In 1453 Brother Robinet Puysin complained that Brother Antonio Tebaldi owed him 47 ducats for the purchase of a number of slaves.\(^9\) Brother Robinet Puysin had borrowed the sum from Bartolomeo Doria, a merchant of Genoa and resident of Rhodes who wanted repayment; Brother Antonio Tebaldi was mandated by Grand Master Jean de Latic to repay his debt to

---


\(^8\) Gioacchino. ‘Di Filippo Paladini Pittore Fiorentino Della Fine Del Secolo Xvi E De’ Primordi Del Xvii: Memorie Raccolte.’, pp. 174–97, This letter exists in the Archive of Slato in Florence, in the Medici Archive, and properly in the correspondence of the Grand Duke Ferdinando I, file 859, letters of May and June of 1595, fog. 780, ‘Fra le altre cose , che monsignor illmo cardinale gran maestro mio signore , di felice memoria , ordinò netti ultimi suoi giorni , fu che per li buoni et continu servicii ricevuti da Filippo Paladini pittore intendeva et ordinava che fosse posto in libertà.’


Bartolomeo Doria or to appear in court in three months.\textsuperscript{92} That this case came before the Grand Master suggests that this had become a serious issue. It is unclear why Brother Antonio Tebaldi needed to purchase a number of slaves that he could not afford, but this suggests that for the Order slave ownership was not a purely economic venture; the benefits for Brother Antonio of owning additional slaves, from his perspective, must have outweighed the costs. Given that slave ownership was a mark of status and wealth in the Order for the Brothers there would have been a desire to achieve prestige by owning as many slaves as possible, even going into debt.

Emanuel Buttigieg emphasized the importance of patronage to members of the Order; ‘Many Hospitallers strove to accumulate as many commanderies as possible, since these not only enriched them but also gave them the possibility of patronising others.’\textsuperscript{93} One form of patronage seems to have taken place through the giving of enslaved people as gifts, this is not unexpected and occurred in a range of different slaveholding contexts as a result of the value of slaves and their relationship to status, especially with female slaves.\textsuperscript{94} Gift giving was extremely significant and complex in the medieval context creating links between the gift giver and receiver.\textsuperscript{95} When Grand Master Verdalle died in 1595 in his will he freed 27 slaves, many of whom were in different locations, or being held by different people: four of the freed slaves were with the seneschal in Rome, and had been baptised; one of them was 10 years old, highlighting the Order’s ownership of enslaved children.\textsuperscript{96} Additionally, Brother Antonio Montana had a 14-year-old slave.\textsuperscript{97} Two slaves were with

\textsuperscript{92} AOM 363, fol. 140v transcribed in Tsirpanlis, \textit{Unpublished documents concerning}, document 298, pp. 689-690; Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, \textit{Documents concerning Cyprus}, Document 302, p. 417, ‘Quod si facere recursaveritis, quod non credimus, ad instanciam dictorum vos citamus, quod in termino trium mensium computandorum a die, quo presentes nostre littere vobis presentabuntur, quorum unus pro primo, alter pro secundo et tertiis pro tercio et ultimo termino vobis assignantur, personaliter sive per procuratorem vestrum sufficienter instruc tum compareatis in hoc nostro conventu Rhodi ad alegandum iura vestra, et quale mandatis nostris huiusmodi non parueritis, quia ordinis nostri vobis sive procuratori vestro administrabimus iusticie complementum.’

\textsuperscript{93} Buttigieg, \textit{Nobility, faith and masculinity}, p. 79.


\textsuperscript{96} ‘Con il S[ign] or Senescallo In Roma Antonio da Pistoya Reconciliato, Il cui nome era Prima Jsuff usein ogli Jo[hanni] Batt[ist]a Dann i xa勤劳a, il cui nome era Prima Memi Xaccor ogli caradenglis Battegiato in Roma Francesco Cucciano Battegiato in Malta, il cui nome era prima ferag.’ AOM 6385 folio 41-42, in ‘List of slaves freed by the Will of Grand Master Verdalle 1595’, pp. 449-451.

Commendatore Salbac; they were brothers and had been baptised in 1588. The three female slaves from the House of Sommaripa were freed; this Venetian noble family had ruled Andros and Paros before their conquest by the Ottomans. As several of the slaves freed are described as ‘in various places’, it seems likely that the Grand Master had bestowed his slaves as gifts around various people as a sign of status. Similarly, when Innocent VII was given 100 Moors in 1488 by Ferdinand of Spain, he similarly distributed them among the cardinals and Roman nobles. It appears that the Order was engaged in similar slave distribution as a form of patronage. Indeed Bono argues that the Order often dispensed slaves as a tribute to rulers or people they felt deserved a reward. He highlights that in 1637 the Grand Master sent two female slaves to the viceroy of Naples and in 1644 the ambassador of the Order sent the viceroy of Sicily two female slaves; in both cases, it was requested that the slaves should be well dressed. In 1656 the Order again sent 3 female slaves as a gift to the viceroy of Sicily, the slaves in question had been captured in 1644 on the Ottoman Gran Galeone. From this example, the Order was not only purchasing slaves specifically to use as gifts but using previously captured slaves, by 1656 these women had been slaves on Malta for 12 years before being sent to Sicily. The Brothers also gave slaves to each other although this appears to have been poorly documented; in 1437 Brother Louis de Lusignan, preceptor of Phinikas and Anoyira, gave a 10-year-old male Greek slave to Brother Angelino Muscetulla, preceptor of the Baiulia of Cyprus and Admiral, and this exchange was confirmed by the Grand Master. Additionally in 1608

---


101 ‘Altrettanto i cavalieri di Malta erano grandi dispensatori di schiavi in segno di omaggio a sovrani, a personaggi di alto rango anche soltanto a chi meritate una qualche gratifica.’ Bono, _Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici_, p. 147.

102 ‘Nel luglio 1637 il gran maestro e il consiglio disposero un ‘presente’ di due ‘schiavette’ alla viceregina di Napoli, raccomandando che fossero ‘ben vestite’. Qualche anno piu tardi, per ringraziare il viceré di Sicilia della buona accoglienza all’ambasciatore dell’ordine, si dispose l’acquisto di ,due schiavette per mandarle ben vestite alla suddetta sig.ra viceregina>’, Bono, _Schiavi musulmani nell’italia moderna Galeotti, vu’ cumpra’, domestici_, p. 147, Bono references AOM 256 folio 171 (1637) and AOM 257 folio 179v (1644); That well dressed female slaves are given as gifts could suggest they were intended as personal servants or a more overt sexual characteristic, Origo, ‘The Domestic Enemy’, p. 355; Wyatt, _Slaves and warriors_, p. 135.
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the artist Caravaggio was given two slaves as a gift for painting the Beheading of Saint John for the oratory of the Order’s church in Valletta.\textsuperscript{106} Often such movement of privately owned slaves was undocumented.

The use of slaves as gifts shows that slaves were considered a worthy gift and could even be sent abroad to foreign leaders. This further highlights the commodification and dehumanisation of the slaves by the Order, from Verdalle’s will it is clear that slaves, including children, were sent abroad as gifts, likely with little hope of seeing their families again or being ransomed but this does not appear to have been a concern for the Order. For the slaves, the threat of being sent abroad would have been terrifying, in the New World plantation owners would intentionally move slaves to different locations to break social connections, such as marriages.\textsuperscript{107} This is another example of the Order engaging in common slaveholding behaviours, which highlights that the actions and behaviours of individual brothers relating to slave ownership do not appear to have been noticeably affected by their status as a Christian Order or the vows that individual Brothers took. This further suggests they would have been involved in other common slaveholding behaviours such as sexual exploitation of their slaves.

\textbf{Vow of chastity, slaves, and prostitutes}

Karras and Barker highlight that in relation to the late medieval Mediterranean; ‘...all female slaves were assumed to be sexually available to their male owners...’\textsuperscript{108} Similarly Sally McKee, argued ‘...sexual service undoubtedly contributed largely to the demand for slave women in Italian households.’\textsuperscript{109} Sexual exploitation of enslaved peoples was part of the way that slaveholders asserted power over their slaves.\textsuperscript{110} As a result, sexual exploitation of slaves is a widespread feature of slaveholding societies to the extent that Patterson stated; ‘I know of no slaveholding society in which a master, when so inclined, could not exact sexual services from his female slaves.’\textsuperscript{111} Susan Mosher Stuard describing Medieval Ragusa stated that; ‘Slaves provided this bachelor population with domestic services, which promoted civil tranquillity. An urban, largely male, unmarried population could be as detrimental to the keeping of the peace.’\textsuperscript{112} The situation in Ragusa has some parallels with the male, urban, unmarried population of the Order. The Order would have been aware of the cultural acceptance of the sexual exploitation of slaves. Although there is a lack of
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direct evidence regarding the sexual exploitation of slaves by the Order; Emanuel Buttigieg has noted that ‘...no evidence has so far emerged of sexual intercourse between Hospitallers and their slaves...’ The absence of evidence is not surprising as Simon Phillips notes ‘...records of misdemeanours and the Order’s reaction to them are hard to come by in the surviving Hospitaller documents, partly, one would suspect because the Order wanted to avoid scandal.’ Similar gaps in the documentation exist regarding the sexual exploitation of slaves in other slaveholding contexts, as Sally McKee states in regard to Renaissance Italy, ‘The private, unrecorded nature of human sexual activity makes it impossible to document...’ As a result of this private nature, any accusation that members of the Order were involved in sexual activity with their slaves would likely have only come from the slaves themselves and as Abela notes the Inquisition on Malta did not particularly value the testimony of slaves.

Both Wettinger and Bono have highlighted that the ownership of female slaves potentially compromised the Brothers’ oath of chastity. Additionally, both interpret the 1698 decree as an attempt to prevent the Knights from engaging in sexual exploitation with their slaves; in 1698 it was decreed that the Brothers were forbidden from owning female slaves under the age of 50, which was intended to prevent the Brothers from deviating from a life of purity. It appears that the leadership of the Order believed that Brothers were potentially engaging in sexual activity with their slaves. Additionally, that this regulation was required when the Brothers had owned female slaves for more than three centuries may suggest that more Brothers were sexually exploiting their slaves in this period. Wettinger views this restriction as solving the issue ‘Thus the possibility of sexual misbehaviour by the slave-owners who were knights at the expense of their female slaves was at length recognised and guarded against.’ This appears to be rather naive for several reasons, firstly sexual exploitation of slaves is a key aspect of slaveholding and with the slaveholding behaviours of the Order already reflecting other slaveholding societies it seems a reasonable assumption to make.
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without clear evidence to the contrary. Secondly, Wettinger appears to be suggesting that this rule would be adhered to completely, which is unlikely as the Order had difficulty enforcing the requirement for Brother’s slaves to sleep in the slave prisons, which had to be reissued multiple times, which is highlighted by Wettinger.121 Thirdly, Wettinger without evidence seems to assume that the Brothers would not engage in sexual activity with slaves over the age of 50, despite there being examples of Brothers in long-term relationships that bore children.122 Finally, and most significantly, sexual intercourse between Brothers and prostitutes, which is better documented, continued despite multiple attempts to prevent it.

Throughout the Order’s time on Rhodes and Malta references to prostitutes are common, as early as 1421 the Order banned Knights from associating with prostitutes and Paul Cassar argues that prostitution only became significant on Malta only after the Order took control of it in 1530.123 On Malta, in 1581 the Order deposed Grand Master Jean L’Evesque de la Cassiere partly as a result of him issuing a ban on prostitutes in Valletta.124 Cassar suggests that this provides a clear indication that the vow of chastity was no longer being observed, contending that: ‘With the passage of years corruption and moral decadence had seriously infiltrated the ranks of the Order so that by 1581 the vow of chastity to which every knight pledged himself on joining the fraternity had become practically extinguished.’125 Although there are earlier examples, Juan Fernandez de Heredia was elected Grand Master in 1377 despite having at least 4 illegitimate children.126 Grand Master Vallette had two children from Catherine Greque. 127 Christine Muscat has argued that the Grand Masters did not consider prostitutes to be either undesirable or dangerous and in general had a laissez-faire attitude towards them.128 It appears to have been relatively common for the Grand Masters to
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associate with prostitutes.129 Given that this attitude was evident from the leader of the Order it would not be surprising for other members of the Order to have acted similarly. If the Brother were willing to violate their vow to engage in sexual intercourse with a prostitute, it is reasonable to suspect they would sexually exploit their slaves.

The Order appears to have been far more active in trying to restrict the Brothers from soliciting prostitutes than policing the Brother’s sexual exploitation of their slaves.130 As mentioned previously, in 1581 the Grand Master attempted to ban prostitutes from Valletta.131 After this the approach focused on controlling where prostitutes could live within Valletta; in 1591 Grand Master Hugh Loubenx de Verdalle, prohibited prostitutes from living on public roads or near churches.132 Yet these efforts appear to have been largely unsuccessful as in 1596 the Inquisitor Innocenzo Del Bufalo wrote to the Pope highlighting the great number of prostitutes on Malta, especially in Valletta.133 Similarly, in 1631 a commission moved prostitutes away from the main streets of Valletta.134 This approach does not seem to have had a meaningful impact, as Christine Muscat notes the regulated area was not particularly large, ‘...living outside the regulated streets meant that one could literally be living around the corner.’ as a result, Grand Master Antoine de Paule simply moved his courtesan Flaminia Valenti outside the regulated area.135

The regulation of prostitution was lacklustre and being violated by those who lead the Order, such regulation may have been a result of prostitution being more visible and more public. Visitors to
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Malta and the Inquisition often wrote about the large number of prostitutes in Malta. Christine Muscat argues that some of these reports were attempts to discredit the Order, although by the Order’s attempts to regulate prostitution they acknowledged the issue. The Order by not regulating the Brothers sexually exploiting their slaves could deny that it occurred. Additionally, if the Order were to engage in sexual intercourse, it would have been preferable for it to be a prostitute rather than a slave; Many of the Order’s slaves were Muslims, sexual intercourse between Christians and non-Christians would have resulted in severe punishment by the Inquisition. In some ways, this is similar to the Order’s treatment of sodomy. Giovanni Bonello noted ‘The subject of male prostitution receives very little attention in the records. That homosexual behaviour was rife is undoubted.’ Buttigieg has outlined several cases of members of the Order being accused of sodomy but notes that the documentation is limited. Liam Gauci has highlighted the difficulty in studying Hospitaller sodomy, ‘It is very difficult to study such phenomena on board ships; at times the subject was so taboo that it was not even mentioned by name...’ Additionally Gauci details the case of Pietro de Giovanni Zelalich, who was enslaved by the Ottomans, but managed to overpower the ship and sail it to Malta and then became a corsair captain but was known to be sexually involved with a fellow sailor, but he was not investigated by the inquisition which Gauci links to his rank or perhaps his economic means. It is likely that other illicit sexual activity was also being kept hidden, it is not surprising that the Order would have wished to hide the existence of homosexual behaviour as it was considered a very grave sin. During the trial of the Templars, one of the charges brought against them was that of sodomy. Those accused of sodomy were severely punished: in 1616 the Scottish traveller William Lithgow witnessed two men being burnt at the stake for the crime of sodomy. There is a lack of evidence addressing the Brothers having sexual
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intercourse with their slaves overall; with regard to male slaves there is no evidence which is not surprising, as Buttigieg notes such activity; ‘...would have implied an unacceptable inversion of the social order...’

This was also true more generally across the Mediterranean, Ruth Karras and Hannah Barker have noted that homosexual sex between owners and slaves; ‘...was illicit and acknowledged only in certain contexts.’

In 1551 Nicolas de Nicolay visited Malta and noted the abundance of courtesans, which included Moors. This raises another consideration, who are the Moorish courtesans Nicolay is referring to, he lists them as distinct from the Maltese so he is not conflating the two, these could be freed slaves, or perhaps slaves working as prostitutes; Anne Brogini has noted that in 1598 a Christian slave named Victoria was a prostitute on Malta. With regard to the terminology of prostitution, Christine Muscat has noted that; ‘Identifying who’s who, is at times an impossible task.’ It is possible that the courtesans identified by Nicolay were, in fact, domestic slaves, similarly Brydone in 1770 noted; ‘There were about thirty knights in each galley, making signals all the way to their mistresses...’ This is a possible factor in explaining the lack of references to Brothers engaging in the sexual exploitation of their slaves. The Brothers actively purchased female slaves; Wettinger outlines the 66 slave sales registered in the deeds of the Notary Nicolo de Agatiis between September 1543 and August 1544. In 1544 Brother Guglelmo Bombast purchased a 30-year-old female slave, in the same year Brother Johanni Antoni Pignuni purchased 3 slaves, 2 female and 1 male, additionally Brother Xaccari Cackie bought a 13-year-old female slave. While it is not explicit that these slaves were meant for personal or sexual use, the values were not notably inflated compared to the other slave sales in the register, which suggests there was no expectation that these slaves were of some particular significance as individuals or were likely to be ransomed. Friedman links the sexual exploitation of female captives to their reduced likelihood for ransom, ‘...it was taken for granted that their captivity included sexual harassment, and they were thus
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considered morally tainted.’

Friedman goes further and states ‘...that some female captives preferred to stay in captivity, rather than face their former society...’, this presents the situation as a choice which would not have existed for the individual if their family did not want to ransom them as a result of assumed sexual exploitation. This further highlights how ubiquitous sexual exploitation was within slaveholding systems, the complex ransom process will be addressed more in the ransom chapter.

Overall the Order engaged in many of the behaviours evident in other slaveholding contexts, such as using slaves as gifts and linking slave ownership to status. Sexual exploitation of slaves is a key part of slaveholding behaviours. The evidence that the Brothers engaged in sexual exploitation of their slaves is circumstantial but given that the vows of chastity did not prevent many Brothers from engaging in sexual activity with prostitutes similar activity with their domestic slaves would not be unexpected. That the Order would try to avoid scandal by hiding this activity is also not a surprise. With regard to engaging in sexual intercourse with prostitutes, it would appear that the very leadership of the Order was at fault. Returning to the decree of 1698 which forbid Brothers from owning female slaves under the age of fifty, which was intended to prevent the Brothers from deviating from a life of purity. This was brought in under Grand Master Ramon Perellos. Giacomo Capello writing in 1716 noted that Grand Master Ramon Perellos was paralysed through the overuse of mercury, which he ironically stated was treatment for exceeding chastity. Mercury was used to treat venereal disease on Malta. In a situation where the promiscuity of the Grand Master was being highlighted by visitors to the island, this culture where the regulations were disregarded by the leadership can only have encouraged other members of the Order to also disregard the regulations and engage in sexual exploitation of their domestic slaves.

Manumission of Personal slaves

It appears that in some instances the Brother became rather attached to specific slaves, Emanuel Buttigieg notes that in 1603 the Inquisition investigated Brother Vincenzo lo Monte who had fallen in love with a Christian slave, Francesca. In 1552 Brother Oswald Massingberd was confined to his house for three months after attempting to carry off the female slave of a Maltese nobleman named
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Paolo Fiteni whom Massingberd had beaten. This appears to have been the result of a dispute over the ownership of the female slave; Paolo Fiteni had recently purchased her while Massingberd believed that he should have had a preference in purchasing her from the Order. This violence suggests that the slave in question meant something to Massingberd beyond the status of owning a slave. William Zammit has outlined how domestic slaves could become integrated into the slaveholder’s household; ‘...at times almost becoming part of the family, occasionally even being granted their freedom following the demise of their owner.’ There is a lack of accounts from domestic slaves but it is unlikely that they would have felt part of the family, their situation was incredibly precarious and the slaveholder had a huge amount of control over them, integrating into the slaveholders household often involved the slave taking on aspects of the slaveholder’s culture, such as becoming Christian. From the surviving manumission documents, it appears that domestic slaves were more likely to be freed than other groups of slaves that did not have a relationship with a specific member of the Order, such as galley slaves. As previously noted when Grand Master Verdalle died in 1595 he freed 27 of the 230 slaves he owned, these appear to have mostly been domestic slaves either held by him or held abroad, none appear to have been galley slaves. Although it is also possible that because slave manumissions had to be authorised by the Grand Master more of these documents have survived. Despite this the surviving manumission documents provide an insight into slaveholding behaviours, illuminating how the system operated and under what circumstances slaves, typically domestic, were freed.

Many of these manumissions were testamentary, as a result, the Brother did not free the slave but typically the Grand Master or the Treasury did at the posthumous request of the former slaveholder; in 1438 Andreas Russo was freed in accordance with the will of late Grand Master Anthony Fluvia by the Grand preceptor and the Convent on Rhodes. Testamentary manumission was also common in other slave systems as it allows for the slaveholder to continue to benefit from the slave for their entire life, for example Sally McKee found that 16% of wills in fourteenth century Crete included
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arrangements to free slaves. Both Origo and Blumenthal also found testamentary manumission to have occurred in medieval Valencia and Tuscany, where it was regarded as an act that would atone for past sins. Testamentary manumission was viewed as beneficial for the soul; it is likely that some slaveholders did not free their slaves for the slaves’ benefit but for their own absolution. This view is highlighted by Marc Bloch, ‘... to bestow liberty was for the master not a stern duty but at least an infinitely commendable act whereby the faithful, raising himself so far as to imitate the perfect life of the Saviour, worked for his own salvation.’ There was likely a similar link between manumission and charity for the Order, this would have been an act of charity that required slave ownership and was linked to status, high ranking members of the Order had more slaves, so were able to free more.

There was a distinction between domestic and agricultural slaves in the statutes of the Order, as Luttrell and O’Malley outline; ‘As early as 1311, the chapter general ruled that the slaves of deceased Hospitallers were to remain on the estates on which they were settled.’ A similar statute was issued in 1332, Luttrell states ‘This legislation concerned slaves who were attached to an agricultural estate rather than to an individual Hospitaller. Brethren of the convent at Rhodes did have personal slaves who, unless they had been freed with a proper licence, passed to the Treasury when their owner died.’ The treasury could then free the slave, for example in 1445 Thomas was freed by the treasury because of his service to the late John de Vilaraguy, the Castellan of Amposta, who had purchased him. That Thomas was transferred to the treasury suggests that he was not an agricultural slave. This highlights that there was a clear distinction between the two sets of slaves, and their purpose, a domestic slave who served a Brother returned to the treasury after the Brother died, when a Brother who ran a Hospitaller estate died, it is likely that they would be replaced, so the choice not to have the domestic slave remain to serve the next Brother suggests that the domestic slave was not considered part of the estate but linked specifically to that Brother.

The Grand Master had overall control of the manumission of the Order’s slaves; the ‘proper licence’ that Luttrell refers to relates to the statute of 1262 which outlined that members of the Order could

169 Luttrell, O’Malley, *The Countryside Of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423*, p. 36.; Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes 1306 -1440’, p. 86. ‘This legislation concerned slaves who were attached to an agricultural estate rather than to an individual Hospitaller.’
170 Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes: 1306-1440’, p. 85 references AOM 280 folio 24v 1332; AOM 69 folio 15v, latin translation from 1357. 1311 Biblioteca vaticana, ms vat lat 3136 folio 68.
only free their slaves with the permission of the Grand Master. The requirement for a special licence could result in complications. In 1381 Grand Master Juan Fernandez de Heredia confirmed the earlier manumission of Johannes de Licosteme, slave of Brother Jacobus de Vinestre, preceptor of Yeavely and Barrow; the previous Grand Master Robert de Julliy had died in 1376 before the licence was granted but despite this Brother Jacobus freed his slave regardless. It is unclear why the manumission from 5 years prior was being confirmed, Johannes de Licosteme’s freed status may have been questioned which highlighted the need for his manumission to be confirmed. Additionally, this suggests that Brother Jacobus must have assumed that the licence would be granted, otherwise his slave would have been incorrectly living as a freedman.

In 1348 Estomaquo Thomasii petitioned for freedom, as his owner the late Brother Petrus Oliti had secured a licence but died before completing the manumission. For this situation to have occurred Estomaquo must have known that he was going to be freed. This is contrary to Mark Kleijwegt’s view of testamentary manumission which he argues was dependent on feelings of affection from the slaveholder, as the slave was unlikely to have known they going to be freed as they would not be familiar with the slaveholder’s will. Although if testamentary manumission was relatively common, contrary to Kleijwegt’s argument, there would instead be an expectation of manumission that could be used by the slaveholder as a means of control over their slaves. Far from testamentary manumission being linked to a slaveholder’s affection, Patterson convincingly argues that testamentary manumission provided the slaveholder with the benefit of continued service from their slave for the whole of their life and could be used as a motivator for obedience without giving up any control as there was no requirement for the slaveholder to free their slave at all. Beyond the benefit for the slaveholder’s life through continued service clauses within testamentary manumissions, the slaveholder could assign their slave’s future service for no clear benefit to themselves as this was beyond the slaveholder’s death; in 1415 Jany Pully was freed specifically for his services to Brother Hesso Schlegelhotz, the late preceptor of Kos, on the condition of serving for another three years. The use of continued service conditions as part of testamentary
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manumissions by the Order is similar to what occurred in other slaveholding contexts.\textsuperscript{179} In 1421 the Grand Master and convent declare that the late Brother Petrus de Balma, a lieutenant on the island of Kos, manumitted Jacobinus in return for his service on the condition that he serve in the infirmary of the Convent at Rhodes for three years.\textsuperscript{180} Interestingly, the continued service was to take place on Rhodes for a slave that had served on Kos, possibly this was related to a slave being transferred to the Treasury after a Brother died, as until the continued service was completed the slave remained bound to the Treasury. Additionally, this is not the only case of a domestic slave being assigned to the infirmary, in 1453 George was manumitted by Grand Master John de Lastic because of his service to the late Bernard de Rochabruna, of the priory of Catalonia, and subsequently in the Hospitaller infirmary on Rhodes.\textsuperscript{181} The requirement for continued service in the Order’s hospital may have further supported manumission as a form of charitable activity, as the Slaveholder was assigning his slave to support the Order’s medical care vocation at no benefit to the slaveholder. As a comparison with agricultural slaves; in 1421 Janj Sergentin and Anthoni Soupy of the preceptory of Kos were freed at the request of Brother Jeno de Boys, on the condition that they continued to serve the Order for the rest of their days.\textsuperscript{182} In this manumission, there is no mention of service to a specific individual and the life of continued services possibly suggests they were agricultural slaves as their service was separate from a specific individual, this will be discussed further in the chapter on agricultural slavery.

Baptism was an important element in the manumission of slaves; when Grand Master Verdalle died in 1595 the slaves he freed were those that had been baptised.\textsuperscript{183} In 1436 Brother Joan de Vilagur, the prior of Aragon was given a licence to free a number of slaves in return for their domestic service and trustworthiness. He did not want them to remain slaves after his death and had them
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Baptism did not guarantee that a slave would be freed but it was seen as a sign of integration and made the slave more acceptable and less alien to the wider society thus baptised slaves were more likely to be freed, but this was never guaranteed and the slaveholder was under no obligation to free their slaves baptised or not. Additionally, Iris Origo highlights that only the manumission of baptised slaves was considered pious in medieval Tuscany. In 1451 a north African Berber named John was freed by John de Lastic for his services to the late prior of Catalonia Philip de Hortals, his former owner; from John’s name it is clear that he had been baptised, the taking of a Christian name was no doubt seen as a sign of integration. Slaves could be freed without having been baptised although this occurred more rarely; in 1511 the Turkish slave Cusseo who had been a gardener for the Grand Master was freed without having been baptised.

The link between Baptism and freedom appears to have been a concern for the Order, due to the likelihood that slaves would undertake insincere conversion to obtain their freedom. It appears that in the early thirteenth century the Order was preventing their slaves from being baptised; a Papal Bull of 28 July 1237 sought to address the issue of insincere conversion and commanded the Hospitalers to permit the baptism of those of their slaves in Syria, whose desire for baptism was a genuine one and who were prepared to remain in slavery. While the Order would then allow their slaves to be baptised the process was still regulated; a statute of 1262 forbade Brothers from baptising their slaves without permission from the Grand Master.  

On Malta it appears that slaves themselves were seeking baptism which members of the Order were preventing, several cases were brought before the Inquisitor of members of the Order objecting to
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the baptism of their slaves. In 1650 Brother Santurin was accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave, in 1669 Brother Gallucci was similarly accused, as was Brother Geronimo Tinvert in 1680. Emanuel Buttigieg noted that in 1641 Brother Lorenzo of Portugal stated; ‘if I had one hundred slaves I would rather burn them than make them Christians.’ Such views were not isolated to Malta; in Tuscany Franco Sacchetti in his sermons argued that slaves were not capable of baptism because they did not have free will and to free a slave was to expose them to the greater dangers of sin. There are a range of reasons why these Brothers may not have wanted their slaves to be baptised; the fear of insincere conversion may have motivated these objections but also concerns that because of the link to manumission the slave would then start to expect to be freed which would undermine the slaveholder’s dominance and control. Daniel Hershenzon highlights that historians cannot distinguish sincere conversions from insincere, a problem that was shared by the Order. Additionally in the same way that baptism was a means of integration into the slaveholder society, it was also separation from the slave’s previous religious identity, this reduced the slave’s chances of being ransomed, this will be discussed in more detail in the chapter on ransom. Domestic slavery has often been considered within the modern historiography as a rather benign institution, and since the slaves were part of their master’s household it has been viewed as a form of forced social integration. There is a lack of evidence with regard to resistance of personal slaves against those they served, as such occurrences were likely dealt with within the household. This integration should not be viewed as the slaves accepting their situation but as the slaves adopting strategies of accommodation. Such strategies still reveal the agency of the enslaved to attempt to improve their situation through manipulation and subtle rather than overt resistance.

Captives the Order enslaved were sometimes already baptised having come from Christian communities, or so they claimed. If a slave was proved to already have been a Christian, then their enslavement was unlawful and they were freed, but such status was difficult to prove and if
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191 Cassar, ‘1564-1698: the Inquisition index of knights Hospitallers of the Order of St John’, pp. 157-196, number 54. 4 June, 1599, Vol 169, Case 69, Denouncement - Fra Antonio Piccione, Italian was accused of having spoken against the Catholic faith to a convert slave. ; number 244. 18 June, 1650, Vol 171, Case 198, Denouncement Fra Santurin, Infermiere at the Sacra Infermeria, living at Valletta, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. ; number 293. 12 July, 1669 Vol 171, Case 230, Denouncement - Fra Gallucci, Neapolitan, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. He was liberated and absolved. ; number 309. 3 August, 1680 Vol 171, Case 246, Denouncement Fra Geronimo Tinvert, French, Order’s Ambassador to King Louis XIV of France, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. Sentence: he was admonished.
193 Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 120, references CAM aim cp Vol 170 case 170, no. 29.
196 Bensch, ‘From Prizes Of War To Domestic Merchandise’, p. 85; Blumenthal, Enemies and familiars, p. 2 specifically references Stephen Bensch article.
successful represented a financial loss for the Order. 197 Georgio Scala claimed to have been a Christian when the Order enslaved him in 1590, as a result he was brought before the Inquisitor Paolo Vellardito in 1591. He claimed to have been a Christian of the Greek rite, and three Moorish slaves declared that they knew Georgio, and confirmed that he was born of Christian parents.198 Georgio had been circumcised, but he alleged that Turks had abducted him and circumcised him against his will as a child. Joan Abela casts doubt on Georgio’s story; ‘It is difficult to decide whether Georgio was shrewd enough to concoct the whole story about his abduction and subsequent circumcision. No doubt, he knew that such a distinguishing non-Christian mark would greatly diminish his chances of being set free.’199 From Georgio’s perspective, it would have been beneficial for him to have been recognised as a Christian and be freed, but his attempt failed and he remained a slave. Although Georgio’s Christian identity may have been recognised by the inquisitor; in 1598 Reverend Papas Angelino Metaxi gave witness that the previous Inquisitor, Paolo Vellardito, had argued that Georgio should never have been enslaved, but he did not have the power to free him.200 It appears that the Order and the inquisition may have disagreed regarding Georgio’s status and he was enslaved regardless, it is unclear why the Order would have interpreted this differently from the inquisition, possibly they had doubts similar to Joan Abela and from their perspective, if Georgio was recognised as Christian then they would have had to free him which would have represented a loss for the Order, this may have encouraged them to be more doubtful of his story. Georgio was freed in 1595 when Grand Master Verdalle died and freed all of his personal slaves who were Christian, although Georgio was never reconciled so this appears to be an admission that he had indeed been Christian the whole time.201 This suggests that the Order was willing to enslave other Christians, even those whose Christian identity was accepted by the inquisition and this is not the only example of this; In 1607 Brother Fraascinet, was accused by the inquisition of having sold 20 Christian Russian and Hungarian women at the slave market in Messina.202 This indifference towards the religion of the captives appears to have been relatively common, as highlighted by Origo, ‘..it is quite plain that many of the Genoese and Venetian traders in the Black Sea paid little heed as to whether the human wares they carried had, or had not, been sanctified by baptism.’203 Origo further notes that there

\[197\] Abela, ‘Who was Georgio Scala’, p. 215.

\[198\] Aim, CP. Volume 10A folio 119v- 121 translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, p. 155.

\[199\] Abela, ‘Who was Georgio Scala’, p. 219.

\[200\] Aim cp, ms 16a, Fol 106-106v ‘ma che in quanto la liberta esso monsignore non ci poteva far altro’ translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, p. 144.

\[201\] Abela, ‘Who was Georgio Scala’, p. 222.

\[202\] Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 119, references AIM CP volume 170 case 169, case 91 folio 1-2, 1607.

were arguments in favour of the enslavement of Christians from Muslim lands as it was virtuous to buy a Christian slave from heathen lands and so save them. That the Order would enslave Christians further weakens the view of the Order as ‘...savior to many Christian slaves.’

When a slave was freed a stigma of their past status remained; a freedman was not a free man, they remained marginal and their previous status and religion were not forgotten. The example of Georgio Scala detailed above is only known about because of this stigma; his wife suspected that he was Muslim, there were claims he engaged in prostituting Christian women to Turkish slaves, and that he threatened to drink his wife’s blood as a result of him having been summoned to the Inquisitor. This is despite Georgio having taken steps to be part of Maltese society, his Christian identity was recognised by the Grand Master when he was freed in 1595, he had married and, from the witnesses at his trial, was part of a wider community, but still his position was unstable. These accusations represent society’s fears of the other and the stigma of having been a slave, especially fears linked to false conversion. After a detailed investigation, Georgio Scala was found to be guilty of apostasy; the other accusations came to nothing. As punishment Georgio had to publicly abjure in the Church of the Annunciation of Mary in Vittoriosa, serve the Jesuit college for a year and confess at least once a month for two years. While baptism was key to integration on Rhodes and Malta, for Muslim slaves conversion meant giving up on returning home. Charles Dalli argues that Georgio Scala’s engagement with Muslim slaves while claiming a vague Christian identity was to allow him a survival strategy based on cultural ambiguities and ill-defined identity; he could possess both an Islamic and Christian identity, engaging with whichever was more beneficial at the time and denying evidence of the other. Yet, if Georgio Scala had such a strategy it failed; he was brought before the Inquisition in 1598 as a result of the ambiguities of his Christian identity and this identity was found wanting, leading to the punishment for apostasy.
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205 Testa, Romegas, p. 2.
207 Aim CP MS 16a folio 93, ‘di modo che io credo che lo facesse per esser un mal Christiano.’; f. 80v ‘che il detto Georgio e homo de mala fama perche faceva professione di far godere christian donne femine Christiane da schiavi turchi e mori’; f.80 ‘la minaccio di volerla amazzare e bere il suo sangue per esser esaminato inanze il vicario di monsignore il vescovo’ translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, pp. 55-59, 100-101.
208 Ciappa, ‘The Date palm and the liver tree’, p. 261.
209 Aim cp, MS 16a folio 122r-v translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, p. 189.
210 Aim cp, MS 16a folio 122r-v translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, p. 189.
With regard to the reason for why a slaveholder would manumit their slave Marc Kleijwegt summaries that ‘One school of thought envisages that the benevolence of the owner and the thrust of humanitarian and abolitionist ideas led individual slave-owners to release their slaves. The other school of thought stresses that manumission enhances the master’s power of control and maintains that manumission was ruled by self-interest.’ In line with the first viewpoint, Steven Epstein has highlighted that the fact that the freeing of slaves was viewed as beneficial to the soul suggests that there were doubts over the morality of slavery. This view projects abolitionist and moral sentiments onto a group that did not engage in abolition and appears to have had no moral qualms with engaging in slavery, the Order on Malta continued to own slaves until the island was conquered in 1798. Patterson meanwhile argues for the second viewpoint that manumission was a means of control; ‘...post-mortem manumission motivated all slaves in a large household, even if eventually only one or two were manumitted.’ Through conditional testamentary manumission, the slaveholder continued to exert control on their slaves even in death. However there is no reason to believe that there cannot be an overlap between these two viewpoints, it is possible that there was some genuine affection from the slaveholder which motivated some of these manumissions, but this affection developed within a system of domination and control.

Conclusion
The documents relating to personal slaveholding and domestic slavery are scarce, and many aspects are unclear although this chapter has shown that there was a relationship between slave ownership and the hierarchy of the Order. This is a topic that should be acknowledged and analysed in order to identify and understand the Order’s slaveholding behaviours many of which appear to overlap with other slaveholding contexts.

Personal slaves were certainly less numerous than the Order’s galley and agricultural slaves. The changing nature of the Order from a land-based military force to a naval-based military force after the fall of Acre in 1291 required the development of a strong navy, the Order needed to crew its ships and galley slavery was a means of doing so. The Order’s exploitation of slave labour in other industries can similarly be viewed in relation to maximising the Order’s wealth and power. However, the same is not true of the Order’s exploitation of domestic or personal slaves; indeed, it is unlikely

215 Patterson, *Slavery and social death*, p. 220.
that the Brothers needed to be served by multiple slaves to achieve the goals of the Order as such this highlights the Order’s predilection for the employment of slave-labour.\footnote{Thornton, \textit{Memoir on the finances of Malta}, p. 51.}

The Order linked personal slaveholding with status; the Grand Master held the most slaves and slaves were being given as gifts to foster patronage and as rewards. This reflects the Order’s traditional slaveholding behaviours and values. The Order’s use of testamentary manumission and baptism for personal slaves also follows medieval slaveholding norms. Sexual exploitation of personal slaves was a common cross-cultural aspect of traditional slaveholding behaviour, the evidence of this for the Order is limited and largely circumstantial, although it seems likely that members of the Order were engaging in sexual exploitation of their slaves especially given the evidence that the Order was soliciting prostitutes.

The remarkable thing about these points is that they are unremarkable, the Order was engaged in many of the same slaveholding behaviours that can be seen in other slaveholding societies. However, this has not been addressed in the existing discourse because the historiography has avoided engaging with the Order’s slaveholding and because there has been a focus on highlighting differences rather than similarities and with regard to domestic slave ownership and the Order was similar to other Mediterranean slaveholding elites.
Chapter 6, The agricultural use of slaves

This chapter will focus on the Order’s use of slave labour in agriculture on Cyprus, Rhodes and Malta. The Order’s approach to agriculture varied considerably depending on the location. The Order on Rhodes gave out grants of lands and collected rents, similar to a feudal lord; while individual Brothers were involved with agriculture the Order itself did not manage lands and it is unclear to what extent the Brothers were actively engaged in managing their lands. On Malta the Order had even more limited involvement, as there already existed a large number of land-owning peasants which meant that the Order did not need to manage agricultural estates. Sugar production on Cyprus was a notable exception and the Order was much more involved in overseeing those agricultural estates. As a result of this varied approach to agriculture, the approach to agricultural slaves was also considerably varied, this is significant as it highlights the flexibility of the Order to change how slaves were used depending on the situation.

Emanuel Buttigieg has outlined the key difference between the Order’s engagement with slavery on Rhodes and Malta: on Rhodes slaves participated in agriculture but were restricted from entering the fortified city of Rhodes, while on Malta slaves were required to remain within the fortified towns and were restricted from leaving.1 In both instances the restrictions were for security. A statute of 1357 decreed that no Turkish slave could be kept within the fortified town of Rhodes.2 The Order on Malta strictly controlled the movement of their slaves and restricted them from leaving Valletta to hinder attempts at escape.3 Wettinger details a proclamation in 1536 that a slave found unguarded in the countryside would receive 25 stokes of a whip and one month of hard labour in public service, while the Owner would be fined.4 This punishment was increased in Verdala’s Pragmatic of 1593: those slaves who were found in the countryside, even if they were obeying their master, would receive one hundred strokes of the whip, while those slaves found in the countryside trying to
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2 AOM 69 folio 21, ‘Item pro euitandis scandalis et periculis, que in nostro castro possent evenire et per consequens toti terre, Statutum est, ne fratrum Conuentus ullus teneat nec tenere debeat in servicio suo inantea sclauum turcum illi uero qui eos presentialiter tenant infra sex menses ipsos aliquantler a se abicere teneantur, Nec interea illos cum eorum equis quesitum paleam seu herbam extra debeant destinare saluo tamen et retentor quod in unquaque albergia pro eius servicio possit haberi unus.’, transcribed in Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes 1306 -1440’, p. 86.
3 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 71 referencing Verdala’s Pragmatic 1593, National Library of Malta (NLM) Libr Ms 704, vol 2 fol. 100 et seq.
4 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 71 referencing NAM, MCC Reg, Act, Orig’ vol 1 fol. 53rv.
escape would have their nose and ears cut off. Despite these punishments, the issue of slaves being found in the countryside appears to have continued, as Wettinger outlines the issuing of new restrictions into the eighteenth century. This situation was very different from that of Cyprus where the Order’s lands would be raided by hostile forces and their slaves working on those lands would be liberated or captured; in 1440 the Sultan of Egypt attacked the Order’s possessions on Cyprus and carried off many slaves. Another difference existed in regard to the slave’s personal relationships; the slave system on Malta was predominately male and marriage for a slave was mostly unheard of. On Cyprus slaves were encouraged to marry; a serf manumission from 1413 gave the condition that the serf had to purchase a slave as a replacement and stipulates that this slave would marry another of the Order’s slaves held at the same location. This also highlights that slaves and serfs were working side by side on Cyprus and undertaking the same tasks.

This chapter will start by outlining the Order’s involvement in agriculture on Rhodes and Malta and the use of slaves. While the Order did not directly manage agricultural estates on Rhodes there were slaves on the estates assigned to individual members of the Order on Rhodes. The Order was less involved in agriculture on Malta, but there were likely slaves working in agriculture on Malta. Secondly there will be a discussion of how Rhodes and Malta were supplied with food; both islands had to import food to sustain the population, and the Order on Rhodes attempted to increase the amount of land in cultivation on Rhodes with limited effectiveness. The final section will focus on Hospitaller sugar production on Cyprus, which made use of a large number of slaves and produced a lot of revenue for the Order as a result the Order was more involved with these estates and took steps to protect them.

Agricultural slavery on Rhodes and Malta

The Order did not directly manage the use of slaves in agriculture on both Rhodes and Malta. On Rhodes the Order granted agricultural land to the Hospitaller Brothers who then managed these lands; as such the Order was not directly involved in the administration of the countryside or decisions regarding productivity, and as a result there is a lack of documentation regarding agriculture in general, and even less regarding agricultural slaves. Anthony Luttrell and Greg
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5 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 71 referencing Verdala’s Pragmatic 1593, NLM Libr Ms 704, vol 2 fol. 100 et seq.
8 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 517.
O’Malley have noted the serious limitations of the surviving material, noting that the registers from 1381 and 1423, ‘...contain rather less information concerning the Rhodian countryside...’ and that the registers from 1423 to 1522 are largely unexplored.10 Despite these issues, there is some evidence that there were slaves on estates granted to individual Brothers; the statute of 1311 stated that slaves on the estate of a deceased Hospitaller were to remain on the estate rather than be seized by the Treasury. Luttrell notes that ‘...this legislation concerned slaves who were attached to an agricultural estate rather than to an individual Hospitaller.’11 This statute was likely introduced to solve an existing issue which suggests that slaves participated in agriculture on Rhodes prior to 1311.

The lands granted to Brothers by the Order were most commonly for a Casale, a term the Order does not define but seems to have been a village or rural domain and the holder of the Casale had jurisdiction over it and the population who lived there, including restricting the movement of serfs.12 Hospitaller Brothers who were granted a Casale were not granted it as fiefs, possibly because they could technically not hold property, and perhaps to ensure the Casale returned to the Order.13 The grant of a Casale seldom mentions the people who inhabit the Casale. There are some exceptions but slaves are typically only mentioned without any specific details, for example in 1348 Brother Raymond de Lescure was granted for 10 years the Castellany of Feraklos given to him by the late soror Margarita of Negroponte along with the slaves, animals and other possessions.14 Another example is the 1381 grant for life to Brother Domenico de Alamania of a mill, two slaves, a mule and a horse.15 To what extent members of the Order were directly involved with the management of their holdings is unknown. Luttrell and O’Malley presume the holdings of individual Hospitallers were managed by a steward or representative, which seems likely and would further distance the Order from their agricultural estates.16 Casali were assigned to individual Hospitallers or other Latins in return for either goods, military service or payment.17 In 1326 Folco de Vignoli was granted the Casale of Lardos in return for 4 rotoli of wax a year and the provision of one armed Latin man and his

11 Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, p. 85, Biblioteca Vaticana, Ms. Vat. Lat. 3136 fol. 68 ‘...que toutes les bestes e bestial de noireture e les esclaf qui seroyent troues au dit luog doient demorent en la reparation odu dit luog e le sur plus veigne au trezor sauue la rayson dou mareschal’ A similar statute was issued in 1332 made use of the term Casale, AOM 289 folio 24v.
13 Luttrell, O’Malley, *The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes*, p. 34.
horse. In 1358 the Master granted Brother Petrus Raterii the Casale of Kalamonas for 10 years in return for 40 florins a year. There is evidence that individual Brothers were able to lease out parts of their Casali; in 1385 Brother Domenico de Almania leased land from the Casale of Koskinou to Covello de Salvo to plant vines in return for 30 aspers a year. For the most part the Order simply collected the rents due from the Casali. Consequently specific details about the Casale are largely unknown, this was lands granted to an individual Brother, who may not have been directly involved with managing it, as a result the Order was somewhat distant from the slaves working on their lands. In the discussion of domestic slaves it was noted that they rarely appear within the archives of the Order except for manumission documents, this is also true regarding agricultural slaves and for the same reason because the manumissions required the permission of the Grand Master. In 1351 the Grand Master freed Johanni Apocogano who was living in the Casale of Apidi; he had been freed by Rostagnus de Serveria, the Bailiff of Rhodes, in return for 28 florins although he had only paid 24 florins before Rostagnus died, he was only manumitted after paying the remaining four florins.

That Johanni Apocogano was living in the Casale of Apidi suggests he was an agricultural slave. This manumission shows that the slaves on the Casale were able to obtain currency. Additionally in 1366 the Grand Master freed a large group of slaves that Luttrell has identified as agricultural slaves, but this is not specifically identified in the document and Luttrell acknowledges that he is making an assumption.

---


20 AOM 323 folio 217 [227], transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 129, p. 197; An asper was a unit of currency, a Rhodian ducat was worth 32 aspers, a Rhodian florin was worth 20 aspers, Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, p. 7.


A notable example is that of Margarita de Negroponte, who is referred to in several documents. Luttrell and O’Malley describe her as “The rich widow soror Margarita of Negroponte, who was probably a Hospitaller donat...” A donat was an associate member of the Order who had not taken full vows but a vow of obedience to the Grand Master. In December 1347 she requested that the Grand Master free nineteen slaves that had served her for a long time, including a mill keeper, his son, and a tavern keeper. Apart from the two slaves whose occupation was given, the large number of slaves suggests that these were not domestic servants. It is not immediately clear why Margarita needed the Grand Master to free her slaves, but an earlier document sheds some light on this; in November 1347 Margarita gave many of her holdings to Brother Pierre de Corneillan, including a mill, several pieces of land, an old vineyard and a new vineyard. The new vineyard had been planted at the joint expense of Brother Pierre and Margarita. It seems likely that Margarita needed the Grand Master’s permission to free the slaves because they were on the properties that had been given to the Order; it is possible the enslaved mill keeper being freed was from the mill given to Brother Pierre, although this is speculation. This further emphasizes the diverse range of ways slaves were used on the Order’s properties but also provides an insight into the complex relationships that occurred. The manumission of these slaves may have been part of the donation in 1347. Margarita died shortly after this, so these donations and the freeing of slaves may have been charitable acts motivated by her imminent death, as testamentary manumission was a common occurrence. This does not appear to have freed all of Margarita’s slaves as in March 1348 the Grand Master granted the Casale of Kalamos to Brother Raymond de Lescure for 10 years, it had belonged to the late soror Margarita who had given it to Brother Raymond along with slaves, animals, and other possessions. It appears that Margarita had given properties to both Brother Pierre and Brother Raymond, although it is interesting that after Margarita’s death the property that she had given to Brother Raymond was now only being granted to him for 10 years.

26 AOM 317 folio 229v [241v] ‘Micali custodem molendini et eius filium...Cali tavernaria’, transcribed in Luttrell, O'Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 36, p. 120.
28 Luttrell, O'Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, p. 47.
29 AOM 317 folio 241-241v, ‘...vinea, terris cultis et incultis, molendinis, pascuis, aquis, nemoribus intra superascriptos confines contentis, necnon et cum sclavis sexus utriusque, averibus grosis et minutis, equabus, asinis, vulgaris, vinis ac utensilibus, ac alis quibus cunctque in casali existentibus memorato per dictam condam sororem nostram Margaritam vobis concessum dum viveret...’ transcribed in Luttrell, O'Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 39, p. 122.
donation to Brother Raymond has been lost so it is not clear whether the property had originally been granted to him for a limited period of time; the grant to Brother Pierre de Conreillan made no reference to a time clause. In 1350 Brother Bartolomeo Beini was licensed to sell a vineyard, windmill and houses including a tavern called the ‘Soror Margarita’; there is no mention of Margarita in the document but perhaps this was another property given by Margarita to a Hospitaller Brother. Margarita had owned a slave described as a tavern keeper, so she may have owned a tavern.

Overall, despite the limited documentation the Order held slaves as part of agricultural lands on Rhodes. The Order was far less involved in agriculture on Malta. On Malta before the arrival of the Order, serfdom had disappeared and there was a large number of peasant landowners and paid labourers. Joan Abela notes that the Order had difficulty administering Malta because the pre-existing Maltese community had legal rights and the Maltese Church remained independent of the Order, which resulted in the bishop of Malta becoming the main opposition to the Order’s rule. As a result the Order was not granting agricultural lands to individual Brothers and was uninvolved with the agricultural slavery that took place. It is difficult to estimate the use of agricultural slaves on Malta because of the lack of documentation, although there were agricultural slaves on Malta prior to the Order’s arrival. Wettinger describes the ownership of slaves before the Order’s arrival as ‘...widespread but numerically small...’ and largely domestic. It appears that when these slaves were involved in manual labour they were paid, however Wettinger notes that ‘...presumably their pay went to their owners.’ Masters leasing slaves to perform labour in return for payment was common in most slaveholding contexts. Fiorini notes that the wages paid for slaves were identical to those offered to freemen. The use of slaves in agriculture does not appear to have been significant, which is unsurprising if the cost to the employer was the same as that of a freeman, perhaps only being useful to perform tasks that freemen found undesirable. This is attested to by Fiorini: ‘They often performed the meaner and harder physical tasks which others disdained, such as the handling of manure in the fields.’ Although the shift in the use of slaves in agriculture may not have been entirely related to the change in location but part of wider changes in labour, Ehud Toledano noted that in the Ottoman empire ‘Agricultural slavery, which had been widely practised until the sixteenth

32 Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century, p. 65.
33 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 17.
34 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 21.
century, was abandoned thenceforward...’

Additionally as the Order often lacked a sufficient supply of labour during its time on Malta, and focused its resources into rowing ships and constructing defences, even going so far as to require privately owned slaves to assist in construction during times of crisis, it is not surprising that the Order did not use its slaves in agriculture. The Order was concerned with security, especially as a slave revolt occurred soon after the Order’s arrival in Malta and resulted in the Order implementing restrictions on their slaves that limited their movement, which would not have been conducive with agricultural labour. As Wettinger states ‘Farming was entirely beyond the reach of most of them [the Order slaves] because they were not allowed into the countryside unaccompanied by their master or a warder.’

Despite the limited documentation the Order’s approach to agriculture varied considerably between Rhodes and Malta and as a result so did the use of slaves in agriculture. This is significant as evidence of how variable and reactive the Order’s slaveholding was, additionally this is something that has been overlooked in the existing discourse because the Order’s time on Rhodes and Malta has been compartmentalised which has hindered approaching this as a single system that developed over time.

**Food supplies on Rhodes and Malta**

Both Malta and Rhodes had to import food to sustain the population. Luttrell and O’Malley outline the situation: ‘Agriculture contributed to the Rhodian economy by reducing, if only marginally, the serious demand for foreign grain but it could not suffice. Famines apart, there were recurring needs to import grain.’ The Order always relied on the import of grain while on Rhodes; Vatin notes that Egypt was a key source of grain for the Order. Similarly Malta had to import food from Sicily to support the population. The economy of the Maltese islands relied on high-value crops that required less land to cultivate, such as cotton and cumin which were traded for wheat; the Spanish
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37 Toledano, ‘Enslavement in the Ottoman Empire in the early Modern Period’, pp. 25 -46.
38 In 1547, Privately owned slaves ordered to work on Fort St Angelo, Wettinger, *slavery in Malta and Gozo*, p. 297, references AOM 887 Fol 102v.
40 Wettinger, *Slavery in the island of Malta and Gozo*, p. 414
41 Luttrell, O’Malley, *The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes*, p. 44.
42 Vatin, *L’Order de Saint-Jean-de-Jerusalem, l’Empire ottoman et le Mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522*, pp. 42-44 ‘A la fin de la presence hospitaliere a Rhodes, l’Egypte etait donc devenue pour les Chevaliers une source secondaire d’approvisionnement en cereales.’
monarchs provided tax exemptions on wheat to encourage this relationship.\footnote{Wettinger, ‘Agriculture in Malta in the late middle ages’, pp. 15-21; Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century, p. 7.} Carmelo Trasseli details that crop yields on Malta were comparatively low, as a result importing food may have been easier than growing it.\footnote{Trasseli, ‘Una Statistica Maltese del secolo xvi’, p. 477.}

The Order on Rhodes did make some attempts to bring more land into cultivation; in 1336 the uninhabited Casale of Embonas was settled by 6 serfs.\footnote{AOM 404 folios 211-12 [221-222] ‘Quapropter considerantes casale nostrum de Lembona depopulatum et inhabitatum fore quodque illud habitare et ad eum sua transferre domicilia Ioannes, Nicola, Georgius et Manoli Zenede frateret et Michalis Mandeos et Iannis Perpinias perpetuo desiderent et affectant…’ transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 6, p. 93.} In 1347 the Order made numerous grants of properties that the Order was not able to cultivate.\footnote{Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, p. 40; examples of Grants AOM 317 235v-236v, 238-239v, Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Documents 13-16, 26-29, 32-34.} Typically these grants were for small areas of land in return for payment; Georgius de Crato was granted 6 \textit{modiates} of land with some trees in return for 80 aspers a year.\footnote{AOM 317 folio 235v [247v] ‘…eapropter volentes quantum decenter possumus conditionem domus nostre facere meliorem Georgio de Crato servienti castri Filermi eiusque heredibus et successoribus iardinum unum situm et positum in pertinenciis dicti castri cum aliquibus arboribus et modiatis terre sex cuius confines sunt hec…’ transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 13, p. 100; Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, p. 8 ‘A Modiate is between 850 and 1000 square meters.} Some of these grants specifically mention that some of the land was uncultivated.\footnote{AOM 317 folio 236-236v, ‘…eapropter volentes quantum decenter possumus conditionem domus nostre facere meliorem Georgio Cosina eiusque heredibus et successoribus quandam plateam sitam et positam in contrata seu territorio de Salaco in loco vocato Agia Marina modiatarum quindecim, quarum septem sunt cultivate et octo modiate incultivate…’ transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes Document 16, p.102.} In 1365 Petrus Bermundi was granted 30 \textit{modiates} of uncultivated land.\footnote{AOM 319 folios 293v-294 transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 76.} The problem of properties falling into disuse appears to have continued into the fifteenth century: in 1422 Brother William Hulles the prior of England and his successors were given the lands of Mangavli which were so ruined as to provide almost no income.\footnote{AOM 346 folios 167v-168v ‘…et omnimodam prothodolor presentialiter pervenerint ruinam, devastationem et anullationem ipsarum…’ transcribed in Luttrell, O’Malley, The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes, Document 205, p. 279.} The document also notes that the Grand Master and the treasury were not allowed to seize the slaves, animals or goods on the prior’s death; this clause was added because the lands will pass on to the next prior of England rather than being assigned to a specific member of the Order in which case upon his death the Order’s Treasury would have been able to claim those items.\footnote{AOM 346 folios 167v-168v ‘Insuper ut dictus prior et sui successores in futurum sint promptiores et audaciores ad redificandum, reparandum, aptandum et colendum ac meliorandum dictam possessionem, volumus et concedimus per imperpetuum quod sclavi, muli, equi, boves, asini et quecumque alia animalia cuiuscunque speciei extenterint, et superfectilia domus et omnia alia bona mobilia et immobilia que per ipsum priorem et successores pro usu et sustentatione ipsius possessionis ordinata sunt in eadem tempore eorum
documentation of the Order taking steps to increase the agricultural output of the island; the Order does not appear to have been involved with improving agriculture practices on Malta. The Brothers appear to have been content to leave the existing agricultural system in place.

Overall the Order on both Rhodes and Malta was reliant on external sources of food, which could be disrupted; Wettinger details that in the early seventeenth century a Turk named Rays Many Ostriff Oghli feigned conversion to obtain his freedom from the Order only to escape to Barbary, return to the faith of Islam, and use his knowledge of the Maltese waters and the movements of the galleys of the Order to attack wheat ships on the way to Malta, ‘...reducing the island practically to starvation.’ This example suggests that the Order’s fears regarding false conversion and that slaves may use their knowledge of the Order against them were not unfounded. Additionally, as with many of the problems, a solution was found that utilised the Order’s slaves; during wheat shortages slave ransoms could be paid with wheat, Wettinger provides several examples from 1625 of the ransoms of family groups being set as either wheat or currency, ‘... the family of Salhic Ibrahim Ogli was priced at 952 sequins or 190 salme of wheat, that of Musto Mami Oglia at 2,847 sequins or 571 salme of wheat, that of Hatige Ruin Ogli at 1,428 sequins or 285 salme.’ If the ransoms of these three families was paid in wheat, the Order would have obtained 1046 salme of wheat. This is not an insignificant amount; Carmelo Trasseli outlined the 1590 survey of Malta carried out by Charles V, which provides a detailed insight into the situation on Malta, it details that 9,500 salme of wheat was needed to feed the Order. Additionally some of that wheat was grown on Malta, although the majority of what the Order required was imported, so in 1590 the Order imported 6,500 salme of wheat. There is a lack of detailed documents regarding the Order’s wheat consumption, the ransoms from 1625 mentioned above would have provided approximately 16% of the Order’s imported wheat at 1590 consumption. Additionally unlike wheat the Order purchased from Sicily, which could be attacked in transit, this was for the Order a relatively safe means of obtaining wheat as this was unlikely to be disrupted by the Order’s enemies as it was being brought to Malta by the Order’s enemies to free their kin. There are other occurrences of ransoms being paid in wheat; in 1703 a French captain brought 120 salme of wheat to Malta as part of the ransom of an enslaved Ottoman Cadi. It is unclear why a French captain was ransoming an Ottoman Cadi, although Pal...
Fodor has noted that the French consul in Zmir engaged in the ransom of enslaved Ottomans on Malta in the seventeenth century. The Order found a way to make use of its enslaved peoples to access additional sources of food.

As the population of Malta increased so too did the quantity of wheat that was imported and the population did increase significantly, Stanley Fiorini outlined the evidence for the population prior to the arrival of the knights: in 1480 it had been approximately 10,633 and in 1530 the population was approximately 20,000. Wettenger notes the increase in wheat imports to Malta and Gozo; ‘...until the 1480s there hardly ever was any talk of the importation of more than 1,000 or 2,000 salme to prevent famine....by 1530 the two islands were importing some 9,000 salme of wheat annually from Sicily.’ The population of Malta continued to grow significantly under the Hospitallers; in the survey of 1590, the population was 28,864. In 1663 Skippon, an English traveller, visited Malta and estimated the population of Valetta alone to be 10,774. The increase in population no doubt further exacerbated the issue of food shortages. The Order also made use of its naval fleet to obtain supplies, in 1592 the Order captured a cargo vessel near Alexandria laden with rice. Although it appears that the Order would limit such attacks solely to Muslim vessels, as in 1603 Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo recorded that the galleys of the Order were sent out in search of ships laden with supplies to combat the famine on Malta, ships of either friend or enemy. This further weakens the notion that the Order was engaging solely in a form of holy war, to return to the discussion of the Order’s naval

61 Wettenger, ‘Agriculture in Malta in the late middle ages’, p. 14. A salme was a variable unit of measure used in regard to the import and export of dry goods from Sicily to Rhodes; it equates to approximately 275 litres, the weight depends on the density of what is being carried. Carmel Trasseli states that 1 salme of wheat corresponds to 220-225 kilos. Both Clifford Backman and Stephan Epstein have identified two different sizes of salme in use in the 14th-century, in western Sicily a salma represented 275 litres, in eastern Sicily it was 330 litres, although the smaller one is the most commonly used. The volume of a salme appears to have varied even in modern times, in 1823 it was defined a 8 and 1/8 bushels (Approximately 295.5 litres), in 1938 it was 8 bushels (Approximately 291 Litres), ‘Colony of Malta and its dependencies, 1823’, p.190; ‘Malta blue book for the year 1938’, (Government printing office, 1939), p. 4; Both available online through the National statistics office Malta, https://nso.gov.mt/Home/ABOUT_NSO/Historical_Statistics/Malta_Blue_Books/Pages/Malta-Blue-Books.aspx (Accessed, 29/07/2022).
63 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 622.
operations in chapter 3, Earle chose to refer to the Order as a navy not as corsairs and Sire argued that the Order did not engage in slave-raiding but rather attacked strategic posts. In this instance the Order was not engaged in slave-raiding but rather using their enslaved oarsmen to undertake raids to satisfy their hunger.

The Order on Rhodes also imported grain but was able to turn to its properties on Cyprus: in 1442 the lieutenant of the preceptor of Cyprus, Brother John of Marsenach, sold 4,000 modii of wheat and 4,000 modii of barley to the Grand Master on Rhodes and was to sell another 4,000 modii of wheat and 2,000 modii of barley over the next three months. Although the grain provided by these properties appears to have been insufficient as in 1448 and 1449 the Order made numerous purchases of grain from Cyprus from other providers: in November 1448 the Order purchased 2866 modii of grain from Cyprus, and in February 1449 Brother Louis de Rilhac was instructed to purchase 6,000 modii of grain and 4,000 modii of barley. Later in June 1449 Brother Louis de Rilhac was in contract with a merchant to purchase another 10,000 modii of grain and 3,000 of barley. The Order’s production and sale of sugar likely helped to fund these purchases of food, and the production of sugar and industry will made use of hundreds of the Order’s slaves.

**Hospitaller Sugar production on Cyprus**

While slaves participated in agriculture on Rhodes and Malta, the Order was relatively disconnected. The situation on Cyprus concerning sugar production was very different. Cyprus was one of the most important producers of sugar in the Christian world during the Medieval period, as the south coast with its areas of low level land and high rainfall was ideal for sugar. Galloway identifies the Episkopi estate owned by the Cornaro family as being comparable in terms of numbers of workers to the

---


largest plantations of tropical America.’ 71 In their work Documents concerning Cyprus, Anthony Luttrell, K. Borchardt, and E. Schoffler state that ‘...some slaves were probably employed in sugar production’, but also argue that given that sugar production was seasonal it was not economical to use slaves, an argument that they then neatly dismiss a few pages later when detailing that the king of Cyprus managed to support 1,500 slaves for producing sugar. 72 The Hospitallers were the second largest landowners on Cyprus after the king so it would be sensible to expect them also to support slaves for producing sugar. 73 At the plantation of Episkopi in 1449 there were reported to be 400 slaves employed in the production of sugar. 74 Episkopi was a similar size to another Hospitaller sugar plantation at Kolossi, so it would be reasonable to assume that Kolossi had a similar number of slaves. If the Hospitallers had a similar number of slaves to the king of Cyprus, this would mean that more slaves were involved with sugar production than any other activity, including on galleys, at this time. 75 Comparable numbers of slaves were found on later plantations not run by the Hospitallers; in 1577 the Spanish sugar plantation of Santa Barbola in the Galapagos isles had 370 slaves. 76 New World slave plantations tended to have only a few hundred slaves per plantation, for example William Taylor in 1832 had 700 slaves split between 3 estates. 77 Galloway notes that: ‘The link between sugar cultivation and slavery which was to last until the nineteenth century became firmly forged in Crete, Cyprus, and Morocco.’ 78

The Order has a long history of sugar production, operating a sugar refinery at Manueth near Acre in the thirteenth century. 79 In the seventeenth century the Order would undertake a short-lived venture in the New World, owning several Caribbean Islands producing and refining sugar. 80 There is a lack of documentation regarding the New World plantations and whether any of the Order’s prior experiences may have influenced how they were run. Sugar was grown on Rhodes but based on the lack of documentation it appears to have been on a far lesser scale than on Cyprus. In 1365 the

73 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. xliv; Coureas, ‘Christian and Muslim Captives on Lusignan Cyprus: Redemption or Retention?’, p. 528.
75 In 1590 the Order had 785 galley slaves, Table E) Galere, in Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese’, pp. 474-480.
77 William Taylor in House of Commons, Select Committee on Slavery, Select committee on the extinction of slavery throughout the British dominions, (J Haddon, 1832), pp. 1-15.
78 The plantations of Crete were run by the Venetians who gained control of the island in 1204 and held similar plantations on Cyprus, sugar production in Morocco started far earlier in the nineteenth century, Galloway, ‘The Mediterranean Sugar Industry’, pp. 189-190.
accounts of the Grand Master Roger de Pins include income from the sale of 33 boxes of sugar to Domenico de Gualterio.81 Additionally in 1365 Brother Bertrin de Gagnac held two Catellanies, Filerimos and Feraklos paid dues to the Grand Master, the incomes produced from these properties were from grain, wine, beasts and sugar.82 A sugar refinery on Rhodes at Zacharomylos near to Feraklos has been excavated, but this has been described by Luttrell and O’Malley as ‘…relatively primitive compared to those on Cyprus...’83 The Order’s most significant production of sugar was undertaken on Cyprus.

On Cyprus, the Hospitallers’ experience in producing sugar is evident in the statutes of 1301 that state that Kolossi should be administered in the same way as Manueth, a similar sugar plantation that had been near Acre.84 The importance of Kolossi and its plantation can be seen from the construction of Kolossi castle in the fifteenth century; it was one of the largest sugar refiners in Cyprus.85 It is difficult to estimate the full extent of Hospitaller sugar production, but Luttrell, Borchardt and Schoffler state that, ‘In 1445 the annual output at Kolossi was estimated at up to 125 quintals’ (a quintal equates to 226 kilos), ‘worth 3562 ½ ducats at 28 ½ ducats a quintal, and in 1464 it was estimated at 400 quintals in a normal year, worth 14,000 ducats at 35 ducats a quintal.’ 86 Production had more than trebled in less than twenty years. Demand appeared to match this increase; Giovanni Martini, citizen of Venice, agreed to purchase all the sugar Kolossi produced in 1445 for 3 years and continued to extend this agreement until 1460.87 Jean Richard records that at the beginning of the sixteenth century it was estimated that Cyprus was producing between 345 and 400 US tons of refined sugar, in addition to 57 to 193 tons of less pure sugar, and 57 to 181 tons of molasses.88 As one of the largest landowners, the Hospitallers would have been responsible for a large portion of this volume. Kolossi’s production of four hundred quintals of sugar in 1464 would

86 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. xl.
87 Giovanni Martini in 1445 agreed to buy all the production for 3 years, AOM 356, folio 218v-219; in 1449 this was extended for another 5 years, AOM 361, folio 255r-256v: Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Documents 194, 251, 315.
have weighed almost 100 tons. As a result of the production of such a high-value crop the
preceptory of Cyprus owed a large annual due to the Order’s headquarters on Rhodes, Luttrell states
that Cyprus produced more of the Order’s wealth than any other single preceptory.89 In 1432 the
preceptory of Cyprus was being leased to Fr. Angelino Muscetulla and Fr. Pedro Sarnes for 6000
florins a year.90 Theresa Vann outlines that this represented more than 16% of the Order’s income,
more than the Hospitallers’ properties in Germany, Spain and Italy combined and slightly more than
the income provided by the English priory; given the size of Cyprus the level of income is beyond
what would be expected.91 This income continued to increase, only two years later in 1434, the lease
was extended for the life of Fr. Angelino Muscetulla, and the dues increased to 10,000 florins a
year.92 Overall this highlights the importance of sugar production on Cyprus as being a substantial
source of income, income that was only generated via the labour of the Order’s slaves, further
emphasizing the significance to the Order.

Slaves appear to have taken part in all aspects of sugar production, planting, harvesting, preparing,
and boiling. Leontios Makhairas makes specific mention of a Saracen slave who was a sugar boiler, a
highly skilled and specialized position.93 Although in this example the slave is not described as being
owned by the Hospitallers it can be assumed that the Hospitallers had similar labour practices to
other plantations on Cyprus. At Manueth, a large number of oil lamps have been found; this suggests
work taking place at night, and given the small period of time in which the sugar had to be harvested
and boiled this practice likely continued on Cyprus.94 This would not be surprising, as in the New
World sugar mills and boilers would operate 24 hours a day, with the slaves working shifts up to 30
hours long.95 Unfortunately the surviving documents for the Order sugar industry are not particularly
detailed, the oil lamps at Manueth suggests the mill operated at night, even if this was not to the
same pace as New World plantations this still suggests intensive operations that would have been
demanding on the slaves.

89 Anthony Luttrell, ‘Sugar and Schism, the Hospitallers in Cyprus from 1378 to 1386’, in The Hospitaller State
on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306–1462 (Variorum, 1999), (IV), p. 158.
90 AOM 348, fols 238v–239v transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus,
Document 89, p. 103.
91 Theresa Vann, ‘The exchange of information and money between the Hospitallers of Rhodes and their
European priories in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries’ in International mobility in the Military Orders
(twelfth to fifteenth centuries); travelling on Christ’s business, Edited by Jochen Burgtorf and Helen Nicholson
92 AOM 351, fols 149r – 150r transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus,
Document 111, p. 129.
93 Leontios Makhairas, Recital concerning the sweet land of Cyprus entitled ‘chronicle’ edited and translated. R.
95 Meredith, ‘Plantation Slave Mortality in Trinidad’, pp. 161–82; Stark, Slave Families and the Hato Economy in
Puerto Rico, p. 42.
Surviving manumission documents from Cyprus provide an insight into the conditions and present a situation that was very different from the one found on Malta; two manumissions from 1449 freed the slaves on the condition that the slaves pay one-third of the dues usually paid by serfs and 24 besants a year, further evidence that these men were not serfs being manumitted but rather slaves becoming a labour group of freed slaves separate to the existing serfs upon manumission. This is similar to the approach taken by the Byzantines in Asia Minor where freed slaves were used to settle and populate territory. Additionally, the manumission was only granted for their lives not for their heirs. This suggests not only that they had heirs, or were expected to produce heirs, but that the Hospitallers wanted those heirs to continue working as slaves. It is possible that by not freeing the heirs the Hospitallers were attempting to prevent children being born free through a free parent. In 1454 there were another 2 manumissions that once again stated that the ex-slaves’ children were not free. These manumissions may relate to another document from 1454 which confirms an agreement to trade slaves between Hospitaller properties on Cyprus as a result of individual properties having a gender imbalance, so that the slaves can marry. Encouragement of slaves to marry is also seen in earlier manumission documents, a slave manumission from 1413 gives a condition that a new slave must be purchased and that the replacement must marry. Overall this suggests that the Order was engaging in reproductive exploitation of its slaves. It is unknown how the Order would treat a slave that was unwilling to marry although in one case a slave’s inability to have children is given as a reason for her sale. This is very different from the situation on Malta where the slave system was predominately male and as a result enslaved people marrying and having children was unheard of. The manumission documents show that freed slaves continued to labour on the plantations, thus there was a mix of labour types being used. This should not be seen as evidence of a decline in the usage of slaves, manumission documents only exist for those few slaves that were freed, far more remained enslaved. Within the medieval slavery discourse the

97 Kedar, Crusade and Mission, p. 95.
100 AOM 365, Fol. 173rv transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Document 310, p. 430.
102 AOM 352, Fol. 149v-150r transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Document 117, p. 139.
103 Wettinger, Slavery in Malta and Gozo, p. 517.
decline theory has been problematised and the Hospitallers were not attempting to transform their plantations from slave-based to serf-based, as the use of slaves continues throughout the period.\textsuperscript{104}

The Hospitaller territory on Cyprus was more exposed than Rhodes or Malta and more susceptible to raids. The 1426 Mamluk raid of Cyprus and capture of King Janus damaged the Hospitaller properties and resulted in the Hospitallers having an insufficient number of slaves for that year’s crop.\textsuperscript{105} Similarly in 1434 an Egyptian raid damaged Kolossi, which would also have resulted in the capture of Hospitaller slaves.\textsuperscript{106} As a result of its location, Cyprus was often used by Mamluks as a place to raid for supplies; in 1440 on the way to Rhodes the Sultan of Egypt attacked the Order’s possessions on Cyprus and carried off many slaves.\textsuperscript{107} The Order appears to have been aware of the significance of Cyprus to its finances and took extraordinary steps to protect its properties on Cyprus: in 1452 the preceptor of Cyprus was allowed to make pacts with the enemies of the Order, the Sultan and Turks, to protect the Order’s possessions on Cyprus, which the Order would observe even if involved in war with these groups outside of Cyprus.\textsuperscript{108} That the Order would allow a part of its properties to be engaged in a pact with the Sultan while the Order was at war, highlights the significance of this income to the Order and the lengths the Order would go to protect its properties on Cyprus. To a certain extent this made the Order’s properties on Cyprus a separate diplomatic entity, able to enter into pacts and agreements separate from the rest of the Order, even when the rest of the Order was at war with those groups that the Hospitaller properties on Cyprus were making pacts with. It is unknown to what extent separate agreements were even used but that such an option was allowed is significant. Although clearly the Order placing profits over its mission against Muslims powers, profits that were derived from slave labour.

Given that sugar production was so profitable and the length the Order went to protect those profits, it might be a surprise that the Order did not produce sugar on Malta after the loss of its lands

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{105} Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. li.
\textsuperscript{106} Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. lii.
\textsuperscript{107} AOM 354, Fols 103v-104v transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Document 165, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{108} AOM 363 folios 142-143v, The grant of the preceptory to Brother Louis de Manhac, December 1452, ‘et insuper circa salutem, statum, pacem, quietem et libertatem vestram et dicte baiullie providere volentes vobis prefato fratri Ludowico seu vestris locumtenentibus et procuratoribus licenciam, potestatem auctoritatemque concedimus tam cum soldano quam cum Theuco eorumque subditis et sequacibus non obstantibus quibuscumque gwierras, quas nobiscum illi vel cum eis nos ipsi haberemus, gereremus vel faceremus, pacem, treugam, firmam, componendi, iurandi et promittendi pro vobis dumtaxat et dicta baiullia, pro omnibus et singulis hominibus, rebus et bonis positis in dicto regno cipri ad nos nostrumque communem thezaurum et ad nostram religionem quomodocumque et qualitercumque pertinentibus absque aliqua inputatione cause, maleficii vel defectus.’ This clause also appears in the confirmation of the grant, November 1454, AOM 365 folios 171-172; Borhardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Documents 298, 309, pp. 407, 426.
\end{flushleft}
on Cyprus, but in the interim the sugar market changed. The end of the sugar industry in Cyprus, Crete, and the western Mediterranean came in a brief period of thirty years, approximately 1570 to 1600. In Cyprus, sugar was an important crop during the 1560s, but by 1600 the industry had collapsed, and sugar crops were replaced by cotton.\textsuperscript{109} The Order appears to have been aware that the importance of sugar was waning; in a document from 1447 the Grand Master and his council mandate 2 Brothers to inspect the damages in the preceptory of Cyprus as a result of frost, and it is mentioned that the damages as a result of frost are less than stated by the preceptor since to some extent indigo, sesame and cotton were planted in place of sugar.\textsuperscript{110} By the sixteenth century sugar production in the Mediterranean was on the decline, as in 1493 Christopher Columbus introduced sugar to Hispaniola and, in 1498 Madeira entered into competition with Cyprus over the production of sugar.\textsuperscript{111} The Mediterranean sugar plantation was being moved to the New World and the newer plantations produced sugar more cheaply.\textsuperscript{112} With regard to why New World sugar was cheaper, there were a range of factors, Galloway notes ‘Sugarcane could grow to maturity and yield more sugar in Brazil than around the Mediterranean. It was cultivated without the expense of irrigation and there was an abundance of fuel and land. Around the Mediterranean, land, especially irrigated land, was scarce and valuable, and sugar had to compete for space with other crops. Imports of inexpensive Brazilian sugar increased, and the time came in the late sixteenth century when other Mediterranean crops were more profitable than sugar.’\textsuperscript{113} Nevertheless, the Hospitallers’ sugar production in the Mediterranean did not end due to competition but due to the fall of Rhodes in 1522. With the Order soon to be based on Malta, Cyprus became distant and was increasingly threatened by the Ottomans, culminating in its loss in 1570. The decline in the value of sugar and the loss of Cyprus resulted in the loss of a lucrative source of income for the Order; on Malta the Order focused its efforts on another high-value enterprise based on slavery, corsairing.

Conclusion
This chapter has sought to provide an insight into the Order’s engagement with agricultural slaves on Rhodes, Cyprus, and Malta; the way the Order interacted with agriculture and the number of slaves involved in agriculture varied considerably. Luttrell and O’Malley recently highlighted the difficulties regarding researching agriculture on Rhodes: ‘The topic under study presents various conundrums. Numerous questions cannot be raised in the absence of any evidence, and the imbalance of the

\textsuperscript{110} AOM 359 fols 211v-212r, transcribed in Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Documents 224, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{112} Solomidou-ieronymidou, ‘The crusaders, sugar mills and sugar’, p. 70; Hill, A history of Cyprus, vol 3, p. 816.
surviving documentation militates against any statistical approach.\textsuperscript{114} It is not surprising that slaves are absent from much of the surviving documentation, but this does not prove that slaves were not there.\textsuperscript{115} On Malta the Order found another way to use slaves to obtain much-needed wheat, by allowing ransoms to be paid in wheat. The Order’s ships would also target ships carrying wheat, if those were Ottoman, the crews could then be ransomed for even more wheat. In the Mediterranean context, sugar production on Cyprus stands out as a notable exception to the typically limited involvement of the Order in agriculture and was based on the labour of large numbers of slaves and provided a notable portion of the Order’s income. This shows that the Order was willing to get involved in agriculture if the revenue generated was significant, this can also be seen by the Order’s ill-fated attempt to establish sugar plantations in the Caribbean.\textsuperscript{116} The Order even went to extraordinary lengths to protect its lands on Cyprus allowing the preceptor to make alliances with the Order’s enemies.\textsuperscript{117} These sugar plantations are also significant in highlighting that the connection between sugar and slavery developed far earlier than is often thought.\textsuperscript{118}

Overall situations on Rhodes, Malta and Cyprus varied immensely and even the way the Order’s system of slavery operated varied immensely; the conditions of slaves on Cyprus were very different from those slaves on Malta with regard to marriage and family. Slaves on Rhodes were not permitted within the city of Rhodes, while the Order’s slaves on Malta were not permitted in the countryside. In a range of different situations the Order turned to slave labour as a solution to its problems. This further emphasizes how ubiquitous slaves were to the Order, even in situations where a link to slavery is not immediately apparent, because of how pervasive slaves were in the Order there was still a connection, such as using slave ransoms to provide a route for wheat to reach Malta and was unlikely to be disrupted by the Order enemies as it was those enemies that were bringing the wheat to free their kin.

\textsuperscript{114} Luttrell, O’Malley, \textit{The Countryside of Hospitaller Rhodes 1306-1423}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{115} David Wyatt expressed a similar view with regard to slaves appearing in Domesday, Wyatt, \textit{Slaves and warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200}, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{117} AOM 363 folios 142-143v, AOM 365 folios 171-172; Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, \textit{Documents concerning Cyprus}, Documents 298, 309, pp. 407, 426.
Chapter 7, Ransom in the Hospitaller slave system

This chapter will discuss the means by which slaves on Malta were able to be ransomed. The Order typically obtained slaves by capturing them through naval combat. Additionally, the Order took 10% of the goods taken by corsairs; those goods often included slaves, which was the price paid by the corsairs to operate and use Malta as a base.\(^1\) The Order also occasionally purchased slaves, although typically this was individual Brothers purchasing their own domestic slaves rather than slaves owned centrally by the Order. Capture, tax on corsairs and purchase represent the main inflows of slaves to the Order’s slave system; one of the possible means of exit available to slaves on Malta was being ransomed. If a recently enslaved individual was wealthy, they could arrange to pay for their own ransom, otherwise payment would have to come from family members, other groups such as redemption charities, or appeals could be made to rulers to intervene on the slave’s behalf. To arrange the payment of a ransom required communication between the slave and other members of their community and regardless of how the ransom payment was arranged the funds had to be brought to Malta from abroad, which needed people to travel to where the slave was being held; to facilitate this the Order issued licences of safe conduct.

Ransom is at times linked to captives rather than slaves; Ruth Mazo Karras and Hannah Barker have argued that captivity ended after the payment of a ransom, while slavery was usually permanent.\(^2\) This suggests that there is a distinction between ‘slaves’ and ‘captives’ although that distinction is often only clear in retrospect. Sarah Azzopardi-Ljubibratic noted that Joan Abela and Michel Fontenay have made the distinction that captives are captured and shortly ransomed.\(^3\) Within the Order’s archive a distinction is not made, and people captured by the Order are simply referred to as slaves including those in the process of being ransomed.\(^4\) This is not unique to Malta, as Kaiser Wolfgang and Guillaume Calafat have noted that ‘Virtually all primary sources refer to captives indistinctively as “slaves.” It is thus not surprising that captives also called themselves “slaves” in
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\(^1\) Earle, _Corsairs of Malta and Barbary_, p. 126.


\(^4\) Typically, people captured by the Order are referred to by term Sclavus. Yvonne Friedman notably avoids using the term slave, ‘...captives, when not immediately sold into slavery, were often reduced to forced labour.’ Friedman, _Encounter between enemies_, p. 113; John Gillingham noted that the Damascus Chronicle notes the enslavement of women and children at the hands of the Franks in 1111, Friedman referred to women and children taken captive, Gillingham, ‘Crusading warfare, chivalry and the enslavement of women and children’, p. 133.
their letters and petitions. Additionally, those individuals organizing their ransom lived in the same conditions as those who were unable to be ransomed; both groups performed the same labours. In 1540 when the Ottoman Naval Commander Dragut was captured by the Order he became a galley slave despite his high status. The question remains, why is a distinction between captives and slaves applied retrospectively rather than simply referring to both groups as slaves, some of which were ransomed. This links to the discussion in chapter 1 regarding language; Friedman chose to use the term captive when slave would have been more suitable, this is likely because taking captives does not have the same negative connotations as slave-raiding. The focus of any discussion of ransom should be on the Order’s slaves, as it was the slaves that were being ransomed.

Like many aspects of the slave system, the ransom process was controlled by the slaveholder, who set the price and choose whether to ransom their slave at all. Even if the slaveholder set a ransom value there could still be difficulties, for example if the slave lacked personal wealth, or was not of sufficient status to be ransomed by others. Additionally, for some slaves the tasks they performed limited their ability to organize their ransom: Peter Earle argues that ‘...of all the slaves, the galley-slaves found it most difficult to organize their ransoms. States which ran galley-fleets had a constant preoccupation with trying to keep their rowing benches manned and were extremely reluctant to let a fit young man go.’ This would have been true of the Order which often had a shortage of galley slaves, as discussed earlier. Communication was also a factor; galley slaves while at sea would have difficulty in contacting individuals who might be able to ransom them. Urban slaves were in the best position to navigate the difficult routes to freedom as the urban environment provided them with more means to contact those people that might be able to assist them in gaining their freedom such as family members, ransom agents and sympathetic rulers. Additionally, urban slaves were more easily able to find work; as Agius states, ‘They worked to earn money in order to ransom themselves.

6 Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 4.
7 ‘E non essendosi potuto contenideri dire, che niun’altra cosa tanto lo cruciassa, quanto l’essere stato preso da vn Cassacca; Fució riferito a Gianettino, il quale se n’adirò,e sdegnò in tal maniera,che dopo hauere dati alcuni calci nel mostaccio a Draguto; ordinò al Comito, che mettendolo alla catena, lo facesse vogare; e lo trattasse, come il più vile, e minimo Galeotto, e Schiauo di tutta la Ciurma; non ostante, che fosse stato de più principali Capitani dell’Armata Turchesca alla Preuesa,& à Castelnuouo.’, Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 3, p. 192.
8 Barker, Karras That Most Precious Merchandise, p. 13 ‘It is only clear in retrospect which individuals would be ransomed from captivity and which would remain in slavery.’
9 Friedman, Encounter between enemies, p. 113.
10 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 171.
in occupations such as hairdressing, shoemaking, sail-making, weaving, selling oil, vinegar, and comestibles and providing domestic services.’

This chapter primarily focuses on Malta, as there does not appear to have been a clear ransom system on Rhodes, although Vatin has noted that ransoms could have occurred which left no trace in the Hospitaller archives. One detailed example from Rhodes will be discussed, the 1503 failed ransom of Camal Bei, this ransom was unlike the majority of those on Malta and involved an Ottoman negotiator of the son of the Grand Turk, Korkud Celebi, rather Camal’s ransom being set at a specific value, the intent was for a truce and an exchange slaves. From this example it appears that the Order on Rhodes linked the exchange of slaves more closely to diplomacy, this is not surprising as Friedman notes that the exchange of captives was included as a clause in almost all Muslim treaties as it was ‘...the formal excuse for a muslim to desist from jihad and make a truce at all...’ Friedman was discussing the first crusade, although it appears that this was still a common occurrence while the Order was on Rhodes. In 1466 on Rhodes the Order exchanged Muslim slaves for enslaved Christians as part of a truce, the Order then freed those Christians. A similar treaty was made with Egypt 10 years later in 1476, as detailed by Vertot. In 1512 the Order agreed to allow Selim I to redeem Turkish slaves on Rhodes for a set price of 25 ducats per slave.

12 Vatin, L’Order de Saint-Jean-de-Jerusalem, l’Empire ottoman et le Mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522, p. 111 ‘Mais, surtout, beaucoup de transactions pouvaient se faire sans laisser de trace dans les bullaires...’
14 Friedman, Encounter between enemies, p. 99.
15 ‘È perche nella Città, e nell’Isola di Rodi, molti Mercanti, & altri Huomini Turchi si trouauano; dediedero ordine, che tutti fossero ritenuti, e fatti prigioni, con le robbe loro; in iscambio de’Christiani, che durando la Tregua, i Turchi presi haueuano. Lasciando preo ritornar libero l’Ambasciatore sopradetto, con tutti gli Huomini, e le robbe sue posciache sotto la Fede dell’Ambasciatore della Religione, iui era venuto. Furono fatte queste cose a’dodici di Febrero, del mille, quattrocento, e sessantasei. Nè tardò molto dopo questo, a mandar MAOMETTO vn’Vfficiale suo in Rodi, a trattare la restitutione, de’Turchi, ch’erano stati dalla Religione ritenuti, e dopo la rottura della Tregua fatti Schiaui; & anco per rinouare il Trattato della Tregua. Sopra di che, essendosi tenuto Consiglio, a’quattordici di Maggio; fu risposto al detto Vfficiale del Turco, che rilasciassi se, e restituisse prima MAOMETTO i Chrifiani, che presi teneua; in cambio de’quali, hauerbbe poila Religione rilasciat i Turchi, che ritenuti haveua. E che s’haueffe egli dopo questo, voluto attendere alla Tregua, si lasciasse intendere; essendo egli risoluti di non più fidarsi di lui.’ Bosio, Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gieroslolimitano volume 2, p. 297.
17 AOM 82, folio 53r-v, references Vatin, L’ordre de saint-jean-de-jerusalem, l’empire ottoman et le mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522, p. 62.
Muslim slaves on Rhodes were given to the Sultan as tribute, the Sultan then freed them.\textsuperscript{18} As a result of this link between ransom and diplomacy, the Order may have discouraged individual Brothers from ransoming their slaves.

The naval-based warfare undertaken by the Order against their enemies ensured a constant stream of enslaved people were brought to Malta, which fuelled a profitable trade in slaves. For the corsairs that operated out of Malta this slave trade was the primary reason for their naval operations; the crew of captured ships were often worth more to the corsairs than the cargo carried on the ships.\textsuperscript{19}

For the corsairs, there was little difference between ransom or sale, but for the slaves, the difference was between freedom and servitude.\textsuperscript{20} Alongside this trade in slaves, slave redemption helped to facilitate more traditional trade; safe conducts were issued to ransom agents allowing them to facilitate the ransoming of individuals but also granting them access to markets that would otherwise be closed.\textsuperscript{21} This access was given for the reason of facilitating redemption but allowed them to take advantage of the trade opportunities.\textsuperscript{22}

As the majority of the Order’s slaves were captured through naval warfare they were predominately male.\textsuperscript{23} That is not to suggest women were not ransomed or freed, as in 1595 Grand Master Verdalle freed 27 of his slaves in his will, which included three female slaves in the house of Sommaripa.\textsuperscript{24} Although, Friedman links the sexual exploitation of female captives to reduced likelihood for ransom, ‘...it was taken for granted that their captivity included sexual harassment, and they were thus considered morally tainted.’\textsuperscript{25} Despite the lack of direct evidence for the sexual exploitation of slaves by the Order, the expectation that slaves, especially female slaves would be sexually exploited would still have remained, the significance of this has been identified by Karras and Barker; ‘Because

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{18} ‘bisognaua procura re di raddolcire l’ira del Gran Turco; con offerirgli qualche leggiero Tributo; o con re stituirgli tutti i Turchi, ch in Rodi schiau si si trovano.’ Bosio, \textit{Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano volume 2}, p. 689.

\textsuperscript{19} Earle, \textit{Corsairs of Malta and Barbary}, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{20} Ma’Cuncizade Mustafa Efendi, \textit{Le Captif de Malte, Recit autobiographique d’un cadhi ottoman}, Translated by Hayri Goksin Ozkoray (Anacharis Editions, 2019), p. 13-14 ‘Cette petite et grande guerre quasi permanente est cruciale pour un phenomene socio-economique de premier plan qui structure tout l’espace mediterraneen a l’epoque modern: le commerce des captifs et la traite des esclaves. En effect, cet effort militaire alimente les dynamique de l’echange qui ne sont pas uniquement determines par la violence, mais aussi par des tractations, des negociations et des jeux diplomatiques, ne serait-ce qu’a cause des gains financiers potentiels. Autrement dit, ce conflit maritime donne lieu a tout un univers qui tourney autour de l’economie multilaterale de la rancon et des echange de prisonniers.’

\textsuperscript{21} Bono, \textit{Corsari nel Mediterraneo Cristani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitu e commercio}, p. 183.

\textsuperscript{22} Abela, \textit{Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century}, p. 193.

\textsuperscript{23} Hershenzon, \textit{The captive sea}, p. 21.


\textsuperscript{25} Friedman, \textit{Encounter between enemies}, p. 10.
\end{flushleft}
women’s honor in both Italian and Mamluk society depended on sexual reputation, slave women were categorically dishonored and dishonorable in comparison to free women.26 Friedman argues that as a result of this; ‘…some female captives preferred to stay in captivity, rather than face their former society…’.27 However, this presents the situation as a choice which would not have existed for the individual if their family did not want to ransom them, the slave had no claim to their former society unless the former society chose to recognise it. The recognition of those ties was outside of the slave’s control, as slaves attempting to organise their ransom were still affected by the condition of natal alienation highlighted by Patterson.28 As a result of the expectation of sexual exploitation of slaves and the relationship between sexual reputation and honour, female slaves were in a different situation from male slaves, the result of this was that ransom was less likely although it was not impossible and may be affected by other factors; for example, mothers accompanied by children were more likely to be ransomed.29 From this, it would appear that the dishonour suffered by a slave would impact their status when ransomed or reduce their chances of being ransomed, in this case sexual exploitation, but there may likely have been other dishonours that affect ransom as well, for example slaves caught trying to escape would have their nose and ears cut off, and eight slaves involved in the 1749 conspiracy were branded with an ‘R’ on each cheek, these would have been a permanent visual reminder of their actions and status, it is unknown whether this would have affected their likelihood of being ransomed.30 The Order also restricted the hair of its slaves, while dishonourable this was temporary and such conditions are outlined by slaves seeking ransom it seems that this dishonour was not considered a barrier to ransom, and rather its inclusion in appeals for ransom may suggest that the slave thought including such details may encourage their kin to ransom them.31

The 1602 account of Ma’gangu-zade Mustafa Efendi, entitled ‘The return of the humble from Malta, the adventures of the prisoner of Malta.’, provides an insight into the ransom process on Hospitaller

26 Barker, Karras, *That Most Precious Merchandise*, p. 77.
28 Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, p. 5.
31 ‘mi hanno tagliato la barba, e li mostacci…’; ‘Noi stiamo in Malta, e non ci e restate ne barba, ne mostacci, e stammo con un cantaro di ferro alli piedi…’, Bono, ‘Schiavi musulmani a Malta nei secoli XVII-XVIII Connessioni fra Maghreb e Italia’, p. 91.
Malta. This account will be discussed throughout this chapter as different aspects are discussed. Efendi’s account is significant because it was written after he was ransomed; there are numerous surviving letters from slaves on Malta who were seeking ransom, but the validity of the content within these letters has been questioned as the slaves may have exaggerated their poor conditions and treatment in hopes of encouraging the recipient to ransom them. Despite having been ransomed, Efendi’s account describes his poor treatment and squalid living conditions, suggesting that the other surviving letters may not have exaggerated. Additionally, his account details the process by which the ransom price was agreed, something that is not set out in other sources.

The source reveals that on the 13th of May 1597 a squadron of 4 ships from Malta attacked the ship carrying Efendi, which had been sailing to Cyprus, where he had been appointed as a judge. After his capture Efendi remained on board the ships for 26 days and witnessed the Order’s fleet plunder another 12 ships and capture 283 prisoners; it is not clear if this includes the attack on Efendi. Efendi was freed from slavery in Malta in 1599 having been ransomed for 500 florins by the governor of Morea, Sultan-Zade Mehmed Beg. Within the Hospitaller archive on Malta can be

---

32The account was translated from the original Arabic by W. Schmucker into German and more recently, into French by Hari G. Ozkoray; W. Schmucker, Die Maltesischen Gefangenschaftserinnerungen eines Turkischen Kadi Von 1599, p. 192. ’...deren ursprünglicher Titel "Bazkest-i haqiri-i Malta — sergüzest-i esiri-i Malta" lautet, liegt in der Selim Aga-Bibliothek (Abt. Kemankeg Emir Hoca, Sammlung 438, 7. Risala) in Uskadar. Der Text, welcher 56 Seiten umfaßt, ist in dieser Sammlung auf den Blattern 132-159 aufgezeichnet.’; Ma’cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman; The two translations differ over the spelling of the authors first name, Schmucker spelling the name as Ma`gangu-zade and Ozkoray spelling the same name as Ma’cûncizâde.

33 Lahlali and Agius, ‘Writing private letters: Breaking with Islamic and literary Arabic traditions’, p. 344.


35 Ma‘cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, Le captif de Malte, Recit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman, p. 33 ‘Nous passames vingt-six jours en mer, endurant de nombreuses souffrances et persecutions qu’il m’est impossible de detailer ici. Saint-Aubin, le maudit capitaine françois nous amena a Malta (que Dieu — qu’il soit exalte — la detruise bientot) dans la troisieme decade du mois de sevval [7-15 Juin 1597], ayant pille douze bateaux a voile et fait 283 prisonniers.’

found the licence of safe conduct for his departure from Malta in 1599 where he is described as a 46-year-old Turk from Constantinople.\(^{37}\)

The role of Communication in organising ransoms

Communication was key to the ransom process, for a slave to be ransomed required the ability to communicate with people who had access to the funds to pay the ransom. For those slaveholders who wanted their slaves to be ransomed this communication was to be encouraged.\(^{38}\) Alienating slaves from their previous lives has often been viewed within the discourse as a means of control and domination but ransom required the slave to have a continuing link to their families and as such, the slave could not be entirely alienated from their previous social contacts.\(^{39}\) From Efendi’s account, he was in communication with the Ottoman hierarchy as he addressed his pleas for help to Sultan Mehmed III, who ruled from 1595-1603.\(^{40}\) Within the Mediterranean slave system a network of communication between the enslaved people and their place of origin existed and facilitated the ransom process, which Daniel Hershenzon summarised: ‘…captives frequently contacted their kin, who in turn contacted pasha, king, and sultan, who then exchanged messages with one another, these cases had the potential to intersect in Spanish, Moroccan, or Ottoman political hubs, as well as in the slave prisons. Such negotiations often led ecclesiastical redemption institutions and north African merchants to establish uneasy ransom coalitions.’\(^{41}\) Efendi’s account outlines how he and the other slaves wrote to the Sultan describing their conditions in hopes of being freed.\(^{42}\) The account includes some of the poems sent to the Sultan in which Efendi outlines his longing for home, that he is in misery at the hands of nonbelievers and asks for the Sultan’s protection.\(^{43}\) Typically

---

\(^{37}\) AOM 452 folio 285, 29th December 1599 ‘Mustafa cady Mahamed ogli turco di Costantinopolii di anni 46 in circa di honesta sttura leva per segno nel brazzo dretto sal loco della segnatura una delicata ferita.’, mentioned by Wettinger, *Slavery in Malta and Gozo*, p. 87.

\(^{38}\) Hershenzon, *The captive sea*, p. 4.

\(^{39}\) Orlando Patterson, *Freedom in the making of western culture*, (Basicbooks, 1991), pp. 9-10. Patterson linked alienation to his definition of slavery.


\(^{41}\) Hershenzon, *The captive sea*, p. 2.


\(^{43}\) Mustafa Efendi translated by Schmucker in *Die Maltesischen Gefangenschaftserinnerungen eines Turkishcen Kadi Von 1599*, ‘In wehmütigem Gedenken der Heimat ist das Auge immerfort tränenfeucht.

Durch die Trennung von ihr ist das Herz
slaves on Malta would write to their families in the hope that their families could organize their ransom. But Efendi describes himself as orphaned and without anyone who can redeem him. As his appeals are made to the Sultan rather than to members of his family it is possible that he was indeed an orphan. The communication between captives and their kin can be seen in the Arabic letters found as part of the trial of Georgio Scala, additionally Jewish slaves in Malta would write letters to Jewish communities abroad.

Minna Rozen has identified 9 epistles from the National Library in Jerusalem which date from between 1625 and 1670, concerning the redemption of Jewish captives in Malta writing to their kin. There were organizations based in Italy and Venice that raised funds to redeem enslaved Jewish people. In Venice a Jewish confraternity for the redemption of captives was set up: Cecil Roth analysed a collection of letters to and from the confraternity dating from between 1671 and 1710 and estimated that at least three-quarters of the confraternity’s activities were centred on Malta. This emphasizes how significant Malta was with regard to the enslavement of Jewish peoples. It is unknown how many Jewish people were enslaved on Malta and the surviving sources are limited, although Godfrey Wettinger highlights some specific examples when larger numbers of Jewish slaves are apparent, in 1568 a safe-conduct was issued to facilitate the ransom of 110 Jewish slaves held in Malta. The 9 epistles identified by Rozen refer to 42 Jewish captives, of whom 34...
were captured on one ship.\textsuperscript{50} These epistles are part of a collection of 232 epistles copied from the archives of Jerusalem’s Jewish community.\textsuperscript{51} These letters were originally written to raise funds to free the captives.\textsuperscript{52} From these letters it is clear that the captives were forced to carry out hard labour while attempting to organize their ransom, one letter details; ‘...they set him to perform hard labour with bricks and mortar, and to shoulder heavy loads of large precious stones.’\textsuperscript{53} It is unknown who was referred to as ‘him’, the epistles are written in the third person and identifying characteristics were removed when these letters were copied, Rozen states that this was so ‘...they could serve as prototypes for additional epistles.’\textsuperscript{54} This suggests that these letters would be useful as a guide to help future captives write letters to gather support for their ransom, that the Jewish community was producing written resources to support captives, suggests that supporting the ransom process was important and further suggests that the enslavement of members of this community must have been a somewhat regular occurrence for such a resource to be useful.

In the seventeenth century, the Jewish community in Venice employed non-Jewish agents in Malta who represented them and helped to organize the ransom of enslaved Jewish people.\textsuperscript{55} Their agents were often Venetian merchants who received a fee for organising the ransom of enslaved Jews.\textsuperscript{56} These agents would visit the slave prisons and question slaves about their origins and financial situation; the agents would then communicate with the redemption organization in Venice to arrange the ransom, typically contacting the family of the enslaved person.\textsuperscript{57} These attempts to contact family do not reduce the slave’s isolation as the slave has no control over whether their previous links to family would still be recognised and acted upon.\textsuperscript{58} The slaveholder retained control as they allowed the ransom and set the price, controlling whether the slave had the option of appealing to their kin, and if the price was too high they would not be ransomed. Similar to the Arabic letters, the Jewish epistles outline the hardships faced by the slaves.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{57} Roth, ‘The Jews of Malta’, pp. 223-4.
\textsuperscript{58} Patterson, \textit{Slavery and Social Death}, p. 5.
\end{flushright}
The Arabic letters from the trial of Georgio Scala have been discussed previously regarding what these letters reveal about the treatment of slaves; within this context, these letters provide an insight into the communication between slaves and their families. These letters were written by Muslim slaves on Malta to their families in Sfax, Tunis, sometime before the trial of 1598. That these letters were given to Scala shows that the slaves thought he could get their letters to their families, probably a result of Scala’s status as a freed slave which gave him more access to merchants and travellers who could transport the letters. The trial of Georgio Scala does not provide much insight into why these slaves would choose to give him their letters, as the letters were used as evidence of his rapport with slaves and were peripheral to the case. Scala was investigated by the Inquisition as a result of accusations brought against him by his wife, who made known his dealing with slaves on Malta and these letters were found following a search of his residence. That these letters were accidentally found highlighted that this channel of communication was unknown to the Order, additionally while Scala’s sentence included banning him from long conversations with Muslims, he was not banned for carrying letters for them.

In all three of the letters, the slaves were writing to their families, in the letter from Muhammad there appears to be a ransom request, although it is not clearly stated. The other letters do not expressly request to be ransomed, although they do highlight the poor living conditions and treatment of the authors. Zammit and Lahali who translated these letters argue that the authors highlight their plight ‘... hoping thereby to move their relatives in Sfax into action and, somehow, secure their release.’ Additionally, all three letters complain about a lack of correspondence from their families. The letter from Muhammad and Ali both writing to their brothers mention having previously received letters but that there has been a lack of correspondence since they became Christians. The third anonymous letter highlights that many people have visited Malta but none have brought him a letter: ‘My Brothers, so many people come (to Malta) but we saw from you

---

60 Agius, ‘A man and his times: Concluding remarks’, p. 431.
neither letter nor answer, (even) on a piece of paper the size of a finger. This highlights that despite these slaves attempting to resurrect links to the families the slave was powerless if the family choose not to acknowledge those links. Notably, two of the letters highlight that there has been no correspondence since they became Christians, this suggests that contact had been previously established but their families had ceased communication after they became Christian likely because they would no longer be accepted in their homeland even if freed as a result of their acceptance of Christianity. The authors by detailing their poor conditions and treatment may have been attempting to excuse their conversion as a survival strategy.

The authors of these letters had likely been enslaved some time as two of them became Christians. Additionally, the letter from Ali complains that ‘years’ have passed without correspondence. Through these letters, the slaves sought to communicate with their families, and they made use of the contacts available to them on Malta to find someone sympathetic to their situation to carry these letters. While their letters never reached their intended recipients abroad, the existence of these letters highlights the agency of the slaves to make connections and engage with free people and that despite these slaves having been enslaved for years and being baptised they are still trying to build links to the kin and alter the situation they are in. These letters provide an insight into the missing documentation that surrounds slaveholding, each of these slaves had written previous letters but none of them have survived, only these examples are known because of the very specific circumstances that caused these letters to be collected by the inquisition.

The importance of communication in the ransom process is clear in the example of Camal Bei highlighted in a 2015 article by Urs Gosken and Nabil Al-Tikriti. On the 23rd of February 1503 an Ottoman negotiator of the son of the Grand Turk, Korkud Celebi, came to Rhodes to demand a truce and seek the release of Camal Bei. This was unusual, the vast majority of slaves were not aided in

72 The lack of sources regarding slaveholding has been discussed in chapter 1, a more detailed account of how these letters have survived is contained within, Agius, ‘An introduction to the inquisition of Georgio Scala’, p. 6.
73 Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, pp. 409-435.
74 ‘Sclavus suu familiar nomine camalbei.’ AOM 80 folio 82 transcribed in Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence between Sehzade Korkud and the knights of st. john of Jerusalem’, pp. 417-419.
obtaining ransom by a negotiator. Camal Bei had been enslaved by the vessel of Brother Maldonati and was owned by the Lords Brethren Guido and Valdimessa. Camal Bei held the title of Kapicibasi, yet it appears that the Order and even those who possessed Camal were unaware of his importance as before this he had simply been a domestic slave. Camal Bei likely intentionally kept his identity a secret so that it would be easier for him to organise his ransom. Once Camal Bei was identified by the Ottoman negotiator his situation changed drastically. Bosio, who recorded this case, stated that Camal was not treated like a slave but treated like a Christian and a person of quality. The Order placed him in a house, and four Brothers were assigned to live in the house with Camal to prevent him from escaping. The owner asked to have security for Camal equalling 2,000 Ducats, a large sum. Camal Bei was also assigned two domestic slaves; they had been his slaves before his capture when they were then enslaved by the Order and prior to being assigned to Camal were owned by Brother Jannottus Fontz, commander of the fortifications. Usually as all slaves regardless of status were treated the same, although the Order have may have made an exception because of the value associated with Camal Bei and that he may be used to make a truce with the Ottomans. For Camal Bei, his newfound importance and the support of the Sultan’s son only complicated his ransom. The process was at first delayed because Camal became ill and while the Order took steps for him to be treated; this meant that Camal Bei could not travel, and this drew out the negotiations. Additionally, his freedom became linked to larger exchanges of slaves, as the Order sought to have numerous Christian slaves freed in return, which the Sultan’s son was willing to provide; In March 1504 Korkud Celebi wrote to the Order detailing that preparations were being made to free Christian

75 Fodor, ‘Maltese Pirates, Ottoman Captives And French Traders In The Early Seventeenth century Mediterranean’, pp. 221-238.
76 The Kapicibasi was a title of great honor, the chief of the palace gatekeepers, ‘...who supervised all the gatemen of the palace, in charge of guarding its gates, transmitting messages and orders, and executing the decisions of the imperial council, including the infliction of punishment through the bastinado.’ Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, (Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 117.
78 ‘...habent quatuor fr[atr]jes seruientes... noce a fuga’ AOM 80 folio 82 transcribed in Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, pp. 417-419.
79 ‘e comperaron per due mila scudi; il sopradetto Camaibei’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 575; Slave insurances was not uncommon, although it was not typically for such a large amount Origo, ‘The Domestic Enemy’, p. 331; For comparison, Wettinger identifies 63 ransoms between 1568 and 1600, of which the highest value by far is that of Manuele son of Joseph, a Jewish slave, ransomed in 1587 for 1,000 scudi, Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 254; 1 ducat was approximately 4 scudi, as such Camal Bei had been valued at 8,000 scudi, Wismayer, The seven year balance sheet of the sovereign, military and hospitaller order of st. john of Jerusalem, p. 75.
80 ‘In sup quia Frater Janottus Fontz... habebat duos sclavus famulos dicti Camalbei.’ AOM 80 folio 82 transcribed in Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, pp. 417-419.
81 AOM 80 folio 98v-99v; ‘E perche egli era ammalato;, comandarono a Medici dell’Infermeria che con ognicura,e diligenza,è curarlo attendere douessero.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 575.
slaves in return for Camal Bei. The Order promised to return some 21 enslaved people and requested eight in return including members of the Order. The situation ended rather abruptly with the death of Camal Bei, who drowned while trying to escape from Rhodes. Why he chose to flee is unknown, possibly he was attempting to regain some of his honour by freeing himself, although Bosio speculates that Camal chose to escape as a result of rumours that the negotiation of his ransom would fail.

Camal’s escape underscored many of the fears domestic slave owners had; he took weapons from the house he was kept in, gathered 12 Turkish slaves from the stables and armed them, then sought to escape by boat. The Order had taken steps to prevent this exact type of escape; in 1501 regulations were set out so that the port on Rhodes would be guarded day and night and slaves were banned from being outside after nightfall. In this instance these regulations were ineffective, although part of this might have been the result of the unique situation that Camal Bei was in, he was not being treated like a typical slave and given how long negotiations over his ransom had been going on perhaps the Order was complacent regarding restricting his movement as he was able to move around outdoors at night. However the Order’s restrictions may have had some effect, the boat the escaping slaves found was without oars, despite this the slaves continued in their attempt

---


83 AOM 80, folio 101-102v; Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, pp. 430-432.

84 AOM 80, folio 103v-105 transcribed in Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, p. 432; ‘...e dubitando, che per quei romori seguiti, la negociatione del suo riscatto si rompesse;’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 576.


86 AOM 400, folio 212, similar restrictions were outlined in the Pragmaticae Rhodiae, ‘De Seruis et custodiae et fuga eorum’, National Library of Malta, Libri Ms 153 folios 99-102; ‘e che tutti gli Schiaui così del publico, come de’Priuati, vilauorassero; e che tutti portar douessero vnferro di seioncie; e che vietato gli fosse il poter vendere, e comprare nelle Piazze, come per l’addietro faceuano.’; Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano* volume 2, p. 605; Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 63; Nicolas Vatin, *L’Ordre de Saint-Jean-de-Jerusalem, l’Empire ottoman et le Mediterranee orientale entre les deux sieges de Rhodes 1480-1522*, p. 107; ‘Ordinò, che rinforzare si douessero le guardie nelle Torri di San Nicolò, di Nailacco, e del Molo de’Mulini; e che si facessero le guardie di giorno,e di notte; acciò che i Nemici il Porto improvvisamente sforzar non potessero che gli Schiaui non fuggissero, e che i Vaselli forestieri, senza licenza entrer, nè vscir potessero. Che dar si douessero ordine tale, a’ Castelli di Trianda, d’Archangelo, di Ferraco, & à gli altriluoghi, ch’erano al lito del Mare, doue le Barche de’ Pescatori ritirare si soleuano; che gli Schiaui con esse fuggire non potessero.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano* volume 2, p. 547; Flight has previously been discussed in chapter 2 with regard to the *Servitudo Marina*, flight was a common form of slave resistance in many slaveholding contexts: Blumenthal, *Enemies and familiars*, p.224.
to escape, although Camal Bei fell into the sea and drowned. That the boat was left without oars may have been to prevent slaves from escaping. This example highlights how fluid status could be, a slave owner became a slave, then regained some status as a tool for negotiation but ultimately, died trying to escape Rhodes alongside other Turkish slaves. This example emphasizes the multileveled interactions that were taking place; the Order communicated with the Ottomans over a specific slave, but the slave retained his agency and took independent actions as a result. Additionally, it seems the concern the original owners had that Camal might escape was warranted. While the escape attempt by Camal Bei is rather unique as a result of the circumstances, it does show that the Order’s enslaved peoples could retain their agency and resist, Camal Bei did not escape alone but alongside 12 other slaves. Although Camal died during his escape attempt, the Order lost far more than a single slave. Bosio records how Camal Bei was a great expense for the Order, costing the Order over 2,000 ducats which were paid to his owners, and the cost of three doctors.

Communication also had risks; by allowing their slaves to send letters they could provide information to the Hospitallers’ enemies. Bosio describes how freed slaves on Rhodes became spies because they knew the Order’s routines and places to land. There are few references to such issues on Malta, although during an invasion scare in 1645 the Grand Master ordered that the slave prisoners be searched for writing and arms, presumably fearing that the slaves might be coordinating with the Order’s enemies. Additionally, even when communication was taking place to organise a ransom, communication that the Order would have typically considered beneficial, allowed the slave to maintain contact with their families and, if reciprocated, provided the slaves with a support network. Slaves were not passive in the ransom process, the slaves were needed to make the connections, and the slaveholder had to allow their slaves to make these connections for the ransom to take place. This provided the slaves with an opportunity to re-establish a link to their

---

87 ‘…Camalbei cadette in Mare; e prima che potesse esser aiutato, iui s’arm egò ; elo Schiavo, che questa trama ordita haveva fù ammazzato.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 576.

88 ‘…per essere il detto Camalbeìà lui tanto caro; per il cui rispetto, con due mila ducati riscattato l’haueuano, e fattolo guarire benissimo, con l’assistenza di trè Medici, e con spesa grandissima;’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 577.

89 ‘Percioche, quindi s’impaurirono tanto i Rodioti, che si come per l’addietro, tutti sicuri attendeauano à coltuiare le campagne, e le possessioni loro, così per lo innanzi, tanto timidi, e codardi diuentarono, che lascianano quasi tutti i terreni dell’Isola incolti. E quel che fù anche peggio, molti di quelli, che furono condotti schiaui, per prezzo, e per la libertà, si fecero poi Spie, e Guide de gli Inimici istessi; conducendo, come quelli, ch’erano dell’Isola pratichissimi, le Galeotte, e le Fuste de Turchi, spesso a far danni noitabilissimi in Rodi; insegnando loro i luoghi, i modi; ed i tempi, ne’quali con sicurezza sbarcare si potessero; guidandogli anche a luoghi sotterranei, e segreti; doue negli improduisi assalti, gli Isolani ritirare, e nascondere fifioletano. Onde molti poueri Contadini restauano poi molto speso in tal modo soprapresi.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 2, p. 255.

90 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p.83 references AOM 258 folio 9v.
lives before enslavement; the letters from the trial of Georgio Scala highlight the lengths that slaves would go to try and establish such a link, even if it was unreciprocated for years. Furthermore, the case of Camal Bei shows that even while a ransom was being negotiated, the slave could still act.

Safe conduct to facilitate ransom
Mustafa Efendi arranged for his letters to reach the Sultan through an intermediary; similarly to how Georgio Scala held letters for Muslim slaves, a man named Yakomo who was on Malta to deliver the ransom of another slave took Efendi’s letter to the Sultan.91 Likewise, it was a merchant named Ibrahim Celebi who brought Mustafa the news that he was to be ransomed.92 Often the people the Order’s slaves would communicate with were considered enemies of the Order so ensuring letters reached their intended destination was problematic, but some merchants were able to move between the Christian and Muslim worlds and so were able to facilitate communication between the slaves and their kin. The Order issued licences of safe conduct or Salvi conductus to various people to enable them to travel with the protection of the Grand Master without fear of the Maltese corsairs.93 One of the first issued on Malta from 1531 was to Francesco Chaena to travel from Barbary with various merchandise.94 Ransom funds had to be brought to Malta to secure the slaves’ release; often these funds were brought by individuals who knew that the Order would normally have attempted to enslave them. To facilitate the ransom process the Order had to grant licences of safe conduct. Mustafa Efendi was granted a licence of safe conduct to depart Malta in 1599.95

In 1610 George Sandys noted that the Order ransomed many of their slaves and as a result, ‘...for ever and anon you shall have a little Boat, with a Flag of Treaty, come hither from Tripoly, Tunis, and

---

91 Ma’cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman, p. 67 ‘Il envoya le zimmi Yakomo avec de l’huile d’olive a saint-jean, afin de payer la rancon exigea pour la liberation du capitaine de fregates Dervis [lui-même originaire de coron. Yakomo ayant obtenu la liberation dudit capitaine, partit avec la letter que j’adressai audit beg son excellence en vue de lui exposer ma situation.’


93 Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy, p. 184.
94 Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy, references AOM 415 folio 208v.
95 AOM 452 folio 285, 29th December 1599 ‘Mustafa cady Mahamed oggi turco di Costantinopoli di anni 46 in circa di honesta ststura leva per segno nel brazzo dretto sal loco della segnatura una delicata ferita,’ mentioned by Wettinger, Slavery in Malta and Gozo, p. 87
Algiers, to agree for the redemption of Captives...’

Although the system of safe conduct was not without its risks for those travelling, as it relied on the document being accepted. Skippon visited Malta in 1663 and states ‘We saw a rich Jew who was taken about a year before, who was sold in the market that morning we visited the prison for 400 scudi; and supposing himself free, by reason of a passport he had from Venice, he struck the merchant that bought him; whereupon he was presently sent hither, his beard and hair shaven off, a great chain clapp’d on his leg, and bastinado’d with 50 blows.’

Merchants with licences of safe conduct acted as intermediaries between the enslaved and the people providing the ransom funds and used this situation to gain access to markets that would otherwise have been closed to them. Joan Abela notes that while the merchants would typically be given the ransom from the families in coinage, the merchants would use that money to buy merchandise to sell in Malta. This strategy both avoided fluctuating exchange rates and allowed the merchants to make additional profits. The link between trade and ransom was not unique to Malta as the Mercedarian and Trinitarian Orders in North Africa used the ransom funds of Spanish captives to buy goods that they would then sell for a profit, further increasing the funds they had available to ransom captives.

Interestingly Michael McCormick argued that, with regard to the European economy in the eighth century, the trade in slaves fuelled further commerce between Europe and the Muslim world as European slaves were exchanged for spices and silks; something similar appears to have been occurring within the Hospitaller context as the issuing of safe conducts as part of the slave trade was being used to allow traders access to both the Christian and Muslim markets. Abela has argued that the Order needed trade with Muslim powers to meet its daily needs and that by linking that trade to the ransom of captives the Order protected its identity as an enemy to Muslims while still engaging in trade with them. Theresa Vann states ‘…the order, more so than other Christian powers, had to cloak such trade with the mantle of defending the faith.’

Daniel Hershenzon observed a similar situation regarding merchants in Spain wishing to trade with the Maghrib who declared they would not trade in war materials and would use their profits to ransom Christians rather than invest in goods for resale in Spain. In 1534 a merchant resident of
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96 Sandy, _Sandys Travels_, pp. 182-183.
97 Skippon, ‘An account of a journey made thro part of the low-countries, Germany, Italy, and France.’, p. 621.
99 Abela, _Hospitalier Malta and the Mediterranean Economy_, p. 195.
100 Wettinger, _Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo_, p.196; Ellen Friedman, _Spanish captives in north Africa in the early modern age_, (University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), pp. 121-23.
102 Abela, _Hospitalier Malta and the Mediterranean Economy_, p. 193.
103 Vann, ‘Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Mariners in the Port of Rhodes, 1453-1480.’, p. 163.
104 Hershenzon, _The captive sea_, p. 51.
Djerba, North Africa, Bayz Mahmet Algnari applied for a licence of safe conduct, which was granted by the Grand Master; Abela notes that the Grand Master ‘... was careful to base his concession on the fact that many Christians were falling captive to Muslims, and thus Muslim merchants such as Bayz Mahmet would be excellent intermediaries for the redemption of such captives, since they were familiar with the region.’ While Bayz Mahmet did redeem Christian captives, he was also permitted to bring other commodities to Malta for trade.

In 1555, two freed slaves that the Grand Master had owned, Murgian De Abdalla and Mahometo Hamidan Benalli Di Zanzor, were granted licences of safe conduct so that they could travel between their homelands and Malta, and traffic in various merchandise. That freed slaves would engage in trade with their former masters is not unusual; regarding Spanish merchants, Daniel Hershenzon outlines that often these merchants had been enslaved and then freed which had formed part of a complex profession trajectory; ‘Often, they were former captives who had developed local connections in the Maghrib and had mastered Arabic and Turkish during their captivity. As Spaniards and Christians, they enjoyed freedom of movement in the Iberian Peninsula and hence easy access to families of captives who sought help rescuing their relatives and to whom these merchants could offer their skills and contacts.’ This overlaps with the role of Atlantic Creoles who used their knowledge of both Europe and Africa, especially concerning language, to serve as intermediaries.

Ira Berlin notes the lack of identity and liminality of the Creoles, shifting position between European and African. Similarly, the slaves freed by the Grand Master in 1555 had probably developed connections on Malta during their time in captivity and now were able to use those connections as well as connections from the homelands to enable trade with Malta. They were from Zanzor, near Tripoli and Aden near the Red Sea and like the Creoles would have shifted positions depending on the circumstance, in this case between their links to Malta and their homelands. It is unclear whether these slaves turned traders faced difficulties as a result of their past status.

Licences of safe conduct were sometimes granted to slaves of the Order so that they could travel to their homeland to secure their ransom and then return with it. This process gave slaves considerable freedom as they were able to travel abroad and were unsupervised by their masters.

---

111 Abela, *Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy*, p. 192-3 references AOM 425 folio 198-199
112 Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p.173.
Given the obvious risk that the slave might not return, this was only used when the Order had reason to believe that the slave would return, typically because the Order possessed either the family of the slave they allowed to travel or other members of the slave’s community. In 1552 Bali Hagi de Stambol who had been captured by Brother Stozzi was allowed to leave Malta and return with the funds to free not only himself but also his wife and three children who remained on Malta.\footnote{Abela, *Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy*, p. 203 references AOM 423 folio 227v-228; Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 14 ‘And so in Malta we find alongside the letters patent licensing the corsair captains to fit out to attack moslem shipping, safe conducts for Islamic merchants to return home after capture to raise money to ransom themselves and the hostages left behind as sureties for their good behavior...’} In 1562 Salomon a Jew of Rhodes was granted safe conduct to ransom himself and 3 other Jewish slaves.\footnote{Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 196 references AOM 429 folio 253v.} Peter Earle details an example from 1662 where a group of 31 slaves were given conditional freedom so long as they paid a group ransom of 22,000 pieces of eight in the next three years; 2 members of the group were allowed to travel to Cairo to collect the ransom.\footnote{Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 173.} From these examples, it is clear that the Order was taking advantage of the family bonds by manipulating them as a means to encourage ransom. Similarly, in fifteenth century Valencia Mudejars would be allowed to travel to raise funds to ransom their kin, for example in 1441 Caat Benazmet of Alberique was granted safe conduct to travel so that he could redeem his father who was the captive of a Castilian.\footnote{Meyerson, ‘Slavery and the Social Order: Mudejars and Christians in the kingdom of Valencia’, p. 171.}

Joan Abela has produced a list of all safe conducts given between 1530-1565; several safe conducts were granted to slaves owned by Brother Francesco de Lorraine the grand prior of France: in the 6 months between November 1556 and May 1557, licences of safe conduct were granted to seven slaves he owned.\footnote{AOM 426 folio 250v, Amor Belbay Tays; AOM 426 folio 254, Jacob Zamero de Tremesen; AOM 426 folio 254v Isuph Ali Ogli de Satalia; AOM 426 folio 254v Agi Ibraim Ogli de Satalia, Memi Trevis Ogli, Thamuza Thsan Ogli; AOM 426 folio 264v. Abela, *Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 220-228.} These seven slaves were granted safe conduct so that they could travel abroad and return with merchandise to redeem themselves and other slaves.\footnote{AOM 426 folio 254v ‘...per andai in Alessandria et altri loci a procurar il riseatto suo et d’aluni altri Turchi che qui si ritrouamo schiavi per il che etc che puotra portar qua per riscatto suo et de dette Turchi...’} L’Abbe de Vertot detailed the capture of multiple ships by Francesco just prior to 1557; the slaves being granted safe-conducts were likely the crews of those captured ships.\footnote{L’Abbe de Vertot, *Histoire des chevaliers hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jerusalem : appeluez depuis chevaliers de Rhodes, et aujourd’hui chevaliers de Malte*, Volume 3, (Rollin, 1726), pp. 377-8 ‘Pour se venger de cette insulte, le Prince de Lorraine se mit aussi-tôt en mer avec ses galères & deux autres de la Religion, courut à son tour les côtes de Barbarie , prit entre Malte & Tripoli un brigantin d’Assanbaly, fameux Corsaire, donna la chasse à Uluchialy auquel il enleva une galère & une galiote ; & avant que de rentrer dans le port de Malte , il prit encore deux vaisseaux chargez de sel & de différentes marchandises.’; Vertot, *The History of the Knights* 234} Additionally, in 1557 a group of ten slaves captured
by the Galleys of Jean de Valette who had redeemed themselves were granted licences of safe conduct so that they could return to their homes. One of these freed slaves, Salmon Monestino, was also granted safe conduct for 14 months to transport merchandise between Malta and Zakynthos. Further highlighting that some freed slaves used their experiences and links to Malta to allow them to trade across the Christian and Muslim border that would otherwise have been impassable and the Order was allowing this. The Order not only allowed its slaves to travel abroad to redeem themselves and other slaves on Malta but also to function as agents abroad to redeem enslaved Christians; in 1563 several slaves of the Order were granted a licence to travel and redeem some important slaves, although it is not clear who these slaves were or why they were important to the Order.

The Order made varied use of its slaves with regard to their abilities to travel abroad to locations that would have been difficult for members of the Order to access. The Order’s slaves were able to travel abroad to facilitate their ransom and the ransom of others on Malta, additionally to act on behalf of the Order to redeem slaves abroad and freed slaves were able to become merchants. For the Order to use its slaves in this way those slaves had to be accepted in their homelands, their return needed to be desirable for them to be able to find people to support their ransom; and for freed slaves that became traders, they had to still have the same access to their homelands. Some of the Order’s slaves were able to achieve this because they were able to retain their faith while enslaved which was a key component to ensuring their ransom, although some instead chose to convert to Christianity which isolated them from their kin as highlighted in the letters which were part of the trial of Georgio Scala.

Faith as a factor in the ransom process
Mustafa’s faith features throughout Mustafa Efendi’s account which included prayers and supplications to God, providing an insight into the importance of religion. Mustafa’s account was

---


written after he had been ransomed, so it is possible that Mustafa felt that it was important to stress his continued devotion while enslaved. For slaves faith was a key factor in strategies for survival and with regard to slaves gaining their freedom, in the extreme the choice was between retaining one’s faith or becoming Christian, neither route was a guaranteed route to freedom. For Muslim and Jewish slaves their fellow co-religionists were more likely to assist with the ransom process if they retained their faith. From the Arabic letters from the trial of Georgio Scala, it can be seen that conversion isolated the slaves from their previous co-religionists.125 Salvatore Bono describes a case where in 1602 an enslaved Maltese man, Agostino Battaglia, was freed in Tunis on the condition that upon returning to Malta he would free the brother of the man who had redeemed him.126 If the brother had converted or died before Battaglia reached Malta he would have to pay 137 scudi. In this example, conversion is equated to death which highlights the link between faith and previous identity.

The Order allowed its slaves to practise their faith, slaves in Malta were not forcibly converted, as in Spain.127 Efendi mentions the prison mosque, highlighting that he was able to continue to worship while enslaved.128 Additionally, faith was important among the Muslim slave community. Emanuele Colombo highlighted both points in the 1691 treatise on conversion by the Spanish Jesuit Emmanuele (Manuel) Sanz, sent to Malta in 1683 as confessor to the Knights, Sanz detailed that slaves retained their faith because if they converted they could not return to their homelands, and in another case a slave stated they would not convert because they served on the galleys and would lose the esteem of the other Muslim slaves.129 Alternatively, slaves could become Christians and be baptised, the Order was more likely to free baptised slaves without them having to pay their

---


126 Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo).

127 Ciappara, ‘The date palm and the olive tree; Safeguarding the Catholic frontier in Malta 1595-1605’, p. 259.

128 Efendi in W. Schmucker, Die Maltesischen Gefangenschaftserinnerungen eines Türkischen Kadi Von 1599, p. 211 ‘...wurde in einer Freitagnacht am äußersten Ende des Gefängnisses ein Platz als Moschee eingerichtet, wo die Gefangenen und die Armen die geweihten Nächte zu durchwachen pflegten.’ ; Ma’cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman, p.42 ‘...un endroit fut reserve pour l’implantation d’une salle de priere au fond du bagne. Les captifs et les pauvres ranimerent les nuits saintes dans ce coin.’

ransom, for example in 1595 Grand Master Verdalle died and in his will freed all of his personal slaves who were Christian. Baptised slaves were also treated better, for example baptised slaves were given a higher quality white bread than unbaptised slaves known as *scacciato*. This reveals that the Order was not only actively enforcing a distinction between these two groups but also highlighting the baptised slaves as being of higher status. Bread was a major part of the diet for both slaves and the population of Malta. Piero Camporesi has highlighted the importance of bread as a status symbol and this appears to have been especially true in Malta where several Maltese idioms refer to bread, often in a symbolic sense. Carmel Cassar details that ‘When inquiring about someone’s character the Maltese often ask, *x’ħobż jiekol dan?* (lit. what type of bread does he consume?)’. It appears that bread was used as a sign of social standing within the Order as well, as the Brothers ate the best bread and the slaves received the worst, further emphasizing the importance of baptised slaves receiving better bread.

The Order not only allowed the worship of other faiths but also made some allowances for this; Mustafa Efendi states that during Ramadan they were allowed to have evening prayer in the mosque. This is not the only example of the Order making allowances for Ramadan, galley slaves were able to fast during Ramadan, although in 1749 this was a key part of the planned slave uprising known as the Great Conspiracy. It would have allowed the slaves to carry out their plan to poison the supplies on the ships in the knowledge that only the Christians would die since it was Ramadan and it would not be suspicious that the Muslim slaves were not eating, the outcome and punishments for the slaves involved in this uprising has been discussed in chapter 4. There were also allowances for Jewish slaves, in 1675 the Inquisitor in Malta prohibited Jewish slaves from being

130 Abela, ‘Who was Georgio Scala?’, p. 222 references AIM 16A folio 111.
132 Trasseli, ‘Una Statistica Maltese del secolo xvi’, p. 476; Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, pp. 362-3, references AOM 738 folio 1-9v; AOM 202 folio 461v; AOM 222 foil 188; Grima, ‘The Rowers on the Order’s Galleys’, p. 125, references AOM 110 folio 182r-v; Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitu e commercio*, p.118 ‘Ai forzati e agli schiavi, al posto del pane, veniva distribuito il biscotto (pane biscottato); a ciascun uomo ne spettavano <once trenta [quasi 900 grammi], tanto d’estate che d’inverno;’
133 Piero Camporesi, *Bread of Dreams*, (Polity Press, 1989), p. 120.
135 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 121.
137 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 146.
forced to work on their religious holidays. Additionally, in 1675 the redemption agent on Malta from the Confraternity in Venice, Francesco Garsin, was authorised to purchase land as a burial site. It is surprising that these allowances to make Jewish worship easier came so late as the Order had a population of Jewish slaves on Malta from as early as 1549. Although, Cecil Roth has argued that the Order viewed Jews as more dangerous enemies than Muslims, ‘...accusing them of espionage and worse: and they did not scruple to violate a neutral flag in order to make Jewish captives.’ In 1501 the Order had expelled all the Jews from Rhodes because they were thought to be spies, similarly in 1572 Grand Master La Cassiere ordered the expulsion of all Jews from Malta, this appears to have effectively enslaved any that refused to leave as Cassar notes; ‘The rule stipulated that any Jewish male that ignored the order was to be sent to row on the galleys. Women and children were to be sent to work on the public works without wages and would only receive food rations normally allotted to slaves.’ This appears to fit with a wider anti-Jewish European trend as in the sixteenth century restrictions were placed on Jewish people by Pope Clement VIII. Overall there was no guaranteed freedom, and by choosing to convert or not, the slave limited their options and chances of being ransomed either by family if they retained their faith, or by the Order if they converted. Regardless of the slave’s strategy, their situation was still controlled by the slaveholder, who may not allow the slave to be ransomed. Slaves who maintained their faith and who were allowed to be ransomed by their slaveholder might not have the means or support to obtain sufficient wealth for the ransom payment. Alternatively, a slave seeking conversion might not be allowed to convert by their slaveholder, the Order’s concern regarding insincere conversion has already been mentioned regarding the Order’s restrictions on the baptism of slaves. Additionally, some slaveholders were financially motivated to prevent their slaves from being baptised, precisely

139 Roth, ‘Lettere della Compagnia del riscatto degli schiavi in Venezia’, pp. 31-36, Letter 3 Address to Francesco Garsin, identified as Letter 149 in Roth, ‘The Jews of Malta’, p. 234 ; ‘..Li nri schiavi si lamentano di non haver luoco per sepelir qualche morto et si se trovase luoco competente potrete comprarlo sino per Rli 50...’
142 Cassar, ‘The Jews, Catholic Policy and the Knights of St John in Malta’, pp. 169-184
because conversion reduced the chances that a slave’s family would ransom them.  

144 Grima focused only on Muslim slaveholders preventing Christian slaves from converting to Islam, but the same was also true on Malta.  

145 As noted in chapter 5, on Malta several cases were brought before the Inquisitor of members of the Order objecting to the baptism of their slaves.  

146 In 1606 a group of slaves claimed to the Inquisition that their lapse in faith had been forced on them by the Order.  

The Order may have sought the monetary gain from ransom at the expense of conversion, this further highlights that the Order was acting primarily as slaveholders rather than achieving Christian ideals of conversion, contrary to Zammit’s appeals that ‘For them [the Order], the triumph of the faith was not to be achieved solely by force of arms but also through the salvation of souls...’  

148 Indeed, Emmanuele Sanz’s treatise on conversion was addressed to the Christian reader, highlighting that conversion needed to be facilitated by the slaveholder.  

The choice to retain their faith or convert was not one that had to be made immediately, Salvatore Bono argues that many slaves converted and gradually assimilated, although the case of Georgio Scala shows how the converted freed slave was still viewed with suspicion.  

149 The Inquisition index of knights Hospitallers of the Order of St John’, pp. 157-196, number 54. 4 June, 1599, Vol 169, Case 69, Denouncement - Fra Antonio Piccione, Italian was accused of having spoken against the Catholic faith to a convert slave. ; number 244. 18 June, 1650, Vol 171, Case 198, Denouncement Fra Santurin, Infermiere at the Sacra Infermeria, living at Valletta, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. ; number 293. 12 July, 1669 Vol 171, Case 230, Denouncement - Fra Gallucci, Neapolitan, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. He was liberated and absolved. ; number 309. 3 August, 1680 Vol 171, Case 246, Denouncement Fra Geronimo Tinvert, French, Order’s Ambassador to King Louis XIV of France, accused of having objected to the baptism of his slave. Sentence: he was admonished.  

147 Wettinger highlights that baptised slaves had a reduced ransom price in the seventeenth century, likely because baptised slaves were unable to pay higher ransoms; if the slave had been able to pay a higher value ransom they would probably have done so rather than remaining on Malta long enough to be baptised.  

151 Cecil Roth highlights the case of Jacob Cardiel, who when captured claimed to be a Muslim for 14 months before declaring himself a Jew in hopes this would ensure his release, Jacob later became Christian ‘...more from desperation
than from zeal..."\textsuperscript{152} Two examples highlight the extremes with regard to when this decision could be made; William Zammit notes that in some instances there were immediate requests for baptism from newly enslaved people, Zammit links this to the trauma of enslavement, ‘...individuals not only lost their personal liberty but found themselves immersed in an alien culture which disparaged all that they stood for.’\textsuperscript{153} Alternatively, Emanuele Colombo notes the example of Mohammed el-Attaz, later known as Baldassarre Loyola, who was enslaved for 5 years on Malta having been captured while on pilgrimage to Mecca, in 1656 his ransom was paid and only decided to convert on the day of his departure.\textsuperscript{154}

The Order was not meant to enslave fellow Christians, as a result some captives claimed to be Christian in hopes of being immediately freed.\textsuperscript{155} The Christian identity of a slave was often difficult to prove as it relied on testimony of people who had known the person before they were enslaved and the word of other slaves was not valued.\textsuperscript{156} The seventeenth century Inquisitor of Malta Federico Borrommeo wrote of the difficulties of reaching a judgement on the Christian status of slaves, stating that for every genuine case there were ten fraudulent ones.\textsuperscript{157} There were disagreements between the Order and the Inquisition in recognizing the Christian identity of certain slaves, Georgio Scala had claimed to be Christian when he was captured, but his Christian identity was rejected by the Order.\textsuperscript{158} The Inquisitor had accepted his Christian identity but was unable to free him despite acknowledging that the enslavement was wrong, highlighting the contested power dynamics between the Order and the inquisition.\textsuperscript{159} The Order’s suspicion is unsurprising as feigning

\begin{itemize}
    \item Roth, ‘The Jews of Malta’, p. 240
    \item Abela, ‘Who was Georgio Scala?’, p. 215.
    \item Federico Borrommeo, ‘Relazione di Malta e suo Inquisitorato del Cardinale Federico Borromeo’, in \textit{Malta Letteria}, 02 (1927)6, p. 190, ‘Prolississima per ultimo e confusa riesce la terminazione di quelle cause che s'intentano da schiavi ritenuti come Turchi o Mori che pretendono essere cristiani e conseguentemente liberi, perche siccome la prova di questa loro intenzione e difficillissima dipendente da luoghi lotani per attestazioni di persone rare volte degne di fede, cosi essendo all'incontro la parte del cristiano e della libera molto favorevole tiene in bilancio gli arbitrii, tanto piu che per uno quale ragionevolmente paga queste istanze, ve ne saranno dieci che falsamente pretendono il simile, e trattandosi talvolta di levare all Religione o ad altri particolari, per tal via, schiavi di rilevante valore, e necessario di considerar molto bene prima di darne giudizio.’
    \item Aim, Processi Criminali, MS 16 A, ff. 76-123. Folio 106v, ‘Da detto monsignore inquisitor accio lo reconciliassse detto monsignore li disse che lui havrebbe fatto fede che della reconciliacione non haveva la de farla et che non trovava che fosse mai renegato, ma che in quanto la liberta esso monsignore non ci poteva far altro’ translated and transcribed in ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, pp. 142,153
    \item Aim, Processi Criminali, MS 16 A, ff. 76-123. Folio 106v, ‘Da detto monsignore inquisitor accio lo reconciliassse detto monsignore li disse che lui havrebbe fatto fede che della reconciliacione non haveva la de
\end{itemize}
Christian belief could be used as a tactic against the Order, Bosio details that during the Great Siege of Malta in 1565 a soldier of the Ottoman army pretended to be a lapsed Christian and sought reconciliation to enable him to spy on the Order; he wrote a letter outlining how to conquer Valletta which was then to be taken by a slave who would flee Malta.\(^{160}\) This plan failed but no doubt contributed to the Order’s fears, although Friedman notes that such suspicion and distrust was perhaps a disguise ‘...for hatred of the stranger who competed for status and employment with old believers.’\(^{161}\) The Order and the Inquisition also disagreed regarding the reconciliation of slaves whose Christian faith had lapsed, with Grand Master Wignacourt claiming that the interventions of the Inquisition were affecting the working of the Order’s galleys as any slave too poor to obtain his ransom could simply claim to have been a Christian.\(^{162}\) This suggests that claims of a previous Christian identity were a result of not being able to afford ransom, possibly an act of desperation. Although it seems likely that if the slave had been Christian they would have attempted to make this known when they were enslaved. It is not surprising that the Order did not want their slaves being freed through reconciliation; apart from the issue of slaves faking a Christian identity to gain their freedom, each slave freed because they had proven themselves to have been wrongly enslaved represented an economic loss to the Order, which would likely have discouraged the Order from investigating such claims.\(^{163}\)

**Setting a ransom price**

Mustafa Efendi was ransomed in 1599 for 500 florins by the governor of Morea, Sultan-Zade Mehmed Beg.\(^{164}\) The value of this ransom is first mentioned early in the work and is repeatedly discussed.

---

\(^{160}\) ‘In questo giorno fù scoperto alla Città notabile, il tradimento d’vn Rinegato Calabrese, il quale, partendosi dall’Effercito Turchesco, era andato quivi, fingendo di voler riconciliarsi alla Santa Fede. E mentre si teneua, come s’vsauano di tener tutti gli altri Rinegati ancor sospetti, chiuso per caustela nelle Carceri del Capitano della Verga; subornò vn Negro Schiauo di quella casa, è fuggirsene, a portar vna lettera sua a Mostafà Bascìa; con la quale ausaia, che facilissima cosa stata sarebbe, espugnare quella Città; come per molte efficaci ragioni persuadeua, che far si douesse.’, Bosio, *Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Illustrissima Militia Di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*, volume 3, p. 627.

\(^{161}\) Friedman, *Encounter between enemies*, p. 139.

\(^{162}\) Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 52.

\(^{163}\) Friedman, *Encounter between enemies*, p. 136 ‘Undoubtedly the economic loss incurred by freeing a converted slave was an important factor in this resolution, but suspicion as to the convert’s sincerity certainly played an important role.’

referenced throughout, likely to emphasize that this ransom was particularly high. The ransom being high reflected Mustafa’s status, as he had been captured in 1597 while travelling to Cyprus to be a judge. The value the ransom was set at was extremely important for both the slave and the slaveholder: for the slave if the price was set too high and they were unable to pay it then they would remain enslaved, meanwhile the slaveholder wanted the highest possible ransom that the slave could afford to maximize their profits. A slave’s ransom value was different from the sale value. Wettinger outlines the differences: ‘The former depended principally on the financial and social status of the slaves in their own country; the latter depended on their sex, age, strength and skill on the demand for and the supply of, the labour they could prove and on such other imponderables as their character especially their willingness to work or instead a disposition to escape.’ Friedman notes that in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem slaves’ ransom prices were higher than their sale price, otherwise the captor would simply sell them. The ransom price was based not just on the status of the slave but also on the demand for that person to be redeemed, and how much kin or political authorities were willing to pay.

The status of the slave being ransomed was significant because it informed the slaveholder of how high a level of ransom they or their kin might be able to pay. The Jewish community in Venice often engaged in ransoming slaves on Malta; Roth has argued that this resulted in the ransom price of Jewish slaves being higher, a ‘Jewish prisoner was worth, in fact, whatever could be extorted from his brethren. Ransom thus degenerated into blackmail.’ Although ransom was not guaranteed, the slaveholder had to want to ransom their slave and there must also be the desire and means for that person to be ransomed: the Jewish community in Venice sought to ransom as many Jewish slaves as possible and as such slaveholders ransoming Jewish slaves may have raised their ransom prices believing that the community would be willing to pay. However the Jewish community also wanted to ransom as many slaves as possible, and Sarah Azzopardi-Ljubibratic notes, ‘...the Confraternity

Dieners, abverlangen, sind 500 Goldmünzen.’; Ma’Cuncizade Mustafa Efendi, Le Captif de Malte, Recit autobiographique d’un calif ottoman, p. 7 ‘Il passa deux ans de captivite a Malte, ou etait base l’Ordre de Saint-Jean depuis les annees 1530, et fut finalement libere grace a son rachat effectue par le gouverneur [sancakbeg] de la province de Moree, Mehmed, au printemps 1599.’


167 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 241.

168 Friedman, Encounter between enemies, p. 148.


would not purchase slaves if the rates were too high.\textsuperscript{171} The ransom of Jewish slaves was overseen by an agent on Malta, this organisation of Jewish ransoms has been seen by Cassar and Azzopardi-Ljubibratic as a reaction to ransoms being set excessively high.\textsuperscript{172} Additionally, there were other ransom agents on Malta undertaking similar activities, Pal Fodor notes that the French consul in zmir had agents in Malta organising the ransom of enslaved Ottomans, partly as a means of generating income but also as a means of gaining prestige with the Ottomans.\textsuperscript{173} The Order also had a redemption fund, in 1606 the Order set up a fund for the redemption of Maltese people, known as La Cassa della Redentione de Schiavi, which provided money to families who could not afford to ransom their enslaved kinsmen.\textsuperscript{174} This was similar to the redemption funds established in Sicily in 1596 and Genoa in 1597.\textsuperscript{175} This fund supported the ransom process, for example in 1625 Brother Gio Bartolomeo, chaplain of the Langue of Italy, was captured while at sea and held in Constantinople, he was freed in return for two Turkish slaves held in Malta.\textsuperscript{176} His father, a Notary named Ascanio Scaglia, was granted funds to help him to purchase these slaves and free his son.\textsuperscript{177} Funds were collected during Lent and captives were chosen to be ransomed during Easter. 70 scudi was offered for each Christian and 200 scudi for each knight; the knights were bound to refund the sum.\textsuperscript{178} This fund was still in operation in 1716 and is mentioned in the description of Malta by Giacomo Capello, which highlights that the issue of Brothers being enslaved remained.\textsuperscript{179} These groups, both those ransoming slaves on Malta and the Order’s fund ransoming Christians from Malta, would have been motivated to use their resources to ransom as many as possible and as such not pay excessive ransoms.

In setting the ransom price it was thus key for the slaveholder to know the social status of the slave as a means of estimating what was the highest value the ransom could be set at and still paid.\textsuperscript{180} This was not unique to the Order but common to all slaveholders who engaged in ransoming their


\textsuperscript{173}Fodor, ‘Maltese Pirates, Ottoman Captives And French Traders In The Early Seventeenth century Mediterranean’, pp. 221 – 238.


\textsuperscript{175}Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo), Kindle Edition. Location 8901.

\textsuperscript{176}Victor F. Denaro, ‘Still more Houses in Valletta’, Melita Historica, 3(1962)3, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{177}Denaro, ‘Still more Houses in Valletta’, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{178}Savona-Ventura, Knight Hospitaller Medicine in Malta [1530-1798], p. 109.

\textsuperscript{179}Capello, Decrittione di Malta Anno 1716, A venetian Account, p. 84, lines 633-4.

slaves. 181 Mustafa details the ransom negotiations, he negotiated with an unnamed member of the Order from the treasury; first he was asked how much he could pay for his release, and so he pled poverty and offered 300 florins. The Order requested 1,000 florins, but he said he could not pay this and another slave, Cadi Abdu-r-Rahman, was called to make the case for a lower ransom price.182 The Cadi Abdu-r-Rahman proposed 400 florins which was dismissed, and the ransom was then fixed at 500 gold coins.183 Interestingly, another slave was brought in to argue for a lower ransom; the slave in question was a Cadi, a judge, it is possible that perhaps knew Mustafa and could attest to his status, or that because of the slave’s status as a Cadi, he was considered trustworthy by the Order. Both parties wanted the ransom to take place, but the control was in the hands of the slaveholder, who allowed the ransom to take place and set the price. While both parties want the transaction to occur, they have opposite aims, the slaveholder wants the highest possible ransom, while the slave wants the lowest. Negotiations like this were common and, in this situation, there was a clear asymmetry of knowledge; the slave knew their social standing and likely knew what level of ransom they or their kin could afford. 184 Daniel Hershenzon notes that in ransom negotiations ‘Captives therefore manipulated these qualities, pretending to be poor, or rich, healthy or sick, trained or lacking in professional skills.’185 This can be seen in the ransom negotiation of Mustafa, he initially pled poverty. People of high status would often hide that fact in hopes of having their ransom price set at a lower value; this deception would at times start even before the person was captured, with high-status individuals attempting to hide valuables or change into less expensive clothing.186 Similar to pricing any other commodity, slaveholders had to determine what ransom price to set, unlike any other commodity, slaves could affect the seller’s perception of their value. 187 Although some of the physical aspects of

---

183 Ma’cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman, p. 61 ‘Il leur propsa quatre cents florins et eut droit a la meme reponse que nous: <Aux tranches!> Pendant quelques moments, nous dumes rester devant eux, humiliés et les tetes decouvertes. Et de plus, nous retournames a nouveau au bagne, desesperes et ruines. Ils trancherent a propos de la rancon du cadi Hasim et la fixerent a cinq cents florins. Nous continuames d’attendre encore, demandant a Dieu de nous proteger des mechancetes des mecreants.’
185 Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 70.
186 Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo).
wealthy individuals would have been difficult to hide, Muscat notes ‘A simple look at the palms of the hands was enough to distinguish the hardy worker from the few lucky ones who enjoyed a life at court.’ Additionally, while the slave could try to deceive the slaveholder through the asymmetry of knowledge, there was also an asymmetry of power and the slaveholder could use their power over the slave to enhance their negotiating position by ensuring the slave witnessed and experienced the worst aspects of enslavement to encourage them to reveal the truth of their status. From Mustafa’s account, the distinction of his status did not improve his treatment and he had been enslaved for some time before being brought to negotiate his ransom price, as his account is full of complaints about the slave prison, the treatment of the slaves and their living conditions; the delay in setting his ransom price was likely a tactic by the Order to encourage him to settle for a higher ransom price. Friedman notes that in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem captives would often be abused and tortured until they accepted a higher ransom value.

This importance of status can be seen in the very high prices set for ransomed members of the Order, for example in February 1531, just 4 months after the Order’s arrival in Malta, 16 Muslim slaves were taken to Tunisia and exchanged for Brother Johannes Laura, Bailiff of Laureto. The captors of Brother Johannes had realised he was of some importance as they were able to gain 16 slaves in return for him, similarly in 1590, six Brothers were exchanged for 29 Ottoman slaves. In 1681 Brother Francesco Rally obtained a galley slave from the San Luigi galley to exchange for his nephew who was being held in Tripoli; in return he had to provide 2 replacement slaves for the galley. The cost of acquiring so many slaves would have been considerable, increasing the need for support from the Order redemption fund.

Each slave’s experience of the ransom process was different and relied on a variety of factors. While Efendi’s time on Malta was relatively short, 1597-1599, other equally prominent captives remained enslaved far longer. In the slave prison another judge was enslaved, a friend of Efendi, Hasim al-Hasimi, who had been enslaved for 6 years since 1591. Similar to Efendi, Hasim’s ransom was also

---

193 Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary*, p. 172.
set at 500 florins but had been unable to organise his ransom.\textsuperscript{195} Establishing a slave’s ransom value was complicated, a range of information was needed for a slaveholder to set a reasonable ransom. Additionally, this process further underscores how slaves that appear to be similar may have been in vastly different situations depending on factors outside of their control, such as the willingness of others to ransom them.

From Efendi’s description of his imprisonment, he was not better treated as a result of his status.\textsuperscript{196} Efendi performed manual labour; his account provides few details, but it is specifically mentioned that he worked to prepare the ground for where cannons were to be placed and carried stones and earth.\textsuperscript{197} Additionally, his feet were shackled while he was working; interestingly, Mustafa highlights this as it suggests that working in shackles was meaningful, likely as a sign of his reduced status and humiliation.\textsuperscript{198} Mustafa resisted his situation by feigning illness to avoid work; other slaves likely undertook similar forms of resistance and the Order would have been aware of such attempts to avoid work. Mustafa states that he had to keep a low profile and remain vigilant to allow him to feign illness.\textsuperscript{199} The Order was able to motivate their slaves to seek ransom and to accept higher ransom prices through the conditions the slave endured while at the same time the Order benefited from the hard work of its slaves, Hayri Ozkoray notes that the Order gained labour from Efendi for two years while also being paid to release him.\textsuperscript{200}


\textsuperscript{197} Mustafa Efendi translated by Schmucker in \textit{Die Maltesischen Gefangenschaftserinnerungen eines Turkischen Kadi Von 1599}, p. 220 ‘...zum Festungsgraben, gaben uns Stößel in die Hand, stampften unter allerlei Kränkungen und Demütigungen die Bodenstellen, wo Kanonen aufgestellt werden sollten, und hießen das uns tun.’; Ma‘cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, \textit{Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman}, p. 58, ‘Au deuxième jour de la fete sacree, lors de la reprise du travail abhorre dans les tranchees, ils nous ordonnèrent de porter des cailloux et de la terre aux batimenets et nous fumes mis a nouveau aux travaux forces.’; p.69 ‘Pour le respect du a Mahomet, porte secours a ce captive qui porte des pierres dans les tranchees.’  

\textsuperscript{198} Ma‘cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, \textit{Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman}, p. 80 ‘Tant de jours je trainai terre et pierres aux tranchees, les pieds entraves.’  

\textsuperscript{199} Ma‘cûncizâde Mustafa Efendi, \textit{Le captif de Malte : Récit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman}, p. 60 ‘Feignant la maladie, nous parvinmes a rester allonges dans un coin du bagnes pendant quelques jours en faisant profil bas avec vigilance.’  

\textsuperscript{200} Ma‘cûncizade Mustafa Efendi, \textit{Le Captif de Malte, Recit autobiographique d’un cadi ottoman}, p.14, note 16, ‘L’Ordre de Malte a profite pendant deux ans de sa main-d’oeuvre tout en recuperant le prix de sa liberation.’
500 florins and 2 years of labour. There could also be other benefits from engaging in the ransom process, this can be seen in the case of Camal Bei, the Order was attempting to have several members of the Order returned as part of this ransom negotiation. There were also less tangible benefits to engaging in the ransom process, these are more difficult to see in the documents, Pal Fodor notes that the French consul in Zmir engaged in the ransom of enslaved Ottomans on Malta as a means of gaining prestige with the Ottomans. The Order could likely have also gained similar benefits from engaging in the ransom of its slaves.

Conclusions
This chapter has provided an insight into the ransom process on Malta; the Order took steps to facilitate the ransoming of slaves, and enabled its slaves to arrange ransoms, provided licences of safe conduct and allowed communication. The process could vary considerably; individual Brothers were able to organise the ransom of their slaves, and even send their slaves abroad to organize ransom payments. Some slaves once freed used their connections to become merchants, gaining access to previously inaccessible markets. For the slave owners, the ransom process was highly profitable, as enslaved people could be used for manual labour while organizing their ransom and their ransom price was typically higher than their sale price.

Not all slaves were able to engage in the ransom process, it depended on the slaveholder allowing their slave to ransom themselves and that the ransom price was set at a level that the slave or their kin could afford. As a result, many slaves would have been unable to be ransomed even if their slaveholder wished for their slaves to be ransomed. There was some external support, redemption funds and agents that could aid in this process, but that still often required the slave to be able to repay the value that was provided once free.

Faith played a significant role in slaves’ survival strategies, if ransom was possible then for the slave maintaining their faith was essential as a means of gaining support from their kin and co-religionists, this is highlighted in the 1620 example where Agostino Battaglia, was freed in Tunis on the condition that upon returning to Malta he would free the brother of the man who had redeemed him unless the brother had converted or died. Ransom was profitable for the Order, and as a result the Order sought to facilitate ransom by providing safe conducts, allowing slaves to communicate with kin abroad and most importantly by denying their Christian obligation to spread their faith and allowing

201 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 29.
202 AOM 80, folio 101-102v; Urs Gosken, Nabil Al-Tikriti, ‘The 1502-1504 Correspondence’, pp. 430-432.
204 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, pp. 170-174.
205 Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo).
their slaves to practise their faiths. The Order had taken steps to limit the baptism of its slaves from as early as 1262, forbidding Brothers from baptizing their slaves without permission from the Grand Master. 206 This religious tolerance was based on profit maximisation and had some unintended consequences. Cecil Roth commented that on Malta, ‘...there came into existence what is assuredly the most remarkable Jewish community that has ever existed, one composed exclusively of slaves, with its numbers continually recruited by prisoners brought in from the high seas by sheer force, and depleted by the releases effected through the galleys, ransom, or death!’ 207 Ransom was significant in this regard as Roth estimated that between 1671 and 1710, at least three-quarters of the confraternity’s activities were centred on Malta. 208 This Jewish community was allowed to practise their faith by the Order and in the seventeenth century was able to bury its dead in a Jewish cemetery purchased with funds from a redemption charity in Venice. 209 On the other hand, for those slaves where ransom was not an option, baptism would provide a means to freedom through manumission. While conversion may have been less directly profitable for the Order, it was significant as a propaganda tool and as discussed in chapter 5, the manumission of baptised slaves in testamentary manumission was viewed as beneficial for the soul of the deceased. 210

The most significant aspect of the ransom process was that it relied on external links, the Order was trading its slaves back to the communities from where the slaves were taken. The process required communications between slaves and their kin, and ransom payments had to be organised and brought to Malta. The Order allowed and supported this communication, ransom agents from abroad came to Malta and the Order provided safe conduct to individuals that would normally have been targeted for enslavement. This feature more than any other highlights that the Order’s ideals that were used to justify the enslavement of their enemies could be put aside for the right price and that the Order interacted with a range of slaveholding powers. Overall the Order on Malta benefited from allowing enslaved people to be ransomed; they gained manual labour from these slaves prior to their ransom thereby receiving greater income than simply by selling them. The Order often complained of shortages of enslaved people, but the funds provided by allowing the enslaved to be ransomed were significant enough to allow this. Ransoms provided funds for the Order which could

be used to fund corsairs to undertake further slave-raiding and acquisition, which highlights the role of the Order as both supplying and demanding slave labour, which supported further supply and demand for slave labour.
Overall Summation

The Knights Hospitaller were a slaveholding organisation; the Order held slaves in the Mediterranean for centuries and their use of slaves was widespread. The Order undertook raids to capture slaves, members of the Order were served by personal slaves and slaves rowed the Order’s ships. Rather than viewing this slaveholding as peripheral to the Order this thesis has sought to undertake a new approach to the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding, an approach that highlights the breadth of the Order’s slaveholding and emphasizes the range of different interactions the Order had with enslaved peoples. This approach has focused on the Order’s enslaved people as individuals rather than a homogenised group and places the limited documents written by those people who endured being enslaved at the hand of the Order at the forefront. Through an analysis of two broad areas of interaction, at sea and on land, this thesis has explored how the experiences and situations of individual enslaved people could vary considerably. Critical assessment and evaluation of the existing scholarship has been a key part of this thesis, highlighting that problematic assumptions and arguments have shaped the current discourse. Many of the previous works on the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding have viewed the Order in isolation and as a result actions that are normal in the wider context have been presented as exceptional because the wider context has not been engaged with, such as the provision of medical care, the slave mosque and conditional manumission.¹ In contrast, this thesis has presented the Order’s slaveholding not in isolation but as part of a broader slaving context that stretched across the Mediterranean and by actively engaging with and employing methodological strategies from the wider discourse on medieval slavery, this thesis has identified areas of similarity between the Order and other slaveholding powers.

In the introduction three aims for the thesis were identified: to provide a critical assessment of the existing scholarship, to focus on the variety of interactions between the Order and their enslaved peoples, and to highlight the significance of slaveholding to the Order. These aims were interrelated and overlapping. As much of the existing discourse has either ignored or downplayed the significance of the Order’s slaveholding, this thesis has focused on the variety of ways the Order interacted with slaves as a means to counter those arguments. Highlighting the widespread and varied use of slaves demonstrates their significance to the Order. The Order exploited enslaved peoples in a variety of ways which resulted in diverse conditions and different forms of interaction.

These enslaved people themselves did not constitute a homogenised group with a single social or ethnic identity. The experience of no two enslaved people was identical: they each had their own motivations, prospects, agency, and trauma which affected how they interacted with their slaveholders. By focusing on the variety and complexity of the Order’s slaveholding strategies and behaviours this thesis has sought to provide a more comprehensive and holistic examination of the Order’s slave system than can currently be found in the Hospitaller discourse. The significance of this is that it reveals the complexity of the Order’s slave system which is not apparent within much of the existing discourse. For example, while the use of Forzati, Buonavoglia and slaves on the Order’s galleys is noted in multiple works, only by focusing on the differences between the groups does the Order’s use of hierarchies of coerced labour to manage and neutralize possible threats become apparent. Moving beyond the simplistic point that the Forzati were treated like slaves and the Buonavoglia were debt slaves, we see that the more similar their statuses appear the more important the differences between them, and that these differences can provide an insight into their motivations.2 The Order ensured there was a Buonavoglia on every bench, who would have had nothing to gain from the galley slaves overtaking the ship.3 The differences between Forzati, Buonavoglia and the enslaved oarsmen were visibly demarcated and the Order forced these different groups to be easily identified through shaving a combination of either the head or beard.4

Manumission is another area where a focus on the variety can provide meaningful insights into the Order’s slaveholding. Despite Hospitaller manumission being the topic of several articles, and the documents having been made widely available through their inclusion in collections of reprinted documents, there has been little engagement beyond noting that the Order freed its slaves through manumission.5 The prominence of manumission is often motivated by an attempt to present the Order as ‘kind’ to its slaves rather than provide insights into the significance of manumission or the variety within these documents.6 The Order’s manumissions varied considerably and can provide
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3 Hershenzon, The captive sea, p. 28; Bono, Corsari nel Mediterraneo, Cristiani e musulmani fra Guerra, schiavitù e commercio, p. 109 ‘Daun ammutinamento e da una ribellione provocata dagli schiavi musulmani nell’intento di recuperare la liberta, riparando in un porto musulmano, i forzati non avevano invero nulla da guadagnare e i Bonavoglia tutto da perdere poiche sarebbero essi stessi divenuti schiavi.’; Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 399.
insights into the motivations of the Order as the conditions were set by the Order. For example, the Order chose in 1588 to free Achamet Ogli on the condition that he served for another six years and trained two slaves in his craft, construction. The Order wanted his skills preserved, and through the continued service clause the Order ensured his future service. Similarly the condition that serfs and those who owed the Servitudo Marina could be manumitted in return for providing slaves further suggests that the Order sought to increase the number of slaves it owned. Testamentary manumission of slaves also appears to have been widely used and was another form of control: the slave would be less likely to rebel if they believed they would only have to endure slavery for a limited time, the life of their owner, while the slaveholder was able to benefit from the slave’s labour until their death, when the slave was freed. Only through consideration of a range of different manumission documents and focusing on the differences is it possible to gain an insight into the complex way the Order used manumission to suit its needs.

This focus on variety allows for a fuller understanding of the Order’s conception of slavery, who could be enslaved and under what circumstances. Throughout the thesis there are several instances of the Order enslaving people who were co-religionists and should have been regarded as non-enslavable. For example, the Inquisitor on Malta recognised the Christian identity of Georgio Scala which had been rejected by the Order, despite this Georgio Scala remained a slave of the Order for many years. This shows the power struggles and contest for authority between the Inquisitions and the Order. The Order appears to have captured galley slaves on enemy vessels and kept them enslaved despite them being Christians. In 1461, women who had fled from Cyprus were allowed to be sold on Rhodes for 7 years after which point they were to be released, a time restriction set by the papacy rather than the Order. These examples highlight ambiguity of enslavement, which could vary considerably depending on circumstance. Christian renegades could be enslaved legitimately, and slaves who converted remained enslaved, clearly the Order had no issue owning
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7 AOM 444, Folio 246v ‘servus nostra religionis artem fabei cementarii docere tenearis & obligatus’, ‘nec alio modo quibus sex annis elapsis et decursis et dictis duobus servus in dicta artem fabri cementarii.’
9 Patterson, Slavery and social death, p. 220; Stuard, ‘Urban Domestic Slavery in Medieval Ragusa’, p. 162.
10 ‘The trial of Georgio Scala at the inquisition in Malta in 1598’, pp. 142,153, ‘Da detto monsignore inquisitor accio lo reconciliasse detto monsignore li disse che lui havrebbe fatto fede che della reconciliazione non haveva la de farla et che non trovava che fosse mai renegato, ma che in quanto la liberta esso monsignore non ci poteva far altro’ Aim, Processi Criminali, MS 16 A, ff. 76-123. Folio 106v.
11 Winter, Sources Concerning the Hospitallers of St John in the Netherlands 14th-18th Century, p. 22.
12 Sarnowsky, Macht und Herrschaft im Johanniterorden des 15, p. 370 references AOM 282, folio. 143v.
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Christian slaves. Additionally members of the Order were even found to have traded in Christian slaves, for example in 1607 Brother Fraascinet was accused by the Inquisition of having sold 20 Christian Russian and Hungarian women at the slave market in Messina. This further highlights that the Order’s interactions were not just based on who the person was but also the context in which the interaction was taking place.

The Order’s ownership of Christian slaves suggests that at times the Order’s involvement in slaveholding superseded its duty of protecting Christians in the Mediterranean and their Christian ideals. This can also be seen in the Order’s requirement for slaves to work on Sundays. Additionally the Order allowed its slaves to practise their faiths and even allowed a mosque to operate in the slave prisons, as this was key to encouraging ransom. Slaves that became Christian were separated from their kinsmen and unlikely to be ransomed, and this may explain why cases were brought before the Inquisitor of members of the Order objecting to the baptism of their slaves. To gain this financial reward the Order was willing to facilitate the religious worship of its Muslim and Jewish slaves, allowed its slaves to communicate with the enemies of the Order and even granted safe conducts to ensure the ransom process could take place. These different examples further highlight the extent to which the Order prioritised its slaveholding.

Understanding the Order’s motivations can offer interpretations that might be otherwise missed, for example the decision of the Order in 1452 to allow the preceptor of Cyprus to make pacts with the Order’s enemies. This decision was at odds with the Order’s mission however it can be explained

14 Buttigieg, Nobility, faith and masculinity, p. 119 references AIM CP volume 170 case 169, case 91 folio 1-2, 1607.
18 AOM 363 folios 142-143v, The grant of the preceptory to Brother Louis de Manhac, December 1452, ‘et insuper circa salutem, statum, pacem, quietem et libertatem vestram et dicte baiullie providere volentes vobis prefato fratri Ludowico seu vestriis locumtenentibus et procuratoribus licenciam, potestatem auctoritatemque concedimus tam cum soldano quam cum Theucro eorumque subditis et sequacibus non obstantibus quibuscumque gweiris, quas nobiscum illi vel cum eis nos ipsi haberemus, gereremus vel faceremus, pacem, treugam, firmam, componendi, iurandi et promittendi pro vobis dumtaxat et dicta baiulilla, pro omnibus et singulius hominibus, rebus et bonis positis in dicto regno cipri ad nos nostrumque communem thezaurum et ad nostram religionem quomodocumque et qualitercumque pertinenteus absque aliqua inputacione cause,
from the wider context of the importance of Cyprus to the Order, especially the value of the Order’s sugar production on Cyprus which had been seriously disrupted by raiding which carried off many of the Order’s slaves.19 Thus engaging with the Order’s slaveholding and re-examining the Order through the lens of slaveholding can provide additional insights into the Order’s actions and highlight its engagement with a range of different slaveholding networks, for example how the Order used slaves to build and strengthen diplomatic relationships through gift giving, and how the ransom process allowed the Order to engage with markets that would otherwise have been closed to them, even gaining access to much needed supplies of wheat.20 The use of slaves as part of maintaining relationships can be seen in the Grand Master sending slaves to the Pope in 1595 in recognition of the Pope as supreme master of the Order.21

Despite the importance of the Order’s slaveholding in understanding the Order, in multiple publications arguments have been identified which have sought to limit the Order’s engagement with slaveholding and curtail the use of slaves by the Order. One form of this argument is to claim slaves were not suited for a task, for example Borchardt, Coureas and Luttrell stated that the Order could not have used slaves for sugar on Cyprus as a result of cost while including documents that detailed that the King of Cyprus used slaves for this purpose, as discussed in chapter 6.22 Similarly, Luttrell’s argument that the Order could not have used slaves on galleys while on Rhodes was shown in chapter 2 to be flawed, as were Wettinger’s attempts to argue that slaves were inefficient, discussed in chapter 1.23 There have also been attempts to distance the Order from the act of enslavement: both Luttrell and Coureas argued that the Order slaughtered rather than enslaved its

maleficii vel defectus.’ This clause also appears in the confirmation of the grant, November 1454, AOM 365 folios 171-172; Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, Documents 298, 309, pp. 407, 426.

19 Borchardt, Luttrell and Schoffler, Documents concerning Cyprus, p. lii.

20 The Order gave enslaved oarsmen to the Pope, chapter 3, Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 309; The Order gave slaves to European powers as gifts, discussed in chapter 5, Frelle and Dolores, Padre Ottomano and Malta; A Story of the 1001 Nights, p. 42; Referencing Aom 259 folio 165; Trade in Wheat, Trasseli, ‘Una Statistica Maltese del secolo xvi’, p. 475; Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, pp. 194-195, references AOM 647, Folio 231.

21 Pozzo, Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta, volume 1, p. 378. ‘Essendo ritornati dalla Corte di Roma il Priore di Capua Scaglia, & il Baglio di S. Eufemia Cagnuolo, palesarono in Consiglio il desiderio di S. Santità d’hauere dalla Religione , cento schiaui per rinforzo delle sue Galere, i quali si sarebbono compensati con altrettanti Forzati, o in altro maggior numero come sarebbe parso al Commendatore Fr. Emilio Pucci Comandante delle Galere Pontificie, ch’all’hora con le medeme si ritrouaua in Messina. Però il G. Maestro, e Consiglio prontissimi a corrisponder ai desideri del Pontefice, ordinarono ch’i Procuratori del Tesoro facessero scelta di detti schiaui, e che fossero tosto condotti a Messina.’; Wettinger Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 263, references AOM 1377 folio 169-70;


23 Luttrell, ‘The Servitudo Marina at Rhodes’, p. 54; Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 318.
foes. The evidence used by both historians to justify this view is highly problematic. This approach is not unique to the Hospitallers, a similar argument was put forward by Yvonne Friedman with regard to slave taking during the first crusade and was based on equally problematic evidence. H. J. Sire argued that the Order did not engage in slave raids. The distinction being made by Sire is that the Order did not undertake operations where the objective was solely the capture of slaves. Sire’s distinction is made as an attempt to separate the Order from other corsairs, likely to distance the Order from the negative connotations of corsairing and present the Order in contrast to the corsairs, although he accepts that the Order was still taking captives as part of their operations. Peter Earle makes a similar distinction between the Order and Corsairs but focused on profit. This approach uses the unprofitability of the Order to legitimise the organisation’s activities, similarly several historians have stated that the sale and ransom of slaves did not cover the maintenance of the Order’s galleys, again to use the lack of profit to excuse the Order’s slaveholding.

Even when the Order’s slaveholding is accepted there is an effort to excuse or legitimise it. This can be seen in the approaches that highlight the ‘kindness’ of the Order to their slaves. Typically this is done through giving prominence to manumission, based on a simplistic view of manumission and focusing on the conditions the slaves were kept in. Concerning the Order’s treatment of its galley slaves Peter Earle stated, ‘...it seems unlikely that they would be allowed to starve or die of exposure unnecessarily.’ While Joseph Muscat and Andrew Cuschieri have argued that ‘No knight could molest or beat a slave or order him about the galley.’ Their evidence for these claims of benevolence is flimsy, based on the issue of rules to reduce the violence against slaves, which suggests that excessive violence was a problem necessitating the need for such restrictions. Additionally this is contrary to what is described in the sources: Otto Friedrich von der Groben’s description of the treatment of the Order’s slaves while at sea outlines cruel and harsh punishments. Joseph Muscat has at different times presented both the conditions of the slaves on land and at sea as superior, stating that: ‘Most probably Muslim slaves in Valletta were treated

24 Coureas, ‘The manumission of Hospitaller slaves’, p. 110. ‘...the Hospitallers frequently massacred those Turks whom they captured in battle. It is possible therefore that this Turk had been acquired by purchase.’; Luttrell ‘Slavery at Rhodes’ p. 87, ‘...the brethren often massacred their Turkish prisoners.’
25 Friedman, Encounter between enemies, p. 19; Gesta Francorum, The deeds of the franks and the other pilgrims to Jerusalem, pp. 79-80.
26 Sire, The Knights of Malta, p. 92.
27 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 107.
28 Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. 26; Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 105.
29 Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 81.
31 Freller, Knights, corsairs and slaves in Malta an eyewitness account, p. 43; Groben, Orientalische reisebeschreibung des brandenburgischen adelichen pilgers, p. 38.
better than in any other foreign city,’ and also ‘...living in the slave prisons must have been unpleasant beyond imagination; so the open air on the galley was, ironically, a relief from the heat of summer in the cities. Good drinking water was available on board to their heart’s content and, if submissive enough, time passed away peacefully...’³² As both situations cannot have been true, it appears that Muscat is varying her argument as required to humanise the Order’s slaveholding. Again, this is an argument that is at odds with the surviving accounts of those who experienced the conditions.³³ With regard to manumission, the fact the Order freed some of its slaves is presented as morally good as if to distract from the fact the Order was enslaving people, only some of whom gained their freedom, and this freedom was only obtained through routes that benefited the Order. This argument fails to understand the wider significance of manumission as a tool the slaveholder could use to control and manipulate their slaves.³⁴

Why there have been such wide-ranging attempts to reduce the significance of slavery for the Order is unclear. A possible answer is that an idealised and morally good version of the Order is still present within the Hospitalaller discourse, which is at odds with the negative implications of slave ownership. Victor Mallia-Milanes has described the rule of the Grand Masters in Malta as enlightened and benevolent.³⁵ Similarly Luttrell has framed the Order’s governance of Rhodes as paternal and benevolent.³⁶ The Order’s slaveholding has been sanitised even when this is contrary to what is apparent in the primary sources, with the validity of limited sources written by slaves being questioned.³⁷ This idealised version of the Order is not new: Christine Muscat has argued that ‘...the image of Valletta that the Order of St John wanted to portray to outsiders. A very happy dominion (fellicissimo dominio) from where no one, not even a convict, would want to escape.’³⁸ This positive image of the Order despite its slaveholding suggests there is a wider issue of how Christian

³⁶ Luttrell, ‘Greeks Latins and Turks on Late-Medieval Rhodes’, p. 360. ‘...few hundred brethren who governed their Rhodian state in paternalistic fashion; doubtless they seemed authoritarian and militaristic to the Greeks but their despotism was comparatively benevolent...’
³⁷ Lahlali and Agius, ‘Writing private letters: Breaking with Islamic and literary Arabic traditions’, p. 337 ‘But the question here is whether Ali’s comparison of the life of a galley slave to hell is a true description of the conditions of galley slaves at that time, or a mere exaggeration of the situation with a view to moving his family and relatives to compassion, and perhaps convince them to ransom his.’
³⁸ Muscat, *Public Women; Prostitute Entrepreneurs in Valletta, 1630-1798*, p. 47.
slaveholding is interpreted, as Peter Earle states ‘From the general silence on this subject one might assume that Christian Europe has had a collective feeling of guilt about the activity of its corsairs for some two hundred years.’³⁹ The focus on the Order’s ‘kindness’ might be a reaction to this guilt, as this ‘kindness’ of the Order to their slaves has at times been linked to the Order’s Christian faith.⁴⁰ The implication that as Christians they were more likely to treat their slaves kindly can lead to a teleological reading of the sources to find evidence which supports this view, such as the focus on manumission and the freeing of slaves, despite this not being the act of kindness that many of those approaching the subject envision it to be.⁴¹

Russell Palmer highlighted the issue of Christian slaveholding being unaddressed in the existing slavery discourse; ‘Major, standard works, including The Cambridge world history of slavery, demonstrate this point, with the latter offering only a single chapter on enslavement in the Ottoman Empire - all but erasing slavery controlled by Southern European Christians.’⁴² This erasure of Christian slave ownership through silence can be seen with regard to the Order’s slave system. Wettinger’s monograph is evidence of this silence, originally written in 1966 but only published in 2002 at the request of other scholars because so little work has been produced on the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding.⁴³ The lack of study highlights the stagnation within the study of Hospitaller slavery, as noted in chapter 1, the examples of slaves highlighted by Luttrell 40 years ago are still being discussed in the same terms.⁴⁴ It is hoped that by highlighting these issues and reflecting upon them in this thesis the Hospitaller discourse can begin to move forward, aware, of the issues and trends in the existing approach and through engaging with the Order’s slaveholding move away from the idealised, benevolent version of the Order.

The significance of slaves to the Order is evident in the sources, the Order was underpinned by slavery. Slaveholding pervaded all areas of the Order’s operations, Brothers earned status through caravans which involved enslaving the Order’s enemies and as they rose through the hierarchy of

---

³⁹ Earle, Corsairs of Malta and Barbary, p. 10.
⁴³ Wettinger, Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo, p. xxx.
the Order more slaves were assigned to them further denoting their status.45 Slaves made up the majority of the Order’s oarsmen and the proportion of slaves on the Order’s galleys increased through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.46 Valletta had a higher proportion of slaves than other European countries and slaveholding on Malta remained widespread into the eighteenth century when it had started to decline in other Mediterranean powers.47 As William Henry Thornton stated the Order had ‘...a strong predilection for the employment of slave-labour,’ and only through the use of this labour ‘...it may be comprehended how the stupendous works undertaken by the knights for fortifying their strong-hold were accomplished.’48 The Order was not ashamed or unaware of the importance of its slaves, the striking image of slaves on the Sepulchral monument to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner pictured on the front of this thesis reveals that the Order’s self-image was grounded in slaveholding and the Brothers displayed this prominently and proudly. The Order’s use of slaves was varied and significant to an extent that has not been acknowledged or addressed within the existing scholarship, this thesis has sought to begin the process of correcting that.

It is hoped that the approach to the topic of Hospitaller slaveholding presented here will reinvigorate the discourse on Hospitaller slaveholding and encourage further critical assessment of how Christian slaveholding has been addressed, allowing for greater insights into Hospitaller slaveholding behaviours and the experiences and responses of those people that they enslaved. Insights that can then be used to provide a better understanding of the motivations and actions of the Order. The Order’s system of slavery did not exist in isolation but was part of a far larger slaving zone fed by broader conflicts that stretched across the Mediterranean. The Hospitaller slave system, much like the Order, was highly versatile and enduring: a military Order that became a sovereign power, they

45 Alonso de Contereras while serving on one of the Order’s galleys in the seventeenth century was ordered to chase fleeing Turks onto land, with the promise of ‘...ten crowns for every slave.’ It appears that the defeat of an enemy ship was not victory enough for the Order, Contereras, The life of captain Alonso de Contereras: knight of the Military Order of St John native of Madrid written by himself (1582-1633), p. 22; The Marshal had four slaves assigned to him while six were assigned to each of the Knights of the Grand Cross, Luttrell, ‘Slavery at Rhodes’, p. 86, ‘Item estabili est que le Mareschal puisse auoir iusque a iiij. Escalus des freres du Conuent quant morront pour lus de son ostel, et li remanas des esclauans uiengue au Tresor et du bestial qui seront troues aus dits freres ce est a sauior chamestre viegne tout au Tresor’, AOM 280 folio 24, latin translation 1357, AOM 69 folio 15v; Brogini, ‘L’esclavage au quotidien à Malte au XVIe siècle’, pp. 137-158; Bono, Schiavi: Una storia mediterranea (XVI-XIX secolo), Kindle Edition, Location 4333; ‘A Malta il gran maestro dell’ordine beneficiava di 30-40 schiavi, addetti alla sua persona e alla cura del palazzo magistrale.’; ‘...inoltre I Gran Croce avevano diritto a 12 tumoli al mese per sei [criados]; y cada piller cabeca de lengua de siete que son, a 20 tumoli per dieci [criados]...’, Trasselli, ‘Una statistica maltese del secolo xvi’, pp. 474-80; Abela, Hospitaller Malta and the Mediterranean Economy, p. 81.

46 Detailed in Appendix 2.


48 Thornton, Memoir on the finances of Malta, p. 51.
held slaves in the Holy Land, the Mediterranean and the New World, and they continued to exploit
enslaved people throughout the later medieval era and until the fall of Malta in 1798.
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Appendix 1, Stefano Dell Bella, Galley slave hauling a ship’s cargo, 1656
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Appendix 2, Overview of the crew of the Order’s galleys in 1590 and 1632

1590 breakdown of the Order’s galleys with approximate percentages.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galley name</th>
<th>Buonavoglia</th>
<th>Forzati</th>
<th>Schiavi</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitana</td>
<td>89 (31%)</td>
<td>43 (15%)</td>
<td>154 (54%)</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Marta</td>
<td>43 (22%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>127 (65%)</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria</td>
<td>66 (29%)</td>
<td>31 (13%)</td>
<td>134 (58%)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speranza</td>
<td>56 (24%)</td>
<td>29 (12%)</td>
<td>146 (63%)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Master’s Capitana</td>
<td>74 (33%)</td>
<td>42 (19%)</td>
<td>108 (48%)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Master’s Patron</td>
<td>76 (32%)</td>
<td>47 (20%)</td>
<td>116 (48%)</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average, excluding the Capitana</td>
<td>63 (28%)</td>
<td>35 (16%)</td>
<td>126 (56%)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dal Pozzo 1574 outline of the Order’s galleys: the Capitana, had 28 oars per side, for a total of 56 oars, of which ¼ (14) had 5 oarsmen per oar, and the remaining (42) oars use 4 oarsmen, for a total of 238. A standard galley, had 25 oars per side, for a total of 50 oars with 4 oarsmen per oar, a total of 200 oarsmen.²

1632 breakdown of the Order’s galleys with approximate percentages.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galley name</th>
<th>Buonavoglia</th>
<th>Forzati</th>
<th>Schiavi</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitana</td>
<td>93 (25%)</td>
<td>22 (6%)</td>
<td>262 (69%)</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padrina</td>
<td>73 (25%)</td>
<td>27 (9%)</td>
<td>188 (65%)</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlo</td>
<td>52 (19%)</td>
<td>24 (9%)</td>
<td>205 (73%)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>61 (19%)</td>
<td>35 (11%)</td>
<td>226 (70%)</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Giovanni</td>
<td>53 (19%)</td>
<td>41 (14%)</td>
<td>192 (67%)</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Paolo</td>
<td>55 (19%)</td>
<td>26 (9%)</td>
<td>212 (72%)</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average, excluding the Capitana</td>
<td>59 (20%)</td>
<td>31 (10%)</td>
<td>205 (70%)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1631 Commissioner of the galleys Brother Giovanni Macedonia 1631: The Capitana had 30 oars per side, 5 oarsmen per oar, 20 spare oarsmen, total 320 oarsmen. A standard galley had 26 oars per side, 5 oarsmen per oar, 20 spare oarsmen, total 280 oarsmen.⁴

---

⁴
### Change in the average galley from 1590 to 1632

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buonavoglia</th>
<th>Forzati</th>
<th>Schiavi</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>63 (28%)</td>
<td>35 (16%)</td>
<td>126 (56%)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>59 (20%)</td>
<td>31 (10%)</td>
<td>205 (70%)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal change</td>
<td>-4 (6% decrease)</td>
<td>-4 (11% decrease)</td>
<td>+79 (63% increase)</td>
<td>+71 (32% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proportionate change</td>
<td>8% decrease</td>
<td>6% decrease</td>
<td>14% increase</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of slaves is increasing in excess of the increase in the size of the galleys. The average 5-person rowing bench in 1590 had between 2 and 3 slaves, in 1632 there were between 3 and 4 slaves and the Buonavoglia had been reduced to the minimum of 1 per oar.

---

4 Wettinger, *Slavery in the islands of Malta and Gozo*, p. 340; AOM 6397, fol 206rv, the document is undated but Wettinger notes that Macedonia only became commissioner in 1631.
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