
“GENTE DI CAPO” ON THE GALLEYS OF THE ORDER IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Joseph F. Grima

The galleys were ships of war and, as such, had to carry a contingent of soldiers and a crew of sailors on board to fulfil the dual work of fighting and sailing. These freemen are usually referred to as *Gente di Capo* and, in general, they comprised the soldiers and sailors on board the galleys. Naturally, one finds subdivisions and what are termed in modern times non-commissioned officers among them because different expertises were needed.

It has always been accepted that “the Maltese were among the finest sailors of the Mediterranean, a fact attested by many sources, and, though estimates are difficult, between roughly 1650 and 1750 about half the able-bodied male population was at sea during the greater part of the year”.¹ This rough estimate includes the Maltese corsairs but refers also to the number of Maltese employed on the galleys of the Order. It is true that a greater number was employed on corsairing activities but the Order made sure that enough personnel was available for its ships. At one time, the Order had considered the idea of forbidding corsairs to arm at Malta because, since a great amount of provisions and war materials were taken over by corsairs, there was a possibility that Malta herself and the Order’s squadron might face shortages. However, for a number of reasons including the fact that the *Corso* provided exercise in maritime warfare for Knights and Maltese alike, this idea was shelved.² It was quite natural that the Order would first ensure that there was always enough personnel available for its own use and, in fact, no restrictions were placed on the fitting-out of Maltese corsairs except that, in 1605, this activity started to be properly organised after the setting up of the *Tribunale degli Armamenti*.³ Moreover, a number of sailors and soldiers mentioned in the Order’s Archives have Maltese surnames, thus leading to the obvious conclusion that, though foreigners were also engaged by the Order, the majority of men serving on the Order’s galley’s were Maltese. Actually, as Ettore Rossi rightly points out, historians of the Order rarely mention the exploits of the Maltese but simply designate such actions as having been carried out by the *equipaggi* or the *gente*. Rossi, however, points out the fact that the Order did pay out pensions to men having had long service or to the families of stalwarts killed on active duty; such records give us the names of some Maltese seamen employed with the Order as, unfortunately, pre-eighteenth century records of ships’ crews are unavailable. Another factor pointing out the great number of Maltese

shipmen in service is the number of votive offerings to various churches and shrines in the island.⁴ It is also a fact, however, that foreign sailors serving on the Order's galleys sometimes married Maltese women and settled in local villages, two examples being Cesare Palumbo and Gabriele Alonso who married in and settled at Luqa in 1617 and 1630 respectively.⁵

The numbers of these freemen varied. The *Capitana* always carried more men than the private galleys but the Captain-General and the galley Captains were warned against having more than the stipulated number of men aboard.⁶ In 1604, the *Gente di Capo* on the *Capitana* amounted to one hundred and sixty five men. These included a purser, a boatswain and his helper, the ship's pilot and his helper, a goaler or task-master, a barber and his helper who were also medical orderlies, four *consiglieri* who were expert seamen, a carpenter and his helper, a caulker, a seaman in charge of oars, a cooper, six bombardiers or gunners, four musicians and a drummer, a steward, a cook, ten 'cabin-boys', seventeen *scapoli*, and twenty muskettiers. The rest of the number was made up of soldiers, arquebusiers and mariners.⁷ In 1618 the number was increased to one hundred and eighty men,⁸ with the addition of a further ten in 1625. This number had to include ninety *soldati moschettieri*, helpers for the caulker and the seamen in charge of oars, the substitution of the *consiglieri* with four *Capi di Guardia* to help the helmsmen, and the reduction of the *scapoli* to eight.⁹ In the same year the number was raised to two hundred¹⁰ but only for a short time because by 1628 the number was down again to one hundred and ninety men.¹¹ This figure remained constant¹² but changes in its composition were made in 1628. Henceforth there were to be on board three trumpeters, forty-four mariners, thirty-two muskettiers, sixty-eight soldiers, five *scapoli*, four cabin boys, a barber's assistant and an apprentice. Other offices remained the same as before.¹³

Likewise there were changes on the other galleys. From 1604, each galley carried a hundred and fifty men on board, including the same main offices as the *Capitana* but having only three *consiglieri*, fourteen *scapoli* and no helper for the carpenter. Moreover, there were only sixteen muskettiers as against twenty on the *Capitana* whilst soldiers and sailors together numbered ninety six, the flagship having six more.¹⁴ The number came up to a hundred and sixty in 1618¹⁵ and to one hundred and seventy in 1625, when the main changes effected in the *Capitana* were also carried out in the other galleys except that the latter had to carry 70 *soldati moschettieri* and eight cabin boys.¹⁶ In the same year, the number of men was further increased to one hundred and eighty¹⁷ but in 1628, the private galleys' complement was reduced to one hundred and sixty, the following being the changes in its composition: three trumpeters, thirty-five mariners, twenty muskettiers, sixty-three soldiers, four *scapoli*, four cabin boys, and a barber's assistant together with an apprentice.¹⁸ By 1637, the figure rose by a further three men,¹⁹ but it then seemed to have remained constant.²⁰

The Order seems to have kept the galleys fully manned. In fact, a

break-up of the figures of men serving afloat in the galley squadron for the year 1632 shows that all the galley's complements were up to the required strength. One can here point out that quite a large number of servants were taken aboard with the total number reaching 261 in the year 1632. The greatest number, 46, was on the *Padrona* and the lowest, 18, on the galley *San Paolo*.²¹

The figure of 150 men for a private galley of the Order in 1604 compares favourably with the number of men on Papal vessels. In 1588 the Papal galleys each carried 180 men on board comprising sailors and soldiers.²² To the Order's figures one must add the number of Knights on caravan duties and their servants, which in fact amounted to about 200 men, the difference being the result of larger galleys being built in the sixteen years difference in time. Yet in 1587, an ordinary Spanish galley carried 226 men on board, including officers and men, but excluding rowers. This figure for the slow but heavily-manned Spanish galleys compares very favourably with the Order's vessels both in numbers and in the general designation of the men concerned. The Spanish list, in fact, includes a *comitre* and a *sotacomitre* who were roughly equivalent to second and third mates, a *remolar* and *remolarote* who commanded the *ciurma*, a *botero* who, as cooper, controlled the galley's bottles and barrels, the ship's carpenter known as *maestre de hacha*, a *boterin* who assisted the cooper, a *calafato* — literally a caulker — who served as boatswain, an *alguacil* who controlled the distribution of water and served as sergeant-at-arms, two *consejeres* who were skilled mariners serving as pilots, two *artilleros* or gunners, a medical officer called *cirjuano* and formerly known as *barbero*, four *proelis* and thirty *marineros* who were ordinary seamen, and a fighting complement of seventy-five *soldados*.²³ Indeed, it seems that the Order paid more attention to the needs of seamanship on board the galleys, an attention which is reflected in the slight differences of detail which crop up when comparing the offices of shipmen of these two navies.

Salaries were paid to all shipmen on a monthly rate. Records of individual salaries do not seem to be available before c.1650 when the Prior of Dacia, Fra Christian Osterhausen, included the salaries paid to the men serving on board the *Capitana* in his treatise about the Statutes, Ordinances and Customs of the Order.⁴² It is possible, however, that salary details — for officers at least — may have been negotiated on a personal basis, as is indicated by the conflicting salaries paid for similar offices which are considered further on. The Spaniards and Venetians paid regular fixed salaries to all, a practice followed by the Papal squadron with regard to officers only.²⁵

In 1642, the Order decided that economy measures were necessary to try and curb the great expenses incurred on behalf of its navy. The Council, therefore, decided to abolish the posts of musicians from the private galleys and to keep only those of the *Capitana*. It was hoped that slaves or other members of the *ciurma* could be taught and would be able to do this work. This

measure was expected to save the Order about 600 scudi annually. A more important decision was to thin down the number of men by fifteen from each galley, including the *Capitana*, for the five month long winter period when the galleys were hardly ever used, a measure which was calculated would save the Order about 1,300 scudi every year.²⁶ Yet such measures were the accepted practice in other Mediterranean countries even in the 16th century. Thus a section of the contracts regarding the maintenance of the Papal squadron included the redundancy of 418 personnel from the five galleys for a six month long winter period.²⁷ The result was that many shipmen plied another trade during the winter months and, in fact, the rhythms of the Mediterranean war at sea seem to have been geared to this annual economic cycle. However, Malta was a small establishment living, up to an extent, off the proceeds of the *guerre de course* and so such a cycle was not part of the island's economic system.²⁸ Therefore, although the end result was the same, such measures were forced on the Knights because of heavy maintenance costs whilst, in other countries, these measures were part and parcel of their economic cycle.

Every new man had to be presented by his Purser to the *Riveditore* who then noted the newcomer in his books, where his name was listed together with his agreed pay and his rations. If this procedure was not followed, that particular shipman concerned had no claim on pay and rations.²⁹ On the other hand, these crew members could not be discharged by the Captain-General or a Captain in the three months preceding the close of their tenure of office.³⁰

Every shipman was allowed his daily ration of bread or ship's biscuit on top of his cooked rations.³¹ These rations were calculated to amount to an average of one *carlino* per day for each person.³² However, no 'extras' could be distributed by the Captain or any other officer on top of pay and rations. Any such handout was liable to confiscation, a procedure which was, naturally, not followed if the Grand Master's permission had been previously obtained.³³ The right to the men's bread rations was strictly observed. In 1642, a complaint by all the six complements of the galleys resulted in the crews being given the monetary equivalent of the ship's biscuit which had not been distributed. A similar complaint had been made in 1637.³⁴

Officers and other crew members could not go ashore, in Malta and overseas, and still get paid by the Order; this prohibition was in force even if the men concerned had previously obtained permits from the Captain-general or the Captains. The only exceptions allowed were when such men were actually serving the needs of the Religion. The Pursers had to note such shore-leave and give the list to the Procurators of the Common Treasury, who then decided on their course of action. If he failed to carry out these orders, the purser was deprived of one year's pay.³⁵ In 1645, the Council ordered that when men were to be put ashore, one quarter of the shipmen were to remain on board the galleys. If he deemed it necessary, the Captain-General could retain more than this number aboard.³⁶

A more serious view was taken if seamen remained ashore and missed a voyage by their particular galley. If the man in question could not justify his absence, such as illness which had to be certified by the squadron's physician, he was tried in the Courts of Justice and punished. Thus, in September 1597, a salaried soldier of the galley *Santa Croce*, was accused of wilfully absenting himself without leave and, by so doing, he missed the voyage to the Levant carried out by two galleys the previous August.³⁷ Equally serious and meriting the same treatment was the question of stowaways. In 1599, Domenico Borg was accused that, in August of the same year, he had boarded the galleys of the Order without permission in order to go to Sicily.³⁸

After 1612 all *scapoli* and sailors aboard were considered as arquebusiers whilst soldiers were muskettiers.³⁹ Each galley had its own corporal who was paid 3 scudi monthly till 1614, after which they were awarded another half scudo every month, following a successful petition.⁴⁰ Even servants of Knights had to be armed; they were to be over twenty years of age and had to carry an arquebus and a helmet.⁴¹ In 1625, the Commissioners of the Galleys were exhorted to recruit bachelors, if possible, as it was thought that these would make better fighters since they had no worries about their families to trouble them. However, married men with the right aptitude were not to be entirely excluded but such choice was left to the Commissioners' discretion.⁴² Arms were to be obtained from the armoury according to the terms of the individual's engagement.⁴³

Every three months, a new complete roll-call was carried out of all crew members together with a thorough checking of their arms. At this time also, the best arquebus marksman was awarded a bonus of 6 scudi.⁴⁴ Salaries were to be paid at least every six months and 33,000 scudi had to be put aside every year for this purpose.⁴⁵ But, after 1637, salaries had to be paid every four months,⁴⁶ the total annual sum amounting to over 29,500 scudi.⁴⁷ In 1644, it was decreed that shipmen who were absent when salaries were being distributed had to wait till the next payday to collect their arrears. However, exceptions were made for those who were absent because they were attending to business pertaining to the Order and those who were ill. Even these, however, were not exempted from this rule unless they were included in lists given to the paying officer by the Captain of the galley, the doctor, or the parish priests of particular shipmen showing the reasons for their absence.⁴⁸

The distribution of powder and shot to the crew could only be carried out on orders given by the Captain-General, but the *Cercamare* had to help in the distribution to look after the interests of the Common Treasury.⁴⁹ There were to be two keys to the ammunition magazine, one being held by the Captain and the other by the chief bombardier. At the end of the voyage, both had to render to the Commander of Artillery and the Procurators of the Treasury an account of the ammunition consumed and the number of shots fired.⁵⁰ The Purser of the galley was to keep his own

records, which were also presented to the same officials of the Order.⁵¹ If ammunition was distributed and an expected sea-engagement did not materialize, that particular distribution was to count for the next action.⁵² Bombardiers had to obtain their slow-matches from the pursers who noted the distribution whilst the Chief Bombardier was expected, according to ancient ordinances, to have monthly accounts of the munitions expended, including occasions such as saluting, sea-fights and defence while watering. These accounts were to be countersigned by both the Captain and the *Cercamare*.⁵³ The chief bombardiers were exhorted to be exact in their distribution of ammunition in order to avoid waste.⁵⁴ Chief bombardiers were very experienced. In fact, a bombardier could only obtain full seniority of *capo-mastro* after 15 years service and four complete caravans carried out on the galleys.⁵⁵ Gunners had, in fact, to learn by experience because cannon-founding techniques were far from perfect and the danger of a bursting cannon was great. The computations of a gunner regarding size of cannon balls and the construction of exact ladles to throw in the proper charge were all based on past experience, and they usually worked. The result was, however, that gunners were, first and foremost, not much worried about long-range accuracy. In any case, the type of fighting of a head-on nature usually involved in as a rule left enough time for one discharge and this was held as such as possible so as to derive the maximum effect possible. In the sixteenth century, gunners were specialists, unlike their eighteenth century successors who were merely trained to perform certain mechanical movements under fire. Gunnery was rather uncertain with an aura of mysticism about it.⁵⁶ The seventeenth century gunner was in a time of transition when his personal importance and stature were on the decline. However, this was not so in the Venetian Navy which, because of lack of man-power, was forced to rely and more on the swiftness of their vessels and the accuracy of their gunners. In fact, apart from the experience and practice which was afforded to gunners, Venice offered a host of privileges to facilitate the recruitment of seamen for this work.⁵⁷ Gunnery in the Order's squadron was also given its due importance and gunners were required to pass examinations before being considered for this position.⁵⁸

Sails, rigging, anchors, cables and such stores together with the summoning of the crew were the responsibility of the galley's boatswain, or *comito* who had a *sotto-comito* to assist him. He was not, however, allowed to cut and devise any rigging, cordage, or hawser unless in the presence of the Captain, the *Riveditore*, the Re and the Purser, the latter having to make a note of such proceedings.⁵⁹ The boatswain and the other responsible officials were held responsible and had to pay for damages to their galley and its fittings if damage was proved to be the result of negligence. A note of the damages sustained was taken by the *Riveditore* and the Purser, and the guilty officer was then fined four times the actual cost of the damage, the fine being deducted from his salary.⁶⁰ This indicates the importance

of the *Comito* who, as in the Spanish and Venetian navies, was the technical officer responsible for all matters concerning navigation and manoeuvring.⁶¹ In the Spanish Navy, the *comitre* and *sota-comitre* were the equivalent of the second and third mates respectively⁶² whilst a Venetian *comito* could only attain this post after serving for eight years as a *sottocomito* or *padrone*. Their responsibilities resembled those of the Order's *comito* and so much importance was placed on this office that, in 1624, the Venetian Senate enacted that whoever served as *comito* for sixty consecutive months became eligible for a yearly pension of four ducats.⁶³

The boatswain was allowed to keep a sort of small tavern from which he could sell wine to the crew. This activity was also effectively supervised. Galley-slaves were not allowed to run up debts of over six tari a month. If this rule was disobeyed, the boatswain lost his claim to the loan.⁶⁴ Moreover, no wine could be sold without permission from the Captain. Disobedience by the boatswain implied the confiscation of the wine, which was distributed among the crew.⁶⁵ In 1645 the galley-slaves' debt allowance was reduced to four tari a month on voyages to the Levant.⁶⁶

Boatswains who did not carry out their duties properly had to pay for their lapses. In 1611, the boatswain of the galley *San Alfonso*, Giacomo di Maio, had to pay 25 scudi to make up for some missing shouids in his charge. Actually, Maio had protested but a commission appointed for that purpose upheld the Treasury's decision after giving a detailed report about the matter.⁶⁷ In 1633, Gabriel Perlis, who was the boatswain of the galley *San Carlo*, was to have 60 scudi deducted from his salary to pay for six rotten oars. Perlis contended that this was not his fault and that, anyway, two of the oars were good enough to be used. He also offered to replace the rotten oars instead of paying for them. The Treasury agreed with this proposal.⁶⁸

A boatswain's salary was four scudi a month but petitions for a increase in pay were sometime favourably met as in the cases of Narduccio di Maria, of the *Capitana*, and Zaccaria Rispolo, of the *Santa Maria*, who were both granted an increase of 2 scudi monthly in 1630 and 1636 respectively.⁶⁹

Responsibility for the rowing element on a galley devolved on the gaoler, or *agozzino*, who had to give a suitable security of at least a thousand scudi as a pledge of fulfilling his duties scrupulously by taking good care of the slaves and other things of the Treasury under his charge. If such a pledge was not given, the gaoler was deprived of his office which was given to others willing to serve under such a condition.⁷⁰

Since the galley depended so much on rowing, the *Agozzino* formed an important element of the crew and, as such, this office was common in the galleys of all stares. Curiously enough, the officer in charge of rowers on board Spanish galleys in 1587 was designated as *remolar* and *remolarote*, but this was a matter of nomenclature.⁷¹ The *remolaro* of the Order was concerned with the actual oars and rowing rather than the safekeeping of the rowers. Like the Order's *agozzino*, the Venetian counterpart was also

required to pay a deposit of 200 ducats as a guarantee that he would not facilitate the flight of slaves or goabirds who had adequate financial means to bribe a willing *agozzino*. The Venetian goaler was also charged with the safekeeping of the water-barrels⁷² which, in the Order's squadron, was the work of the cooper.

The goaler, together with his galley's purser, had to call the roll every week to check the vestments of the rowers. If this was not done, or some clothes were missing, the gaoler had to pay the price of the missing clothes and both officials were fined a month's pay in favour of the Common Treasury; moreover, both were responsible for exhibiting the old clothes when a change of raiment was made.⁷³

When the galleys returned to harbour, the gaoler was obliged to conduct all his rowers to the slave prison in Valletta and hand them over to the '*Capitano delli Schiavi*'. He had, however, to retain some slaves and prisoners, thirty in all, for the ordinary needs of the galleys. This had to be affected within 24 hours of entering port or else the gaoler was deprived of his office and was sentenced to 4 rope lashes. If the galley captain impeded the gaoler from carrying out these orders, he was fined ten *sucdi* payable to the Common Treasury for each time this offence was repeated.⁷⁴

These responsibilities of the gaolers were considered very important by the Order, special concern being the slaves. If one escaped, the gaoler was held responsible and had to pay his price, the fine being usually deducted from his salary. However, the Religion was also fair to these men and there are many examples of commissions being formed to determine the culpability of officials for escaped slaves or prisoners condemned to row in the galleys. Sometimes the gaoler was cleared of the charge and other officials were to blame. On other occasions, the gaoler was found guilty.⁷⁵

In 1623, Pietro Mallia, the goaler of the galley *San Francesco*, protested against being fined the price of a slave to repay for the flight of a slave. Mallia maintained his innocence and asked for and was granted a commission to inquire into his case.⁷⁶ Mallia was successful in his appeal and the commission cleared him of all charges in 1625 because it was proved that he had taken all the normal precautions to prevent escapes.⁷⁷ Around the same period, this same Mallia was also successful in his appeal against responsibility for the escape of a slave left ashore. He had previously been fined 500 zecchins but this penalty was passed on to the purser of the same galley, Ridolfo Faraone, from whose house the slave in question had escape.⁷⁸ In 1628, Giovanni Maria Taurone, the goaler of the galley *San Carlo*, was held responsible for the death of a recaptured slave and was ordered to pay the 100 zecchins which the slave had previously cost the Order.⁷⁹ This gaoler seems to have been a rather brutal fellow for, in 1630, he was found guilty of causing the death of another slave "for his own private interests" and his case was referred to the Treasury for punishment.⁸⁰ In 1630, the cost of an escaped slave was borne by the helper of the gaoler of the galley *Santa Rosalia*, since it was he who was deemed

responsible for the Order's loss.⁸¹ In 1645, the gaolers of the galleys *San Lorenzo* and *San Giovanni*, Giovanni Taunini and Camillo Maldonado respectively, were condemned to pay the debts of the *buonavoglie* who were freed during the sea-fight against the Turkish Soltana in 1644 and were killed. These two gaolers pleaded that they had been ordered to free the *buonavoglie* in question, presumably because the galleys were hard-pressed in action.⁸² High ranking officers were not exempt from paying for such losses to the Order. In 1608, the Captain himself of the galley *San Luigi* was ordered to supply a slave to take the place of an escaped convict who had been condemned to the galleys for life.⁸³

It seems that shipmen were transferred from one galley to another, sometimes rather frequently. No lists of 17th century ships' companies seem to be extant in the archives of the Order but the Court decisions to hand over convicts to galley gaolers⁸⁴ seem to indicate that gaolers, at least, seemed to move around quite often. Thus we find that between 29th March 1596 and 12th August 1599, Julius Grec was successively the gaoler of the galleys *Santa Fede*, *San Placido* and *San Giorgio*.⁸⁵ In 1620, Grec was still serving as gaoler on the galleys, only by this time he was on the *San Giovanni*.⁸⁶ Thomas de Arena succeeded Grec on the *Santa Fede* of which he was still the gaoler in March 1597 but, by October of the same year, he was serving on the *San Giovanni* where he was still in office in March 1599.⁸⁷ Other gaolers included Joannes de Rodo of the *Capitana* (1598-9)⁸⁸ and Giannettino Grec who had preceded Julius Grec on the *San Placido* (1597).⁸⁹ Another indication of transfers is found in the office of vice-gaoler of the *Capitana*. This office was held by Michael Santin in February 1596⁹⁰ but a certain Rayci is named in the following month.⁹¹ It is improbable that Santin had been promoted because his name never appears again, certainly not as a gaoler, up till 1599. Moreover, by August 1599, Georgius Corogna had succeeded to this office.⁹² Other vice-gaolers were Antonio Depares of the *Santa Croce* in 1598⁹³ and Leonardo Vella of the *San Giovanni* in 1597-8.⁹⁴ One may here note that the majority of the surnames mentioned are Maltese-sounding, thus further indicating that the complements of the galleys were made up mainly of Maltese nationals.

Another important official on board the galley was the pilot whose work it was to guide and steer the ship. He had a *compagno* to help him, whilst present on the ship were also three or four councillors who were expert seamen,⁹⁵ who, after 1625, were detailed to help the steerman in such a way that, henceforth, there were no less than eight helmsmen serving on each galley.⁹⁶ In 1623, it was contracted that Francesco Lonegro was to serve the Order in his capacity of pilot for a monthly salary of 10 scudi for the rest of his life,⁹⁷ but in 1635, the pilot Oliviero Emanuele was allowed a salary of only 5 scudi monthly.⁹⁸ It seems, however, that not all these officials were granted the same salaries and increments. In 1617, the pilot of the *Capitana*, Giacomo Rispolo, was granted a salary increase of one scudo a month, but no mention is made of the pilots of the other galleys.⁹⁹

On the other hand, all the carpenters seemed to have the same salary of 3 scudi a month, the only exception being the carpenter of the *Capitana* who had one scudo a month more than the others.¹⁰⁰

It seems that not all other navies attributed to the *piloto* the importance which the Order reserved for this technical officer. Pilotage duties on Spanish galleys in 1597 were carried out by two skilled mariners designated as *consejeros*. Perhaps this was due to the fact that the Spaniards, having both an Atlantic and Mediterranean seaboard, fully realised that the difficulties facing a Mediterranean navigator were minimal when compared to the difficulties encountered in the Atlantic.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, the Venetians did not appoint pilots unless the candidates had served a minimum of ten years as *padroncino* and had passed an examination.¹⁰² It seems that the Order followed the purely Mediterranean tradition of safety first and foremost. Writing in 1614, Captain Pantera states that pilots were to be well versed in "*carta nautica*".¹⁰³

The *Gente di Capo* could also be awarded their *gioia*, which consisted of reward money for particular services when the galleys captured prizes at sea. The usual procedure was for claimants to stake their claim and then a commission would be appointed to establish exactly whose claim was justified.¹⁰⁴ Sums of money were awarded to whoever sighted the prize and to whoever had been first, second or third to jump arms in hand aboard the captured prize. Thus in 1637, the seaman Riso di Giovanni of the *Capitana* was awarded five scudi for sighting a prize, a reward also awarded to Giovanni Maria Pullicino, a seaman of the galley *Santa Ubaldesca*, who sighted a *pollacca* which was then captured. Simone Vella and Valerio Camilleri were each awarded ten scudi for being first on board whilst Gratio Caruana was awarded five scudi.¹⁰⁵ In 1640, a *bombardiere* of the *Padrona*, Benedetto Giusti, asked for and was granted a *gioia* of ten scudi for having spotted an enemy merchant ship at night; later the ship was captured. His claim was signed by the Captain-General, the Captain of the *Padrona* and the *Riveditore* of the squadron.¹⁰⁶ These rewards were instituted as incentives for the crews.

Many of these men were engaged for long periods in the service of the Order. In fact, one finds many requests for pensions based on the length of service which sometimes even exceeded fifty years. Pensions were sometimes also granted to widows of such seamen, especially those killed on active service whilst help was also accorded to others who may have fallen on hard times as the result of, say, slavery or accidents on service.¹⁰⁷

It appears that serving men were not, strictly speaking, entitled to a fixed pension. The usual procedure seems to have been for the retired seaman to apply, giving reasons to back his pretensions and then wait for a decision.¹⁰⁸ In fact, not everyone was awarded the same amounts.

In 1605, the ex-pilot of the galley *San Giacomo*, Antonio Vassallo, was granted a pension of four scudi monthly¹⁰⁹ but, two years later, Antonio Ricupero, also a pilot, was allowed only two scudi per month.¹¹⁰ Corporal

Vincenzo Conti in 1605¹¹¹ and Antonio Merich, *remolario* — a seaman in charge of the oars — of the *Capitana*, in 1607,¹¹² were each given a pension of two and a half scudi monthly, with the latter having fifty years of service behind him. Yet the mentioned corporal's pension compares favourably with the two scudi granted to two soldiers in 1616¹¹³ and to Giorgio Vitale, another soldier, in 1642.¹¹⁴ But in 1635 Domenico Rossello was only granted four loaves daily after twenty-six years of service as a sailor and soldier on the galleys.¹¹⁵ In December 1614 a sailor, Gio Batta Bottone, was awarded a pension of two scudi per month in recognition of forty years' service, including periods of imprisonment by the Venetians and slavery in Tunis.¹¹⁶ Yet one month later, another mariner, Gio. Domenico Grasso, was allowed only one scudo per month even though he had lost an arm on active service and had served for many years — '*molti anni di servitio*'.¹¹⁷ On the same day, the former boatswain of the *Capitana*, Michele Vozino, was awarded the same pension not on account of his services as an official, but in recognition of his many years of service.¹¹⁸ In 1608, the gaoler Stefano Matarango, formerly of the galley *San Michele*, was awarded one scudo monthly together with two loaves daily. This gaoler had completed forty years of active service, had been captured by the Muslims at Cimbalo in 1606 and had impoverished himself to buy his freedom.¹¹⁹ But, on the other hand, two *gente di capo*, Tomaso Coms and Pietro Pisagnelo, were each awarded two scudi monthly for their services on the galleys¹²⁰ whilst Giorgio Armachi was awarded three scudi monthly in recognition of forty-five years in the Order's service, thirty-four of them on the galleys and eleven in the Holy Infirmary.¹²¹ In 1623, Antonio Sardo, described as a *compagno* on board the galley *San Lorenzo*, and Mattheo Seychel, a *consigliero* or expert seaman of the *San Giovanni*, were each awarded pensions of three scudi per month. The former had 39 years of service to his credit.¹²² This cross section of pensions granted seems to indicate, therefore, that pensions were granted on a personal basis and that no fixed amount for each category of seamen seems to have existed.

The Religion seems to have been rather sympathetic to those injured when on duty. In 1614, Metelino d'Ariano, a cabin-boy of the galley *San Stefano*, was given all his pay and food allowances withheld for the period when he was indisposed after losing an arm due to an accident on board the galley. The required forms had not been properly filled and sent to the authorities, but all the Order's rights were waived.¹²³ In 1620, Nicolao Raguseo was granted a pension of two and a half scudi monthly after losing an arm in a voyage to the West on board the *Capitana*.¹²⁴ In 1607, the Religion ordered that all men on board the galleys at the time of the 1606 Cimbalo incident, when three galleys were wrecked, were to be given their arrears. The confusion had resulted in various men being listed as deserters but the Order now gave the men their due.¹²⁵

The families of men killed or missing in action were not forgotten. In 1625, the Order lost two galleys in a sea action off Murro di Porco and

their complements of men were either killed or taken into slavery.¹²⁶ The Order, however, took steps to try and help their families immediately, according to their needs. In all, 212 families were helped and for three successive years, that is 1626, 1627 and 1628, 100 scudi and 20 salms of grain were distributed annually.¹²⁷ Usually, however, families of dead men petitioned for help, the petition usually taking one of the following three forms: a direct plea for help based on the dead man's length of loyal service, a petition to be given arrears still accruing from the Order to the dead shipman, or a plea to wipe off debts which the dead seaman might have owed the Order. All these petitions, if considered justified, were usually complied with.¹²⁸

It seems that it was almost traditional for members of some families to serve in the squadron of the Order. This may have been simply the result of the necessity for one to find work but the fact remains that some petitions to the Grand Master sometimes mention the long service of a supplicant's father or near relative to drive home the point. Such an example occurred in a petition for help made by Paradisa Bezivolari, a resident of Cospicua. According to this petition, the petitioner's grandfather, father and brother — Cailo Farrugia, Domenico Bezovilari and Francesco Bezivolari respectively — had all served the Order on the galleys during their lifetime. All three had gone into service as cabin-boys and then become sailors, before finally earning promotion to boatswains. All three had been wounded in the Order's service on numerous occasions but, by 1645, the year of the petition, all three were dead. Farrugia had died of old age a long time before but Domenico and Francesco Bezivolari had both been killed on active service in the adverse sea encounter off Murro di Porco in 1625. Domenico had left four orphaned daughters who were provided for by their uncle Natale Bezivolari after their father's death. Natale was also in service on the galleys, on which he had started as a cabin-boy and had since risen to the rank of under-boatswain. Natale had been severely wounded in service and his shoulder had remained maimed.¹²⁹ This petition seems to indicate that Maltese who went into service at an early age seemed to have a much better chance for future promotions. All four seamen mentioned had entered service as cabin-boys and all four had been promoted, three becoming boatswains and the fourth just one grade lower in rank.

Working in the Order's galley squadron entailed a more than fair amount of danger of one being wounded or even killed. The latter mishaps were bound to happen even if the squadron was always successful, which it wasn't. An unsuccessful cruise could also result with one being taken into untold years of slavery especially if the means of redemption were not forthcoming. The case mentioned above concerning the Bezivolari family shows that all four men had been wounded, one very severely whilst two of them were killed on active service. This was not an isolated case. Petitions for help sent to the Order by families of dead men were an everyday occurrence. The unsuccessful attack on Hammamet in 1606 meant the loss

of 70 Maltese sailors and soldiers¹³⁰ whilst the successes at Lepanto and Patras in 1603 ended with 90 men being wounded, although overall losses were reported to have been very light.¹³¹ The success at Susa in 1619 ended with 8 men dead and 12 others wounded,¹³² whilst a minor naval encounter at Policastro in 1630 finished with 14 wounded on board the *Padrona*, though no deaths were recorded.¹³³ Yet these losses are nothing compared to the number of deaths recorded in 1625. 30 men died in the successful attack on Santa Maura in May¹³⁴ whilst a month later about 350 men were killed in the unfortunate encounter off Murro di Porco.¹³⁵ These figures concern only the freemen and exclude Knights and rowers. Nor do they include figures of men taken into slavery.

Captured Christians were considered as prisoners-of-war and, consequently, they could be ransomed or exchanged with Muslim slaves,¹³⁶ though the commonest exchange rate seems to have been three or four Muslims for one Christian. At any rate, exchange rates, even if not always so high, was nearly always in favour of Muslims, a fact partly explained by the greater wealth of Christendom and partly by the fact that ownership of slaves was a status symbol in Islam.¹³⁷ Anyway, the Christian slave knew that “the chances of escape were few... and the only other way home was through the payment of his ransom, or through exchange for Moslems held in a Christian land. Collection of his ransom money, often set at inflated levels, was therefore the main interest of most Christian slaves”.¹³⁸ On the other hand, some authors assert that, because of overpopulation in the slave bagnios, escape was not difficult, the chief deterrent being betrayal by fellow-slaves.¹³⁹

In Malta, the Order set up an institution known as the “Monte della Redenzione de Schiavi” in 1607. Of interest is the fact that preference was to be made to redeem slaves captured when in the service of the Religion or the State especially those who were mostly in financial need or in danger of losing their Faith. Sums of up to and including 70 scudi could be advanced for the redemption of a slave and, in exceptional cases, the sum was increased. If a slave could partly redeem himself, the Monte provided the remainder of the sum needed.¹⁴⁰ The setting-up of this Monte may have been influenced by the existence of similar institutions in the Papal States, Genoa and Sicily. In 1581, Pope Gregory XIII had set up the *Opera Pia della Redenzione de Schiavi* whilst the Sicilian *Arciconfraternita della Redenzione dei Cattivi* was established at Palermo in 1586. In Genoa, there had existed since 1403 the *Magistrato di Misericordia*, which was converted into the *Magistrato di Riscatto degli Schiavi* in 1597.¹⁴¹

Some slaves were never released or redeemed and died after long years in slavery. In 1639, Mattheus Greg testified in court that he had been taken as a slave at Murro di Porco in 1625. The slave Cos.o Miraglia lay dying when their galley was being smeared with pitch. Cos.o was taken ashore at Prevesa where he died and was buried.¹⁴² In 1644, another ex-slave by name of Petrus Portoges testified that one of his companions in slavery,

Stephano Greg, had died when on service at the Black Sea, but was given a Christian burial.¹⁴³ This latter case seems to bear out Peter Earle's contention that, at least with reference to the Barbary corsairs, "few Moslems had an interest in the conversion of slaves — rather the reverse since apostasy might lose them part of their ransom, or at least delay its payment". He quotes Salvatore Bono in noting that "there is considerable evidence of the reverse — of pretended apostates being forced to deny their apostasy through torture".¹⁴⁴ Bono, in fact, gives three accounts of apostates being forced to recant and become Christians once more.¹⁴⁵

In modern times, ships' companies have always been regarded as potential trouble-makers when ashore. This also seems to have been the case in those times, judging from the number of registered court cases involving different grades of *gente di capo*.¹⁴⁶ Sometimes public misbehaviour also involved acts of piracy, of which the Order took a very serious view. One such case involved a certain Hieronymus Floccari, a soldier of the galley *San Giovanni*. In November 1597, Floccari was charged with piratical acts carried out in July of the previous year. It was alleged that when the Order's galleys were in Messina for smearing with pitch, Floccari went off in a small boat accompanied by other persons. They then encountered and boarded a *feluca* on its way to Messina from Catania and, by threatening violence, they stole various objects of value from the passengers on board the *feluca*. Floccari was tortured to be forced to disclose the truth,¹⁴⁷ something which he probably didn't because on the following April he was simply deported from Malta to Messina, though with the proviso that he would be executed if he returned to these islands.¹⁴⁸

Of course, misdemeanours were not always of such a grievous nature. Sometimes it was a simple matter of stealing such as when the *Agozzino*, or goaler, of an unnamed galley, Mariano Grec, was accused of not paying for goods taken from the shop of a certain Caruana.¹⁴⁹ Of a more serious nature were accusations of robbery with violence such as when a sailor of the galley *Santa Croce*, de Lecci, was tried for attacking and injuring Argento Penza in his own house at Vittoriosa and of stealing various papers.¹⁵⁰ The commonest incidents seemed to have been causing disturbances and fighting.¹⁵¹ Sometimes trouble came as a result of non-payment of a debt such as when Matthew Janvensus, a salaried soldier of the galley *Santa Croce*, refused to pay the balance of 6 tari over a sum of 18 tari which he had borrowed from Joannes de Quaci. It was alleged that the soldier even threatened de Quaci with his sword in front of two witnesses.¹⁵² The bombardier of the *Capitana*, Joannes Zammit of Senglea, was also involved in a similar case when he refused to hand over 8 tari to Francesco Rizzo who had given Zammit the money to buy him certain objects during the galley's last voyage to the Levant. Moreover, it was alleged that Zammit insulted and slapped Rizzo when the latter asked for his money back.¹⁵³ Such trouble sometimes involved arms in addition to fists though a certain Valerio, a carpenter on the galley *San Placido*, was accused by Catherina

Rimeo of beating her up in her own house at Vittoriosa.¹⁵⁴ Trouble ashore also led to accusations of attempted murder¹⁵⁵ and even to homicide, when Francesco Bianco was accused of such an offence committed at Candia in March 1597.¹⁵⁶

Shipmen were not always to blame, however. Sometimes they were the victims such as when Athanasio Pica, a sailor on the galley *San Placido*, accused Gio Paolo Vella and his son Pasquale of attacking him at Senglea near the door of Mastro Giorgio, a caulker.¹⁵⁷ In 1597, another sailor of the galley *San Placido*, Joannes de Sato, accused the brothers Juliano and Gaspere Caruana of Cospicua of forcibly stealing 4 tari from him by threatening him with their swords.¹⁵⁸ Yet such incidents involving all categories of shipmen were to be expected in such turbulent times.

Certain members of the galley crews had a form of private income, though this seems to apply only to those who were in the non-commissioned officer class, such as goalers, boatswains, bombardiers and the like.¹⁵⁹ Various, though admittedly not many, men derived a small extra income from so-called *rents ad formam bullae* which consisted of “an annuity, or a yearly payment in money or in goods ... stipulated by the assignment of a movable or immovable thing or by the payment of a sum of money of which the payer binds himself not to claim the return”.¹⁶⁰ Such an annuity could be inherited or transferred onto someone else. Thus we find the boatswain of the *Capitana*, Michele del Zante, obtaining annuities amounting to 10 scudi and 20 scudi in 1611 and 1612 respectively.¹⁶¹ Such annuities varied. The gaoler Joannes Michallef of Senglea had an income of only 4 scudi;¹⁶² another gaoler, Petro Mallia of the galley *San Stefano*, derived 10 scudi as his annuity¹⁶³ whilst Julius Grec from Senglea, gaoler of the galley *San Giovanni*, had five scudi yearly from the Monastery of Santa Scholastica.¹⁶⁴ Gaolers had probably private means of income as they had to deposit a personal surety of 1,000 scudi to be confirmed as *agozzini*. Such annuities were sometimes sold. The purser of the *Capitana*, Franciscus Busto, sold his annual income of 12 scudi for 150 scudi¹⁶⁵ whilst Michael Papagoto, the pilot of the galley *Santa Maria*, sold his annuity of 7 scudi for 70 scudi.¹⁶⁶

The better status of these galley officers is reflected in the houses the majority probably lived in. Whereas an average village house consisted of a living room, a kitchen, a yard, a well and a small field, the house of Michele Psaila of Luqa, a bombardier serving on the Order’s galleys, consisted of a hall with a room built on it, a shop, a kitchen, a yard, a well and was situated in the village square.¹⁶⁷ This does not imply that all men of lower naval rank did not have alternative sources of income. Indeed, it seems that many inhabitants of Malta had the use of a certain amount of arable land and there is evidence to suggest that seamen — or their families — did till the land as well. Examples include Sebastiano Mallia, a sailor from Luqa, who owned or rented two fields at Marsa whilst another sailor, Gerolamo Caruana — also from Luqa — had a field at Wied il-Knejjes,

limits of Luqa. One must keep in mind the fact that most village houses had a small garden or field attached to them which, if tilled, meant another, albeit small, source of income for their owners. 168

REFERENCES

- 1 Cavaliero R., "The Decline of the Maltese Corso in the XVIIIth Century," *Melita Historica*, Vol 2, No. 4 (1959), p. 224.
- 2 Dal Pozzo B., *Historia della Sacra Religione Militare di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano* (Verona, 1703), Vol. I, pp. 493-4.
- 3 A[rchives of the] S[uperior] C[ourts of Justice], M[agna] C[uria] C[astellanae], S[acra] A[udientia], Vol. 2, f. 93, 21 June 1605.
- 4 Rossi E., "I Maltesi nella Marina dell'Ordine di San Giovanni," *Archivio Storico di Malta*, Vol. II, 1931, p. 223. The only ship's roll which Rossi cites belongs to the 'nave San Giovanni' of 1769-1770. Some pensions paid to Maltese seamen are considered further on.
- 5 Micallef, Rev. G., *Hal Luqa: Niesha u Ġrajjietha* (Malta, 1975), pp. 39-40. On pp. 165-6, Micallef gives us more information about Cesare Palumbo who was captured by the Turks in 1639 and remained a slave at Constantinople till 1663 when he was set free because of old age. In 1648, he was joined in bondage by his son John who managed to escape safely in 1667.
- 6 A[rchives of the] O[rder in] M[alta] 101, f. 72r, 2 September 1604.
- 7 *Ibid.*, ff. 72r-v; N[ational] L[ibrary of] M[alta Manuscript] 676, f. 30r.
- 8 AOM 1759, f.353v; AOM 1760, f.309v, 12 November 1618
- 9 AOM 108, f.107v, 16 July 1625.
- 10 AOM 108, f.113r, 2 August 1625.
- 11 AOM 109, f.76r, 10 March 1628.
- 12 *Ibid.*; AOM 737, f.87r, 20 July 1637; AOM 738, f.3v, 27 July 1644.
- 13 AOM 109, f.76r, 10 March 1628.
- 14 AOM 101, f.72v; NLM 676, f.30r-v; 2 September 1604
- 15 AOM 1759, f.353v; AOM 1760, f.306v; 12 November 1618
- 16 AOM 108, f.107v, 16 July 1625.
- 17 AOM 108, f.113r, 2 August 1625.
- 18 AOM 109, f.76r, 10 March 1628.
- 19 AOM 737, f.87r, 20 July 1637.
- 20 AOM 738, f.3v, 28 July 1644.
- 21 NLM 162, f.127v. The *Capitana* carried 203 men, the *Padrona* — 161, *San Carlo* — 160, *San Antonio* — 167, San Giovanni — 164, and *San Paolo* — 163. The other figures for servants were 44, 27, 45 and 38 on the *Capitana*, *San Carlo*, *San Antonio* and *San Giovanni* respectively.
- 22 Guglielmotti A., *Storia della Marina Pontificia* (Rome, 1886-93), Vol 7, p.28.
- 23 Guilmartin J.F., *Gunpowder and Galleys* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 293.
- 24 NLM 162, f.108r-v.
- 25 Guilmartin J. F., *op. cit.*, p. 293; Nani Mocenigo M., *Storia della Marina Veneziana da Lepanto alla Caduta della Repubblica* (Rome, 1935), pp. 70-72; Guglielmotti A., *op.cit.*, Vol. 7, pp. 252-4.
- 26 AOM 113, f.213r; AOM 223, f.22r; AOM 224, f.311v; AOM 225, f.394r; AOM 226, f.248r and 326r; all dated 13 January 1642. Moreover, the salary of each shipman was decreased by 2 tari out of every scudo, i.e. 1/6, thus saving the Order a further 4125 scudi.
- 27 Guglielmotti A., *op.cit.*, Vol. 7, pp. 195-205, 240-251

- 28 Guilmartin J.F., *op. cit.*, p.108.
- 29 AOM 293, Ch[apter] G[eneral] 1598, ff.108v-109r, Ord[inatione] 69 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f. 122v, Ord. 84 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.146r, Ord. 94 Galere.
- 30 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f.108v, Ord. 64 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604 f.122v, Ord. 79 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.145v, Ord. 89 Galere.
- 31 AOM 737, ff.87v-88r, 20 July 1637; AOM 738, f.3r, 27 July 1644. For distribution of bread and ship's biscuit and cooked food see Grima J.F., *The Galley Squadron of the Order of St John: Its Organisation between 1596 and 1645* (University of Malta, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, 1975), p.205 seq., and p. 251 seq.
- 32 AOM 737, f.88r, 20 July 1637; AOM 738, f.2v, 27 July 1644. 24 Carlini = 8c3 in present Maltese currency.
- 33 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, ff.108-v-109r, Ord. 69 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.121r, Ord. 62 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, ff.144v, Ord. 72 Galere.
- 34 AOM 665, ff.30v-31r and 148v, 18 November 1637 and 15 July 1642 respectively.
- 33 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, ff.108v 109r, Ord. 69 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.121r, Ord. 84 Galera; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.146r, Ord. 94 Galere.
- 36 AOM 258, f.38r, 14 August 1645.
- 37 ASC, MCC, R[gistrum] A[ctorum] C[riminalium], *Volume Unico*, 3 September 1597.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 17 August 1599.
- 39 AOM 295, Ch. G. 1612, f.113r, Ord. 2 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.137v, Ord. 2 Galere. In 1669 the Council ordered all arquebuses on board the galleys to be of Brescian make while all muskets were to be Milanese *cf.* AOM 261, ff. 155v-156r, 24 October 1669.
- 40 AOM 663, f.230v, 22 February 1614.
- 41 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f. 105v, Ord. 30 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.119v, Ord. 41 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.142v, Ord. 51 Galere.
- 42 AOM 108, f.108v, 16 July 1625.
- 43 AOM 256, f.35r, 27 July 1625.
- 44 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f. 105v, Ord. 29 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.119v, Ord. 40 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f. 142v, Ord. 50 Galere.
- 45 AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.138r, Ord. 5 Galere.
- 46 AOM 737, f.87r, 20 July 1637.
- 47 AOM 738, f.2r, 27 July 1644; the exact amount was 29,508 scudi 6 tari.
- 48 AOM 665, f. 190r-v, 21 June 1644.
- 49 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f. 104v, Ord. 14 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f. 119r, Ord 37 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f. 142v, Ord. 47 Galere.
- 50 *Ibid.*, Ord. 15, 38 and 48 Galere respectively.
- 51 AOM 101, f.73v;AOM 1759, f.333r-v; AOM 1760, f.386r-v; 2 September 1604.
- 52 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f.104v, Ord. 16 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.119r, Ord. 39 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.142v, Ord. 49 Galere.
- 53 AOM 108, ff.113v-114r; AOM 1759f.333v; AOM 1760, f.386v; 2 August 1625.
- 54 AOM 110, f. 151v; AOM 1759, ff. 333v-334r; AOM 1760, f.386v; 11 March 1632.
- 55 AOM 110, ff. 88v-92r; AOM 220, f.298r; AOM 1759, f.333v; AOM 1760, f.386v; 6 May 1631.
- 56 Guilmartin J. F., *op. cit.*, pp. 165-6, 174-5.
57. Nani Mocenigo M., *op. cit.*, pp. 34-5.
- 58 Brockman E., "The Order of St. John of Jerusalem — The Sovereign Order as a Naval Power," *Revue de l'Ordre Souverain Militaire de Malte* (1958), p. 171.

- 59 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f.107v, Ord. 51 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.121r, Ord. 64 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, F. 144v, Ord. 74 Galere.
- 60 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f.108r-v, Ord. 61 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.112r, Ord. 76 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.145v, Ord. 86 Galere.
- 61 Pantera P., *L'Armata Navale* (Rome, 1614), pp. 119-120, wherein the author lists all the duties of the *comito*.
- 62 Guilmartin J. F., *op. cit.*, p. 293.
- 63 Nani Mocenigo M., *op. cit.*, p. 33.
64. AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f. 108v, Ord. 62 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.112r, Ord. 77 Galere; AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f. 145v, Ord. 87 Galere.
- 65 *Ibid.*, Ord. 63, 78 and 88 Galere respectively.
- 66 AOM 221, f.154v, 3 June 1645. Cf. AOM 296, f. 145v, Ch. G. 1631, Ord. 87,88.
- 67 AOM 663, ff. 167v-168r, 11 March 1611. This particular lapse had been first reported on 24 July 1610.
- 68 AOM 664, f.20v, 27 October 1633.
- 69 AOM 664, f.169v and 24 v, 21 January 1630 and 15 March 1636 respectively.
- 70 AOM 296, Ch. G. 1631, f.139r, Ord. 11 Galere. Many examples of this *pleggeria* are found in the *Libri de Contratti del Tesoro*; cf. AOM 737, *passim*. The usually accepted duties of the *Aguzino* are listed in Pantera P., *op. cit.*, pp. 124-5.
- 71 Guilmartin J. F., *op. cit.*, p. 293.
- 72 Nani Mocenigo M., *op. cit.*, p. 35.
- 73 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f. 107v, Ord. 54 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.121v, Ord. 70 Galere; AOM 296, Ch G. 1631, f.145v, Ord. 86 Galere.
- 74 AOM 293, Ch. G. 1598, f.108r, Ord. 60 Galere; AOM 294, Ch. G. 1604, f.122r, Ord. 76 Galere, AOM 296, Ch G. 1631, f. 145v, Ord. 86 Galere.
- 75 AOM 663, 664, 665, *Camera d'Audienza, passim*.
- 76 AOM 664, f.73r, 23 August 1623
- 77 AOM 664, f.105v, 14 March 1625.
- 78 AOM 664, f. 83r and 99r, 12 January 1624 and 9 November 1624 respectively.
- 79 AOM 664, f. 148r, 11 March 1628.
- 80 AOM 664, f. 171r, 23 Februarh 1630.
- 81 AOM 664, f. 179r, 23 November 1630.
- 82 AOM 665, f. 206f-v and 209v, both 14 January 1645.
- 83 AOM 663, f. 107v, 29 November 1608.
- 84 ASSC, MCC, RAC, *Volume Unico, passim*.
- 85 *Ibid.*; 29 March 1696, 18 April 1598 and 12 August 1599 respectively.
- 86 ASC, MCC, R[egistrum] P[artit.] B[ullarum], 29 February 1620; N(otarial) A[rchives] V[alletta], R[egister] 184/19, Deeds of Notary Salvatore Ciantar, ff. 261r-262v, 29 February 1620.
- 87 ASC, MCC, RAC, 28 March 1597, 18 October 1597 and 31 March 1599 respectively.
- 88 *Ibid.*, 30 October 1598 and 29 June 1599.
- 89 *Ibid.*, 10 April 1597.
- 90 *Ibid.*, 7 February 1596.
- 91 *Ibid.*, 28 March 1596.
- 92 *Ibid.*, 14 August 1599.
- 93 *Ibid.*, 14 February 1598 and 25 May 1598.
- 94 *Ibid.*, 1 December 1597 and 3 September 1598.
- 95 AOM 101, f.72r-v, 2 September 1604.
- 96 AOM 108, f. 107v, 16 July 1625.
- 97 AOM 737, f. 16v, 21 August 1623.

- 98 AOM 664, f.252v, 21 July 1635.
- 99 AOM 663, f.295r, 18 March 1617.
- 100 AOM 663, f.112r, 20 December 1608.
- 101 Guilmartin J. F., *op. cit.*, pp. 293, 63-5.
- 102 Nani Mocenigo M., *op. cit.*, p. 33.
- 103 Pantera P., *op. cit.*, p. 120.
- 104 AOM 663, 664, 665, *Camera d'Audienza, passim*.
- 105 AOM 665, f. 14r-v, 4 July 1637.
- 106 AOM 1121, ff.106r-108v, 6 June 1640.
- 107 AOM 663, 664, 665, *Camera d'Audienza, passim*.
- 108 *Ibid.*
- 109 AOM 663, f.19v, 9 July 1605.
- 110 AOM 663, f. 84v, 13 October 1607.
- 111 AOM 663, f. 19v, 9 July 1605.
- 112 AOM 663, f.77r, 1 September 1607.
- 113 AOM 663, f. 288v, 10 November 1616.
- 114 AOM 665, f.140r, 17 May 1642.
- 115 AOM 664, f.241v, 12 May 1635.
- 116 AOM 663, f.250r, 23 December 1614.
- 118 *Ibid.*
- 119 AOM 663, f.108r, 29 November 1608.
- 120 AOM 663, f.78v, 15 September 1607.
- 121 AOM 663, f.101v, 23 August 1608.
- 122 AOM 664, f.73v, 30 August 1623.
- 123 AOM 663, f.231r, 12 April 1614.
- 124 AOM 664, f.21v, 15 April 1620.
- 125 AOM 663, f.72v, 1 September 1607.
- 126 Rossi E., *Storia della Marina dell'Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme di Rodi e di Malta* (Rome, 1926), p.65; Ubaldini U.M., *La Marina del Sovrano Militare Ordine di San Giovanni di Gerusalemme di Rodi e di Malta* (Rome, 1970), pp.359-363.
- 127 AOM 256, ff.33v, 47r, 63v and 72r; 14 July 1625, 15 December 1625, 1 December 1626 and 29 November 1627 respectively.
- 128 AOM 663, 664, 665, *Camera d'Audienza, passim*.
- 129 NAV, 625/12, Deeds of Notary Salvatore Busuttill, undated but bound after a cancelled deed date 17 July 1645.
- 130 Dal Pozzo B., *op. cit.*, I, p. 616.
- 131 *Ibid.*, p. 471.
- 132 AOM 1768, ff. 67r-v
- 133 AOM 1768, f.172r.
- 134 AOM 1768, ff. 138r-139r.
- 135 Ubaldini U.M., *op. cit.*, p. 362.
- 136 Fisher Sir G., *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*. (Oxford, 1957), p. 103; Earle P., *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary* (London, 1970), p. 80. The latter author is right in stating, on p. 277, that although on the whole Fisher is objective, he “overstates his case in trying to demonstrate the bias of earlier writers”.
- 137 Earle P., *op. cit.*, p.90.
- 138 *Ibid.*, pp. 85-6. Earle gives a full account of the redemption of slaves, how slaves worked to ransom themselves and the practice of slaves being “granted safe-conducts to arrange their own ransoms... by finding a Moslem slave in their home-

- land, and fiving up an exchange. The same was done the other way round". *cf.*, p. 91.
- 139 Braudel F., *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (London, 1972), Translation by Reynolds S., Vol. II, p. 889; Fisher Sir G., *op. cit.*, p. 103.
- 140 AOM, Treasury Series B, Vol. 309, Chapters X and XII.
- 141 Braudel F., *op. cit.*, II, p. 887.
- 142 ASC, MCC, O[fficium] V[enerandae] S[eniscalliae], Vol. I, not paginated, batch dated 1604-1641, 8 May 1639.
- 143 NAV, 625/9, Deeds of Notary Salvatore Busuttill, 20 February 1644.
- 144 Bono S., *I Corsari Barbareschi* (Turin, 1964), pp. 252-3; Earle P., *op. cit.*, p. 92.
- 145 Bono S., *op. cit.*, p. 252.
- 146 ASC, MCC, RAC, *Volume Unico*, not paginated, *passim*. This volume covers the period 1586-1599.
- 147 *Ibid.*, 8 November 1597.
- 148 *Ibid.*, 16 July 1598. Floccari, however, landed at Syracuse instead. In July he re-returned to Malta where he was quickly taken into custody.
- 149 *Ibid.*, 27 April 1596.
- 150 *Ibid.*, 20 October 1597.
- 151 *Ibid.*, 12 December 1595, 16 March 1596, 2 December 1596, 29 October 1597, 15 November 1597, 29 December 1598 and 14 January 1599.
- 152 *Ibid.*, 29 October 1597.
- 153 *Ibid.*, 17 November 1597.
- 154 *Ibid.*, 9 July 1598. Catherina Rimeo hailed from Messina and was, in all probability, a prostitute.
- 155 *Ibid.*, 22 March 1596. A sailor of the galley *Santa Fede*, Antonio, was accused of stabbing a certain Sciafone in the sailor's own house after a disagreement.
- 156 *Ibid.*, 20 June 1597.
- 157 *Ibid.*, 1 July 1596.
- 158 *Ibid.*, 30 September 1597.
- 159 I have not been able to find records of ordinary soldiers and sailors who had this type of income.
- 160 *The Laws of Malta* (Revised Edition, 1942), Civil Code, Vol. 3, p. 1297, Title XI, Section 1783.
- 161 ASC, MCC, RPB, *Volume Unico*, not paginated, 17 December 1611 and 6 June 1612.
- 162 *Ibid.*, 9 February 1611. NAV, R 501/11, ff. 364v-366v, Deeds of Notary Martino Zammit, 9 February 1611.
- 163 ASC, MCC, RPB, 5 February 1613; NAV, R 12/20, Deeds of Notary Andrea Albano, ff. 833r-835v, 5 February 1613.
- 164 ASC, MCC, RPB, 29 February 1620; NAV, R 184/19, Deeds of Notary Salvatore Ciantar, ff. 261r-262v, 29 February 1620.
- 165 ASC, MCC, RPB, 7 June 1617; NAV, R 229/34, Deeds of Notary Gio Simone de Lucia, ff. 1208r-1211r, 7 June 1617.
- 166 ASC, MCC, RPB, 11 May 1618.
- 167 Micallef Rev. G., *op. cit.*, pp. 40-1.
- 168 *Ibid.*, p.44.