

## The Decline of the Aristocracy in Eleventh and Twelfth Century Sardinia

Robert J. Rowland, Jr.

Beginning in the eleventh century, Pisa and Genoa — both as communes and in the persons of individual Pisans and Genovese, — followed by Catalans and Aragonese, exhibited an increasing, and increasingly covetous, interest in Sardinia and (especially) its resources;<sup>1</sup> and, already during the twelfth century, the island had fallen largely under continental domination.<sup>2</sup> That the story developed as it did should evoke no puzzlement: Pisa, Genoa, and the Iberians had more powerful navies, more fully developed economies, and when necessary, stronger armies; Sardinia's rulers, moreover, helped bring about their own eclipse, granting concessions and aligning themselves, to their own disadvantage, with one or another of the competing powers. Nor were papal policies without importance.<sup>3</sup>

Decisive as these factors were, however, they were external; what seems to have been generally overlooked is that there were coeval internal factors at work which functioned further to weaken Sardinia during this most crucial period of its history. The closed, now anachronistic, manorial economy is certainly one internal weakening factor; but it has often been cited.<sup>4</sup> What I wish to suggest here is that the combination of three factors — 1) alienation of land and other property by the aristocracy, particularly to the church; 2) Sardinian partible inheritance practices; and 3) the church's imposition of its prohibition of consanguineous marriages — accelerated, if it did not cause, the decline of the indigenous aristocracy, thereby facilitating the victory of the continentals.

For reasons that were often the most pious, sometimes blatantly political,<sup>5</sup> Sardinia's rulers and landowning aristocracy alienated enormous amounts of land and moveable property both to the church in the form of monastic foundations and outright gifts as well as (apparently) to its own slaves in the form of encasation ("hutting"). Speaking of only one recipient of such largesse, G. Rossi Sabatini noted that the Cathedral of Pisa "venne così arric-

chendosi progressivamente, per largizioni ed acquisti, di possessioni in Sardegna in modo da costituire un cospicuo patrimonio le cui rendite affluivano a Pisa."<sup>6</sup> The Cathedral of San Lorenzo at Genoa, though not so well endowed as its Pisan rival, received extensive gifts in 1107 from the ruler of Cagliari, Mariane de Lacon: six manors and everything belonging to them, viz., "servos et ancillas, vineis, pratis, pascuis, cultis rebus et incultis, spluis et aqua," as well as one libra of gold each year and tribute besides.<sup>7</sup> An inventory from 1108 informs us that those slaves consisted of 39 *serbos*, 20 *ankillas*, 36 slave couples, 76 sets of children, and 4 grandchildren.<sup>8</sup> In 1131, Comita II, ruler of Arborea, donated to San Lorenzo one manor with all of its appurtenances, numerous lands and fishing rights, as well as "medietatem moncium in quibus invenitur vena argenti in toto regno meo,"<sup>9</sup> about the same time putting himself, his son, and his kingdom under the protection of the commune of Genoa.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, many of the documents collected by Tola for this period are for concessions or donations granted by one ruler or another to a church or monastery. The cartularies of the monasteries provide similar documentation;<sup>11</sup> the foundation gifts of the monastery of S. Maria di Bonarcado, for example, and their reconfirmation some years later consist of ten sets of land, vineyards, *saltos*, slaves, sheep-pens, and other buildings (CSMB 1), with the later addition of fishing rights (CSMB 33, 34). Cerkis, an early twelfth century ruler of Arborea, gave 15 *sollos* (*solidi*) of *saltus* (CSMB 66), Comita in 1131 gave several *saltos* and five slaves, three of whom had already been given along with their father by his father Gosantine (CSMB 131-32). Barusone I (1151-85) donated two *saltos* and some land (CSMB 39, 145-46), while his wife Algabursa gave one-half of a slave woman and her daughter (CSMB 71). Petru de Serra (1185-92) gave two slave women each with a son and two males, one with a son (CSMB 20, 102, 118, 119). Mariane of Torres (1073-83) gave three churches of the realm (*de rennu*) (CSPS 2), a *saltus* (CSPS 4, 6, 12), several other *saltos* (CSMS 7), still another *saltus* (CSPS 62), half of a slave (CSPS 67), and, in company with his wife donna Susanna de Thori, three slaves and their offspring (CSPS 69).<sup>12</sup>

Not only were the rulers liberal to the church, but so were members of their families and other leading landowners as well as numerous individuals of exiguous means. The following tables, compiled from the lists of acquisitions in the four extant *condaghi*, show to what extent donations formed an essential part of the monasteries' acquisitions.

## Percent of all transactions by

	CSNT	CSMB	CSPS	CSMS
purchase	49	33	32	50
donation	44	60	57	41
trade	6	5	10	9
fine	1	2	1	0

Because trades, at least ideally, did not increase a monastery's patrimony and because fines were theoretically intended to replenish a reduction in that patrimony (by theft or homicide, e.g.), the following table will be more instructive.

## Percent of acquisitions by

purchase	52	35	36	55
donation	48	65	64	45

Over the four documents, donations accounted for 58% of all transactions (n. = 1020) and 54% of all acquisitions (n. = 931). More to the point, sales were mostly of small pieces of property, often worth less than one *sollus*, so that the percentage of property acquired by donation was actually much greater than the number of donations indicates. It is true that many gifts were of relatively small amounts, even those made by rulers; some few were part of the proceeds of a sale and these average 1 ½ *sollus* each.<sup>13</sup> So as to develop a clearer picture not only of who was making donations to the church, but also of the relative value of those donations, it will be useful to summon the assistance of some price and value statistics, "if only to save us from our own, uncontrolled impressions."<sup>14</sup>

For those unfamiliar with the evidence, it may come as a surprise to find that there was a fairly numerous small landowning (or at least land-disposing) class in medieval Sardinia; the dossier of the property called Terra de Collectariu, scattered throughout CSNT can serve as illustration. In a series of transactions,

1) the monastery purchased from Niscoli de Lella for four *sollos* a plot that was bordered on two sides by the 'balle de Gitilesu' and by the land that had belonged to Izoccor de Serra (CSNT 2; cf. nr. 5 below);

2) it purchased from Egizu Altana and from his brother Furatu land on the left hand side of the road from Trullas to Arkennor, paying one *sollu*; it then acquired for five *moiis* (*modii*) of barley (= ⅓ *sollu*) the bordering plot of Janne Plana, and, for the same price, another bordering plot from Gabini Altana (CSNT 7-9);

3) Bicturu Plana donated his portion, which bordered on what had been purchased from his brothers (*sic*) (CSNT 10);

4) after a transaction involving several lands, the church purchased from Gunnari de Sebin what he had in Golletariu (CSNT 49);

5) it then purchased from Izoccor de Sera, for one *eba* ('mare' = two *sollos*), a plot bordering on what "su donnu maiore" (i.e., a previous abbot) had purchased from Niscoli de Lella (CSNT 53);

6) Dorgotori Carbone donated one *terra*, on the left hand side, "where we go down to Falatoriu" (CSNT 102);

7) Susanna de Cerki, wife of Petru de Nurci, donated her land (CSNT 135);

8) Mariane Buiace and his brother Janne sold land on the right hand side of 'Scala de ficos' for a price of two *moius* of grain and an *opera* of cheese (=  $1/6$  *sollu*), and both brothers donated their portions of the land they shared with Janne Malio (CSNT 140);

9) Petru de Nurki sold three *sollos* of land (CSNT 160);

10) Petru Saracina donated two plots in Golletariu and three rows of vineyard elsewhere (CSNT 179);

11) Petru de Gunale sold one *sollu* of land, and his brother Mariane sold land worth  $\frac{1}{3}$  *sollu* (CSNT 233);

12) their sister Jorgia then donated her share, which bordered on what had previously been purchased from Petru de Nurki (CSNT 234);

13) Petru de Zori and his brother Itzoccor donated one *terra* which bordered on the church's land on one side and on Gosantine de Serra's on the other (CSNT 246);

14) Ithoccor Icalis sold a '*fune* of land for one *sollu*, land that he shared with Petru de Campu and with Comita his brother (CSNT 258);

15) Maria de Gunale sold land worth  $\frac{2}{3}$  *sollu* bordering on the church's (CSNT 267; cf. nr. 11-12 above);

16) Furatu Pianu sold for twelve *bisantes* several lands, one of which was in Collectariu (CSNT 283).

Some persons donated land and property that we could, without exaggeration, call them a "middle class" (without the commercial or other connotations of that term), as the following sample will illustrate:

Gunnari de Banios (CSMS 186) donated part of a manor, land, a vineyard, fruit and olive trees, and slaves: approximate value, 37 *sollos*;

Furato Birdis and his wife (CSMB 23) donated a manor with lands and vineyards: 34 *sollos*;

Presnaqui Braca (CSMS 62, 139, 198, 239) donated part of a land, two lands, and a cañaveral: 20 *sollos*;

Juan Catrosque (CSMS 68, 85, 259) donated two pieces of land, half of his share of two *saltos*, and half of a vineyard: 28 *sollos*

Petru Contena (CSPS 363) donated half a *salto*, half of eight different lands, two lands entire, half a cañaveral, half of a 'plain', one vineyard, part of another one, half of a slave, and fourteen days total of other slaves: 74 *sollos*;

Bittoria Galle (CSNT 62) donated a *domo et terras et binias*: 34 *sollos*;

Comita Icali (CSNT 147) donated salt beds, two *saltos*, slaves, a *corte*, *ficu*, *pira*, *domos*, two arable lands (*terras de agrile*), and *binias*: 158 *sollos*;

Thomas de Matrona (CSMB 37) donated everything that he had, three vineyards, his share of *serbos*, a *corte* with vineyards, gardens, and lands: 76 *sollos*;

Justa d'Ortu (CSPS 40, 94, 124) donated half a *fundamentu*, half a *corte*, half a slave, and part of a vineyard: 19 *sollos*;

Thunthude de Salvenor (CSPS 290) donated two *saltos*, two gardens, eighteen lands, half a hill (*monticlu*), two *secaturas*, one plain, four vineyards, two nurseries, one *domestica*, three *valles*, five separate enclosed areas, five more collectively, three *cortes*, two *codas* and one *ruginia*: 319 *sollos*;

Terico de Scopedu (CSMB 19, 86, 165, 176) donated five slaves, two *domestigas*, one garden, three lands, and a *salto*: 148 ½ *sollos*;

Goantine Tamaglu (CSMB 200, 202) donated part of two vineyards, all of two others, one *terra*, a *figu*, all of the fruit trees in one vineyard, and part of a *domo*: 33 *sollos*;

Iorgi Zukellu (CSMB 114) donated *plazas*, lands, one vineyard, to a total of sixteen properties: 99 ½ *sollos*.

The average value of these donations is eighty-eight *sollos*. Thunthude de Salvenor could perhaps qualify as a great landlord; the rest certainly stand well above the landless, and persons like Terico de Scopedu and Comita Icali are a world apart from Justa d'Ortu. But the amount of a person's donations is only part of the story.

Carta Raspi observed<sup>15</sup> that the de Gitil rarely appear in the texts, and indeed their generosity as a clan is not remarkable: part of a land (CSPS 377), part of a *salto* (CSNT 36), one land (CSPS 137), two days of a slave (CSNT 172), one-third of part of a *salto* (CSPS 435), part of a slave (CSMS 66). Only Dericcor de Gitil's gifts are noteworthy: half of everything he had in Silki — *homines*, lands, and vineyards (CSPS 84) — the *homines* consisting, as we learn from the next entry (CSPS 85), of two slaves entire, four



halves of slaves, eleven quarters, and four days' worth of some others, with a total value of some 120 *sollos*. The average of the de Gitils' gifts in the condaghi is only about 17 *sollos* each, but there are other factors; Dericcor's lands, given the number of slaves, were probably extensive; and Comita de Gitil was son of donna Jorgia de Thori and father-in-law of Juanne de Serra. There is even more, for, precious as they are, the condaghi have limited value; Furato de Gitil and his wife Susanna de Thori happen to be attested elsewhere as generous benefactors of another church.<sup>16</sup>

In the condaghi, 47% of the donations are made by persons bearing 15% of the total number of cognomina; they may be said to have constituted the landowning aristocracy, at least in Torres and Arborea. These names are<sup>17</sup>

de Athen (23 examples)	d'Oscheri (3 examples)
de Bosove (2 examples)	Pinna (2 examples)
de Capazennor (5 examples)	de Roma (1 example)
de Carbia (11 examples)	de Salvenor (1 example)
de Cerki (3 examples)	de Scanu (5 examples)
de Gitil (7 examples)	de Serra (10 examples)
de Gunale (11 examples)	Spanu (2 examples)
de Lacon (9 examples)	de Thori (43 examples)
de Martis (9 examples)	de Uarru (8 examples)
de Navithan (1 example)	de Uda/Uta (2 examples)
d'Orruu (2 examples)	d'Ussan/Uxan (2 examples)
	de Zepera (1 example).

Some of those who made donations did so with the permission of a master or lord — *donnu*, *señor*, or *amo* (e.g., CSMS 142, 196, 275) —, or even indicate that it had been given to them by a master (CSMS 272). Some of the great landowners had acquired (some of) their property as a gift from the ruler, a *saltus* of the de Capathennor (CSNT 262), for example, and one belonging to the de Athen (CSNT 72), but most such gifts seem to have been made to slaves in the form of encasation. Not that it is always possible to tell if a given individual is or is not a slave. To cite one example, in CSMB 203 we read of a garden that belonged entirely to the church "from the mill to the garden of the chestnut together with the portion of the garden (which she shared with Furadizu) given to the church by Justa Marki at the hour of her death." Is this the same person as the slave Justa, daughter of Torbeni Marki (CSMB 82.1)? Is Jorgi Marras who donated land (CSMB 4, 210) related to Maria Marras, a slave (CSMB 205n)? Slaves' portions were sometimes substantial: Terico Melone, a slave, died childless, and his portion was seized by Juanni d'Urrolo against whom the church

litigated, winning what one assumes was the property at issue — “plazas et terras et issa figu calaridana et ipsa terra in Pirastru de Zinzalu et in binias de Monte et terra de ponne,” worth perhaps forty-eight *sollos*. Furthermore, we can suspect that some of the small landholders at Terra de Collectariu and elsewhere, either themselves or their ancestors, had a servile relationship with some of the great magnates who had coterminous or neighboring lands, in that case the de Serra, de Cerki, de Gunale, and de Zori, who themselves perhaps had, through inheritance and marriage ties, fractions of a formerly unified estate. In Kerki the situation seems similar: two different de Athen (CSNT 44, 65) and a de Thori (CSNT 117) donated land to the church, and other (clearly) smaller bits were owned by various individuals: Petru Mugra who sold his part to Maria de Serra who gave it to the church; Gosantine Consu owned a piece next to Mugra’s; Gavini Tillis had a plot; Andria Vozo had a plot bordering on Mugra’s; Janne Zanaste had a portion bordering on that of his kinsman Vozo; the two brothers de Mela and their kinsman Gosantine Taras had a plot bordering on Vozo’s; and Janne Pinta had a plot which also bordered on Vozo’s (CSNT 121-7).

Land and moveable property, then, were alienated to the church, and quite probably to slaves; some land was given by rulers to members of the aristocracy. At the death of a parent, each child received equal shares of the inheritance, and spouses shared equally in what had been acquired after the marriage; even though offsprings may have acted in concert to maintain control over the land, they in fact possessed and alienated their own individual portions. Duby has demonstrated how the nobility of northern France acted to maintain control over its land by endogamy and how the needs of the aristocracy and the wishes of the church came into conflict.<sup>18</sup> The same conflict was repeated in medieval Sardinia, for the nobility there, eschewing primogeniture, habitually practiced endogamy to maintain as much cohesiveness as possible, occasionally marrying into newly risen or rising “middle class” landowning clans, one presumes to replenish diminishing resources. Although we don’t have the detailed sources that were available to Duby, we have sufficient that there can be little doubt about the process. Pope Alexander II in 1065 and another pope, probably Urban II around 1090, reproached one or another of Sardinia’s rulers for marrying within the prohibited degree of consanguinity.<sup>19</sup> This was a long standing, or recurring, conflict, for Nicolas I, *ca.* 864, referring to an earlier condemnation by Gregory IV, castigated the same practice,<sup>20</sup> which may also have been one of the reasons for Gregory VII’s stern admonition

to all four rulers in Sardinia to be devoted children of the church.<sup>21</sup> As late as 1200, Innocent III wrote to the archbishop of Cagliari requesting the latter, *inter alia*, to investigate the genealogies of the rulers to the fourth or fifth generation.<sup>22</sup> Even a glance at the family trees of the ruling families<sup>23</sup> will show the same cognomina recurring into the thirteenth century. It has been suggested that the de Gunali, de Serra and de Thori are all branches of the de Lacon family;<sup>24</sup> if this is so, it both confirms the point being made and partially explains the curious practice of a single individual's bearing different names as, e.g., Torchitorius, ruler of Cagliari (1058-1080), who is called both Trogodori de Unali and Trogodori de Lacon.<sup>25</sup> A sample of other cases will serve as further illustration.

Orzocco de Lacon — son of Gomita, ruler of Arborea in 1131, hence grandson of Gosantine I and Anna de Thori - married Maria de Zori (CSMB 147). Mariane I of Torres (1073-1082) married Susanna de Thori (CSPS 69); one of their sons, Gosantine, married Marcusa de Gunale, Maria de Arrubis and Maria de Thori (who Scano<sup>26</sup> thought was the same woman); another son, Gunnari, married Elena de Thori, one of whose daughters married Furadu de Gitil.<sup>27</sup> Another son of Mariane married a Maria de Lacon (CSPS 322). Donna Jorgia de Azen was a wife of a de Thori (CSNT 45), and Maurikellu de Athen was husband of Scolastica de Serra (CSMS 105). Donnu Petru d'Azen Murclu was married to an Elene de Lacon (CSNT 276, 291); donnu Gosantine de Athen was son of Comita de Thori (CSNT 72), while donna Elene de Thori married Dorgotori de Carbia (CSNT 155, 225, 263). Another (or the same?) Elene de Thori was wife of Marian de Carvia (CSMS 307). Siquia de Thori was married to Barusone Duxan (CSMS 309), and donnu Dorgotori du Uxan was husband of Maria de Thori (CSMS 179). A Jorgia de Thori was mother of Comita de Gitil (CSPS 355, 374), while Helene de Gitil was married to Petru de Nurki (CSNT 172), a homonym of the spouse of Susanna de Kerki (CSNT 201). Justa de Serra was daughter of Petru de Capathennor and Maria de Serra was grand-daughter of Petru de Carvia (CSPS 191). Ithoccor de Gunale had as grandson Petru de Uarru (CSPS 87-8), who was cousin of Dorgotori de Roma (CSPS 133), presumably kin to Vittoria de Roma, who had adopted the brother of Barusone II of Torres (CSMS 258). As examples of exogamy, we may note Itzoccor de Athen who was father-in-law of Gunnari de Sivi (CSNT 99); Muscu de Thori who married Comita Porcariu (CSNT 292); and donna Bera d'Athen, who was wife of donnu Petru Barbate (CSPS 287). Particularly noteworthy is the marriage of Vera de Thori with Erradore Pisanu, a slave of the church (CSMB 25).



Thus, in a very real sense, the ruling, landowning class of Sardinia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was very much an extended family, occasionally open to outsiders. However, in spite of their best efforts to maintain their land and position, they were unable to withstand the powerful forces leading to disintegration: alienation of land, equal inheritances for offspring, and the church's imposition of socially and economically disruptive marriage customs, all fatally combined to weaken the indigenous ruling class at precisely the time that Pisans, Genovese, and Catalans were becoming increasingly active in Sardinian affairs, and prepared the way for the political intervention and domination by those 'forestieri'<sup>28</sup> — which is not to suggest that different customs by the Sardinian nobility would have produced an appreciably different result over the long duration.

University of Missouri

## NOTES

- 1 See the introductions by A. Boscolo to the two volumes *Documenti inediti relativi ai rapporti economici tra la Sardegna e Pisa nel medioevo*, ed. by F. Artizzu (Padova: Cedam, 1961, 1962), and to *Documenti inediti sui traffici commerciali tra la Liguria e la Sardegna nel secolo XIII*, ed. by N. Calvini, E. Putzulu, and V. Zucchi (Padova: Cedam, 1957); cf. the valuable review by C. Manca in *Economia e Storia* 9 (1962), 331-43. See further, M. Branca, "Contesa per il dominio della Sardegna tra le due repubbliche di Pisa e Genova" *Arch. Stor. Ital.* 78 (1920), 79-109; F. Artizzu, "Pisani in Logudoro nel secolo XII," *Medioevo: Saggi e Rassegne* 3 (1977), 27-38.
- 2 Cf. A. Boscolo, *Sardegna, Pisa e Genova nel Medioevo* (Genova: Collana storica di fonti e studi, Università di Genova, 1978), p. 141.
- 3 See, e.g., A. Boscolo, *La Sardegna bizantina e alto giudiciale* (Sassari: Chiarella, 1978), p. 151, for the influence of Gelasius II and Callistus II.
- 4 A. Boscolo, "La vita curtense in Sardegna nel periodo alto-giudiciale," *Fra il passato e l'avvenire: saggi storici sull'agricoltura sarda in onore di Antonio Segni* (Padova: Cedam, 1965), pp. 49-63.
- 5 Cf. R. Mortimer, "Religious and secular motives for some English monastic foundations," *Studies in Church History* 15 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), 77-85; C. Violante, "Il monachesimo cluniacense di fronte al mondo politico ed ecclesiastico, sec. X e XII," *Studi sulla cristianità medioevale*, ed. by P. Zerbi (Milano: Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1977), pp. 3-67.
- 6 *L'espansione di Pisa nel mediterraneo fino alla Meloria* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1935), p. 38; for the Opera, see F. Artizzu, *L'Opera di Santa Maria di Pisa e la Sardegna* (Padova: Cedam, 1974), especially pp. 29-92.
- 7 F. Tola, *Codex diplomaticus Sardiniae*, vol. 2 (Torino: Regium Typographeum, 1868) (=CDS), sec. XII, doc. 3, pp. 178-79.
- 8 CDS, sec. XII, doc. 4, pp. 179-80.
- 9 CDS, sec. XII, doc. 41, pp. 207-78.
- 10 CDS, sec. XII, doc. 42, pp. 208-09.
- 11 The standard editions of these are E. Besta and A. Solmi, *I Condaghi di San Nicola di Trullas e di Santa Maria di Bonarcado* (Milano: A. Giuffrè, 1937) (CSNT, CSMB); R. Di Tucci, "Il Condaghe di San Michele di Salvennor," *Archivio Storico Sardo* 8 (1912), 247-337 (CSMS); G. Bonazzi, *Il Condaghe di San Pietro di Silki* (Sassari: Dessì, 1900) (CSPS).

- 12 References to other monastic and ecclesiastical foundations and donations can be found in Artizzu, op. cit. (above, n. 6), p. 41, n. 22, to which add G. Zanetti, *I Camaldolesi in Sardegna* (Cagliari: Fossataro, 1974). See also the important observations of M. Tangheroni, "La Sardegna prearagonese: una società senza feudalesimo?" *Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident méditerranéenne (X<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Rome: École française à Rome, 1980), pp. 530-43. At one point, almost in passing, Tagheroni (p. 536) observes that "i metodi ed i fini della penetrazione pisana e genovese in Sardegna non sono stati ancora adeguatamente indagati," an observation which forms one of the starting points for the present inquiry. I am grateful to Prof. Tangheroni for having given me a copy of the typescript of his essay before it appeared in print.
- 13 The prices used here are taken from R. Carta Raspi, *L'economia della Sardegna medioevale: Scambi e prezzi* (Cagliari: Fondazione Il Nuraghe, 1940), pp. 181-228, with a few modifications. This is not the place to digress at length about prices of land and commodities in Sardinia or to attempt a comparison of Sardinian prices with those which prevailed elsewhere in the medieval world. Although it would be worthwhile to know why some pigs were worth only 2 *tremisses* and other 2 *sollos*, we need here only observe that of twenty prices for pigs, nine are for 1 *sollu*, seven for 2 *sollos*. Similarly, of seventeen prices for cows, nine are for 1 *sollu*, five for 2 *sollos*, with two of the others being between 1 and 2 *sollos*. It would also be interesting to know why, when the average value of a cow was 1 ½ *sollos*, one specimen was worth four. The values used here are averages; when the object or commodity is given in the plural, they are assumed to be only two.
- 14 D. Herlihy, "Family Solidarity in Medieval Italian History," *Economy, Society, and Government in Medieval Italy: Essays in Memory of Robert L. Reynolds*, ed. by D. Herlihy, R.S. Lopez, and V. Slessarev (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1969), p. 174.
- 15 Op. cit. (above, n. 13), p. 125.
- 16 CDS, sec. XII, 15-16; Carta Raspi (p. 124) calculates that the value of this donation was 1600 *soldi*.
- 17 Cf. E. Besta, "Postilli sopra i Condaghi di S. Nicola di Trullas e di S. Maria di Bonarcado," *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 71 (1938), 151-6.
- 18 G. Duby, *Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-Century France* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), especially chapter 2.
- 19 *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* 10 (1975), 392-93.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 379.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 380.
- 22 D. Scano, *Codice diplomatico delle relazioni fra la Santa Sede e la Sardegna* (Cagliari: Arti Grafiche, 1940), 1, p. 6, nr. 4.
- 23 F. C. Casula, "Introduzione alle 'Genealogie medioevali di Sardegna' di L. L. Brooke, F.C. Casula, M.M. Costa, A.M. Oliva, R. Pavoni, M. Tangheroni," *Medioevo: Saggi e Rassegne* 4 (1978), 93-103.
- 24 D. Scano, "Serie cronologica dei Giudici Sardi," *Archivio Storico Sardo* 21 (1939), 31.
- 25 Cf. R. J. Rowland, Jr., "Matronymics and other rarities in Medieval Sardinia," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, in press.
- 26 Op. cit. (above, n. 24), 96.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 97.
- 28 Decisive turning points were reached when continentals became the outsiders who were linked to the ruling families by marriage. The earliest example seems to be that of Gunnari, ruler of Torres 1116-1153, who spent his youth at Pisa where he married Maria, daughter of Ugone Ebriaci (Mossen Ebriando): *Libellus iudicum turritanorum*, ed. by A. Boscolo and A. Sanna (Cagliari: Fossataro, 1957), p. 48. Perhaps the most tragic case was the consequence of the marriage of Barisone I with Agalbursa while his first wife Pellegrina de Lacon, from whom he had a son and successor, was still alive; Agalbursa was daughter of Poncio de Cervera, Visconte di Bas: cf. E. Besta, *La Sardegna Medioevale*, vol. 1 (Palermo: A. Liber, 1908), pp. 152-79.