

stayed in villages and tilled or managed their land themselves.³⁹ The origin of big landowners varied. Some belonged to towns for few or many generations while others “amassed their wealth only recently [such as] villagers who had got on in the world.”⁴⁰ Regardless of origin or residence, a certain number of landowners invested in citrus.⁴¹ Again, some of these landowners may have been moneylenders and merchants also.

Having distinguished between the moneylender, merchant, and landlord as belonging to a separate position/function and their, in many cases, being the same in reality, it is true that “pure” merchants were involved in citrus plantations, not as growers, but as marketers. Those were called “fruit-on-the-tree merchants, who buy the fruit when it is still on the tree.”⁴² Besides not being citrus growers, it may also have been the case that these merchants were also big landowners or upper-middle peasants. An additional important rationale for the inclusion of growers of citrus, let alone vegetables and other cash crops in our analysis, was the fact that most of the “funds” used for investment in these crops originated in rural areas whether in the form of revenue from the sale of land to European settlers, which meant the eviction of tenants, or appropriation in the form of rent extraction, surplus value, or the profits of merchant capital—all of which played a

³⁹Granott, *Land System*, 108.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 81-2.

⁴¹*Ibid.*

⁴²Brown, “Agriculture,” 140-2; and B. Veicmanas, “Internal Trade,” in Himadeh, 364-5.