

Urbs Capta

The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences
La IV^e Croisade et ses conséquences

Sous la direction d'Angeliki Laiou

Ouvrage publié avec le concours de la Fondation J. F. Costopoulos

10

RÉALITÉS BYZANTINES



LETHIELLEUX
7, rue de Canettes, 75006 Paris

THE LATINS IN THE AEGEAN AFTER 1204: INTERDEPENDENCE AND INTERWOVEN INTERESTS

Marina KOUMANOUDI*

During the first century of Latin rule in the Aegean, conquerors and colonists developed a complex network of interdependent relationships that linked them to each other and to the other areas under Latin rule on a number of levels. In this study, I discuss the factors that, in one way or another, determined the nature and form of these relationships. These factors include the conquerors' place of origin, the manner in which they took possession of their land, the prevailing political situation, and the geophysical and climatic particularities of the Aegean islands, their location, and geographic dispersal or grouping. The focus here is on the small independent or semi-independent lordships established on the Aegean islands in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, and not on the two largest islands, Crete and Negroponte.

After the fall of Constantinople to the crusaders, the Aegean islands suffered political fragmentation, as did the rest of the Byzantine Empire. However, the Latins did not impose their dominion on all the islands in one fell swoop; indeed, a number of islands did not come under Latin control for another century. Others, including the islands of the northeast Aegean and the Dodecanese (apart from Rhodes), which had been handed over to the Latin emperor according to the terms of the partition treaty, were soon to find themselves under the control of the emperor of Nicaea, only to be reunited with the main body of the Byzantine Empire a few years later.¹

The triumph of Venice in 1204 was a heavy blow to Italy's second naval power, Genoa, who having abstained from participating in the Fourth Crusade, did not share in the spoils from the capture of Constantinople and the division of the lands of the Byzantine Empire among the victors. Moreover, for almost six decades, until 1261, its merchants were forced to keep their distance from the former Byzantine capital as well as the markets and ports of Greece. The Genoese response to these setbacks was dynamic. From early on they devoted all their energies to hindering Venetian expansion in the eastern Mediterranean, adopting a policy of promoting piracy, in the form of both attacks on its adversaries' merchant vessels and the provision of capital and ships to pirates, as in the case of the count of Malta Enrico Pescatore, who attempted to capture Crete and bring it

* University of Athens.

1. CARILE, A., *Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae*, *StVen* 7, 1965, pp. 125-305, and esp. pp. 217-222. NIKEPHOROS GREGORAS, *Historia*, ed. SCHOPEN, L., vol. I, Bonn, 1829, p. 29. See also OIKONOMIDÈS, N., *La décomposition de l'empire à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: À propos de la "Partitio Romaniae," Rapport au XVe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines*, Athens, 1976, reprinted in IDEM, *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*, London, 1992, no. XX; ANGOLD, M. J., *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea, 1204-1261*, Oxford, 1974, pp. 104, 114-115, 183, 196-197, 249; cf. GOUNARIDIS, P., *Η τύχη της Ρόδου τον ΙΓ' αιώνα*, *Symmeikta* 15, 2002, pp. 177-182.

within Genoa's sphere of influence.² A few short-lived successes notwithstanding, all the Genoese accomplished was to awaken Venetian interest in the Aegean isles, where foreign rule still remained purely theoretical several months after the dissolution of the Byzantine Empire, and hasten their conquest. But, apart from the conquest of Crete for which we are relatively well informed, the sources are regrettably vague about these events.

If the sixteenth-century Venetian chronicler Daniele Barbaro is to be believed, the conquest of these islands was effected in two stages.³ Around 1205, Marco Sanudo set sail for Naxos from Constantinople at the head of a fleet of eight galleys he had armed at his own expense, with the aim of expelling the Genoese who had recently taken control of the island. Although Naxos was not on the main sea routes connecting the northwestern Mediterranean with the Middle East and Constantinople, it stood on the alternative routes between the islands and was centrally positioned within the Cyclades.

It was for its particular geographic location as well as its considerable size that the island had been selected to become the seat of a *turmarch* and of the metropolitan of Paronaxia in the eleventh century and subsequently, by the late twelfth-century, the capital of the province of the Dodecanese.⁴ The island was also exceptionally fertile and rich in marble and emery deposits, which had been known since antiquity. All these factors, and, more importantly, the fact that Naxos had not been included in the *Partitio*, rendered the island particularly important and explain why the Venetians, with their profound knowledge of the geography and economy of the region, should be unwilling to allow Genoese pirates there.⁵ That Marco Sanudo should undertake the conquest of the island is hardly surprising. With the Republic of St. Mark lacking the resources required to take

2. BALARD, M., *Les génois en Roumanie entre 1204 et 1261. Recherches dans les minutiers notariaux Génois, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, École Française de Rome* 78.1, 1966, pp. 467-592, esp. pp. 467-474; IDEM, *La Roumanie génoise (XII^e -début du XV^e siècle)*, Rome - Genoa, 1978, BEFAR 235, *Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria*, n.s., 18 (92), fasc. 1, pp. 38-40.

3. Although the chronicle of Andrea Dandolo is the earliest source that refers to the conquest of the islands (ANDREA DANDOLO, *Chronica per extensum descripta*, ed. PASTORELLO, E., RIS XII, Bologna, 1942, p. 282, Daniele Barbaro's unpublished chronicle is considered more reliable. The relevant passage is published in FOTHERINGHAM, J. K., *Marco Sanudo, Conqueror of the Archipelago*, Oxford, 1915, pp. 106-108. Excerpts from both chronicles are included in LOENERTZ, R.-J., *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel, 1207-1390*, Florence, 1975, pp. 312-316. See the analysis in FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 36-59; BORSARI, S., *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1966, pp. 34-43; JACOBY, D., *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les "Assises de Roumanie," sources, application et diffusion*, Paris - The Hague, 1971, pp. 271-273; and, more recently, RAVEGNANI, G., *La Romania veneziana*, in CRACCO, G., and ORTALLI, G., eds., *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, II: *L'età del Comune*, Rome, 1995, pp. 197-200. Cf. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 26-28, who believes that the islands were conquered in their entirety in 1207; and THIRIET, F., *La Roumanie vénitienne au moyen âge*, Paris, 1959, p. 82.

4. MALAMUT, E., *Les îles de l'Empire Byzantin, VII^e-XII^e siècles*, I-II, Paris, 1988, pp. 268, 319, 331-332, 355-357, 495, 592. According to the author, by the late 12th century the former Byzantine province of the Cyclades islands, now designated Dodecanese and with Naxos as its capital, had been severely reduced in size by the administrative reforms introduced by Alexios I and continued by Manuel Komnenos. On sea routes during the 11th and 12th centuries and the Cyclades' role in the network, see MALAMUT, *Les îles de l'Empire Byzantin*, II, pp. 549-561.

5. Most of the other islands in the central Aegean had been divided between Venice and the Latin emperor: see CARILE, *Partitio*, pp. 217-219, 258-259, 281. A possible explanation for the omission of Naxos from the text of the *Partitio* is that the "Cyclades" province had already seceded from the Byzantine Empire in the late 12th/early 13th century, as was also the case with Rhodes and central Negroponte; see MALAMUT, *Les îles de l'Empire Byzantin*, I, pp. 99-101

control of and retain the more lucrative lands it had been allotted, the annexation of further territories was out of the question. Sanudo presented the next best alternative: not only did he possess the necessary funds to carry out the mission, but he was also the nephew of the doge. Moreover, he was well versed in the backstage politics of the day for he had followed his aged uncle to Constantinople and had been actively involved in the negotiations for the sale of Crete.⁶

The second naval expedition, which succeeded in bringing a significant number of islands under Latin control, set sail from Venice in 1207. Concerned about continued insecurity in the Aegean as a result of the ongoing pirate raids, the Venetian government authorized its citizens to proceed with the conquest of the islands at their own expense. Henry of Flanders, the emperor of Constantinople, consented to this initiative on condition that his suzerainty be recognized over any territories taken.

The information contained in the sources regarding the naval expedition and its achievements – that is, which islands were conquered and by whom – is considered generally unreliable.⁷ Nevertheless, it would appear that the would-be conquerors focused their efforts on two island groups in the southwest Aegean: the Cyclades, which serve as stepping stones on the journey from mainland Greece across to Asia Minor and Crete; and the so-called Thessalian Sporades, which stretch east of Pelion and north of the island of Negroponte on the main sea route to Constantinople. Marco Sanudo, who organized and coordinated the whole venture, along with his comrades succeeded in capturing Paros, Melos, and Santorini. His cousin Marino Dandolo seized Andros, while Andrea Ghisi took Tinos and Mykonos and his brother Geremia the islands of Skyros, Skiathos, and Skopelos. The sources include the name of yet another Venetian noble in the expeditionary force led by Sanudo: Filocalo or Filocarò Navigaioso, who around the same time took control of the island of Lemnos, situated much further to the north. Although his taking possession of the island was in fact the result of a separate initiative, Navigaioso seems to have shared with Sanudo, Dandolo, and many other Venetians, whose wealth and prestige had increased considerably after the conquest of Constantinople, the desire to seize lands to hold as vassals of the Latin Emperor. According to Giorgio Cracco, this desire was an expression of separatist tendencies within the Venetian nobility that had already been evident since the beginning of the Fourth Crusade.⁸ As to the supposed conquest of Kea in 1207, the later chroniclers to whom we owe this piece of information have been proven to be wrong, and we now know that the island escaped Latin occupation for a few more years at least.⁹ Finally, although Karl Hopf somewhat arbitrarily links the establishment of the Venier, another Venetian family, on Kythira with the expedition of 1207, there can no longer be any doubt that this actually took place at a much later date and as a result of the peaceful transfer of power from the Byzantines to the Venetians by way of a marriage contract.¹⁰

6. FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 31-35.

7. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 34ff; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 28-29.

8. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 41-42; TOPPING, P., Latins on Lemnos before and after 1453, in BRYER, A., and LOWRY, H., eds., *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, Birmingham - Washington, D. C., 1986, pp. 217-220; SAINT-GUILLAIN, G., Deux îles au temps de l'Empire Latin: Andros et Lemnos au XII^e siècle, *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Moyen Âge* 113.1, 2001, pp. 603-617. On the separatist tendencies, see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, XXXII, Rome, 1986, s.v. Dandolo, Andrea.

9. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 37-38, 42-43; LEDUC, F.-X., Venise, Marin Falier, l'Égée au début du XIV^e siècle: La vente de Céos par les Ghisi à Ruggiero Premarin (1325), *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 160, 2002, pp. 605-607.

10. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 37-38; MALTEZOU, CH. A., Le famiglie degli Eudemongianis e Venier

In accordance with the agreement concluded between the doge and Henry of Flanders, Marco Sanudo recognized the suzerainty of the latter. In turn, the emperor invested Sanudo with the lands he had conquered on the same terms as he had the empire's other barons.¹¹ In a similar fashion, Andrea and Geremia Ghisi became the direct vassals of the Latin emperor for the islands they had conquered. It was thus that the island lords became part of the feudal hierarchy of the Latin Empire of Constantinople, where they were to remain until 1248, when Emperor Baldwin II transferred the suzerainty of the Aegean islands to William II of Villehardouin, prince of Achaia. When the suzerainty of the principality passed to Charles I of Anjou on William's death in 1278, they became vassals of the Angevins of Sicily.¹²

In the few public documents that have survived from the thirteenth century, the insular state founded by Marco I Sanudo is referred to as the "ducatus Nixie et Andre" – the duchy of Naxos and Andros – after its two largest islands. Although it is more widely known as the "Duchy of the Aegean" or "the Duchy of the Archipelago," neither term was current until the following century. We have no way of knowing what Sanudo's intentions were when he set sail to conquer the islands, or whether he planned to replace the preexisting Byzantine theme with his island state, whose capital Naxos also was. However, the term *duchy* – with all its associations and implications – must have been deliberately chosen as a direct reference to the fiefs the Latin emperor had divided among the crusaders.¹³

Barbaro, writing some three hundred years after the conquest of the Aegean islands, ascribed the title "duke" to the founder of the duchy; but in fact the rulers of the Archipelago did not employ it until much later. On all official documents issued before the beginning of the fourteenth century, Marco Sanudo and his heirs are designated as "ducatus Nixie et Andre dominator."¹⁴ Bartolomeo I, the son of Andrea Ghisi, also styled himself

a Cerigo dal XII al XIV secolo. Problemi di cronologia e prosopografia, *RSBS* 2, 1982 (= *Miscellanea Agostino Pertusi*, II, Bologna, 1982, pp. 204-216 [reprinted in EADEM, *Βενετική Παρουσία στα Κύθηρα. Αρχαιακές Μαρτυρίες*, Athens, 1991]; KOUMANOUDI, M., "Illi de Ca' Venier": The First Venetian Lords of Kythera, in KOUMANOUDI, M., and MALTEZOU, CH., eds., *Venezia e Cerigo. Atti del Simposio Internazionale, Venezia, 6-7 dicembre 2002*, Venice, 2003, pp. 87-91.

11. "plus quam aliquis baronus qui tunc erat in Romania": LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 279, doc. B2 (a letter sent by Marco II Sanudo, duke of Naxos, to the doge of Venice in 1282).

12. JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 21-23; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 279-280.

13. The Byzantine territories – which, as Geoffrey of Villehardouin relates, the emperor had divided as fiefs among the crusaders when they were still to be conquered – were called duchies and included a castle and its surrounding area. They were therefore similar in form to the themes, the administrative units into which the Byzantine provinces were divided, as these stood after the reforms introduced during the reign of the Komnenoi. See GEOFFREY OF VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. FARAL, E., Paris, 1938, §§ 304-305, 316. CARILE, *Partitio*, pp. 128-131; IDEM, *Per una storia dell'Impero Latino de Romania (1204-1261)*, 2d ed., Bologna, 1978, pp. 207-211, 213-216; PAPADOPOULOU, E., *Marin Sanudo Torsello, Istoria di Romania*, Athens, 2000, pp. 219-220.

14. "non solamente si dava titolo di duca di quell'isola ma per reputation se appellava duca dell'Arcipelago": FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, p. 107; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 27-29, 314. Shortly before his death, Marco Sanudo I refers to himself in a document drawn up in Venice on 3 September 1227 as "ducatus Nixie et Andre dominator": LANFRANCHI STRINA, B., *SS. Trinità e S. Michele Arcangelo di Brondolo. Documenti 1200-1229 e notizie di documenti*, III, Venice, 1987, Fonti per la Storia di Venezia sez. II, Archivi Ecclesiastici, Diocesi Clodiense, p. 439, no. 679. His heir, Angelo Sanudo (1227-1262), is also referred to as "ducatus Nikisee et Andre dominator" in the deed of the grant of a fief from 1251: SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, p. 618.

“dominator Thynarum et Micularum.”¹⁵ And Marino Dandolo, who as was mentioned earlier held his lands in fee from Sanudo, is referred to as “dominator Andre” in a document drawn up in Modon in 1242.¹⁶ One cannot help but wonder whether the uniformity in the form of the titles of the island lords is a reflection of the unease Venetians felt, at least at this early stage, in the unfamiliar yet not entirely alien feudal environment. The same could very well be said about the phrase “quarte partis et dimidie dominator” (lord of one-fourth and a half of the Latin Empire), which was added to the doge’s titles after the Fourth Crusade.¹⁷

From the very start, Marco Sanudo’s leadership qualities and, more important still, the role he played in the conquest of the Aegean islands, as well as the geopolitical importance of his lands, made him one of the most important barons in the Latin Empire. The marriage of his son Angelo to the daughter of Macaire de Sainte Menehould, one of the most important imperial officials – a marriage the historian Marino Sanudo Torsello informs us was enacted in the imperial palace in Constantinople – was to confirm his status and brought him closer to his overlord’s immediate circle.¹⁸

The Sanudo family continued to use their imperial connections to further their ambitions, even after Baldwin II was expelled from Constantinople in 1261. For instance, when the emperor passed through Thebes en route for the West, the wife of the duke of the Archipelago was among the nobles there to greet him: the exquisite gifts she made to Baldwin and his entourage assured a knighthood for her son Marco.¹⁹

The limited information at our disposal indicates that although the island lords aspired to marry into the feudal aristocracy of the principality of Achaia during the second half of the thirteenth century (as evidenced, for example, by the marriage between Francesco Sanudo, lord of Melos, and Cassandra, daughter of Godfrey de Durnay, baron of Kalavryta and Gritsaina), they were also on the lookout for suitable brides further afield.²⁰

Marco Sanudo II (1262-1292) bore the title “ducatus Nicoxie et Andre dominator or ducatus Nechesie et Andre dominator.” Marino Sanudo refers to the fifth lord of the Duchy of the Archipelago, Nicolò Sanudo (1323-1341), as dux “Nicxie et Andreae” in letters from the first half of the 14th century: PAPAPOPOULOU, *Istoria*, p. 219. On the origin of the title “duke of the Aegean Sea” and alternative interpretations of the etymology of the terms “Archipelago” and “Aegean Sea,” see MALTEZOU, CH. A., *De la Mer Égée à l’Archipel: Quelques remarques sur l’histoire insulaire égéene*, in *EYΨΥΧΙΑ. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler*, II, Paris, 1998, *Byzantina Sorbonensia* 16, pp. 459-467.

15. “venit ante nostram nostrumque consiliariorum presentiam egregius et nobilis vir dominus Bartholomeus Ghisi dominator Thynarum et micularum”: LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 285, doc. B4, lines 10-11, 33-34 (24 December 1284).

16. See Archivio di Stato di Venezia (= ASV), *S. Giovanni Evangelista di Torcello*, b. 3, Perg. (3 August 1242).

17. DANDOLO, *Chronica*, pp. 279-280; LAURENTII DE MONACIS, *Chronicon de rebus Venetis ab U.C. ad annum MCCCLIV*, omnia ex mss. editisque codicibus eruit, recensuit, praefationibus illustravit F. CORNELIUS, Venice, 1758, p. 140. CARILE, A., *La Chronachistica Veneziana (secoli XIII-XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*, Florence, 1969, pp. 195, 202-203.

18. PAPAPOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 122-123, 251.

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123, 249-250.

The case of George I Ghisi – the son of Bartolomeo I, lord of Tinos and Mykonos – is of particular interest for the light it sheds on marriage strategies. His first marriage was to the daughter of Guy de Dramelay.²¹ In 1292 he held the barony of Chalandritsa in his wife's name while simultaneously performing the duties of military governor in the Castellany of Kalamata.²² On his wife's death, the barony of Chalandritsa passed to Nicholas de Dramelay, and George began to search for a wife in neighboring Negroponte. His marriage to Alice dalle Carceri, heiress to the central third of Negroponte, in 1299 or 1300 not only ensured financial benefits and rights over the island of Negroponte for himself and his heirs, but also increased his status and raised his position in the feudal hierarchy. As triarch of Negroponte, George acquired equal rank with the prince of Achaia, whose vassal, baron, and liegeman he already was, occupying the same position in the hierarchy as, among others, the dukes of Athens and Naxos, the marquis of Bodo-nitsa, the count of Cephallonia, and the lords of Kalavryta and Patras.²³ This marriage had one further advantage for George: the relatively short distance separating Negroponte from Tinos and Mykonos allowed him to rule his island domains more effectively.

George I Ghisi was not the first member of his family to marry into that of a triarch of Negroponte. In circumstances that remain unclear, Agnes, his grandfather's sister, had married Othon de Cicon, the nephew (on the side of Sibyll, his mother) of Othon de la Roche, lord of Athens and also of Karystos, which comprised the southern third of the island.²⁴

The Ghisi family's ties with the island of Negroponte and its capital in particular went far back in time. George I Ghisi's great-uncle, and possibly his grandfather, had kept a house in the Venetian quarter of Chalkis as early as 1216, presumably because they could conduct their commercial activities more effectively from the island's capital than from their distant castles on Skopelos and Tinos.²⁵

Marriages between the ruling houses of the Aegean and the triarchs of Negroponte would seem to have been relatively common. Sanudo informs us that the youngest daughter of Guglielmo I da Varona (lord of the southern third of Negroponte) married Marino Sanudo, lord of one-half of Naxos and the whole of Paros,²⁶ although this is not verified by any of the other sources. Sanudo also refers to marriages between Agnes and Maria, daughters of Paolo Navigaioso of Lemnos, and Gaetano da Verona, lord of one-sixth of Negroponte, and Gilberto II, the son of Guglielmo I da Verona, respectively.²⁷ Both these marriages were celebrated prior to Licario's conquest of Lemnos in the autumn of 1279, and were probably motivated by a need for closer political and military cooperation between the Latin powers of the Aegean after the reconquest of Constantinople by Michael VIII Palaiologos.

21. On Guy de Dramelay and his place in the feudal hierarchy of the principality of Achaia, see the Aragonese version of the Chronicle of the Morea, *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del Principado de la Morea compilado por comandamiento de Don Fray Ferrandez de Heredia, maestro del Hospital de S. Johan de Jerusalem. Chronique de Morée aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, ed. and trans. MOREL-FATIO, A., Geneva, 1885, p. 56, § 254.

22. *Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée. Chronique de Morée (1204-1305)*, ed. LONGNON, J., Paris, 1911, pp. 302-303, § 764; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 105-108.

23. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 110-111, 113-114; JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 25, 238.

24. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 33-37.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

26. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 130, 259.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 139, 273; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 436 n. 8.

On the other hand, despite their shared Venetian lineage and common interests in the region, the island lords do not appear to have shown much interest in establishing closer bonds through intermarriage. Indeed, the marriage between Paolo Navigaioso, grand duke of Lemnos, and Marco II Sanudo's sister remains the only known case of intermarriage between members of the island ruling families during the thirteenth century.²⁸

As far as marriage to Venetians is concerned, the information at our disposal is insufficient to draw sound conclusions. However, if one may judge from the case of Marchesina, the daughter of Geremia Ghisi, who married Lorenzo Tiepolo, the son of Giacomo Tiepolo, the doge of Venice (1229-1249), and later doge himself (1268-1274), the daughters of the lords of the Archipelago must have been considered a highly eligible match by the Venetian patricians.²⁹ It is worth noting that both Lorenzo and his father were well acquainted with the state of affairs on the islands, since Andrea Dandolo informs us that the former had been appointed bailo of Negroponte in 1261 or thereabouts – he had, in fact, welcomed the emperor, Baldwin II of Courtenay, when he fled Constantinople following Michael VIII Palaiologos's reconquest of the Byzantine capital – and the latter had served as duke of Crete prior to being appointed doge.³⁰ Moreover, both would also have been accurately apprised of Marchesina's financial standing, since the Great Council had confiscated her father's estate during Giacomo's term as doge as part of a legal dispute occasioned by the occupation of Andros.³¹

The feudal relationship between the Sanudo and Ghisi families, on the one hand, and their overlords, on the other, was not merely theoretical. As Marco II Sanudo characteristically notes in a letter sent in 1282 to the doge of Venice concerning the Andros affair, his grandfather had never once failed to bestow upon the Latin emperor the honors and services due in exchange for the islands he had received.³²

Although he does not specify the nature of these services, he is clearly referring to a Western feudal lord's formal obligations to his suzerain, services that essentially involved the provision of assistance – as a rule military – and counsel (*auxilium et consilium*). According to the Aragonese version of the Chronicle of the Morea, on the eve of the battle of Pelagonia, Prince William II of Achaia dispatched letters to the duke of Athens, the marquis of Bodonitsa, the barons of Thebes and Salona, the triarchs of Negroponte, and the duke of Naxos, requesting them to assemble in Thessaly with their troops in early April 1259.³³ The feudal army did indeed join forces with the troops of the prince and Michael II of Epiros near the city of Neopatras, before encamping in the plain of Thalassino. "It was such a mighty army," the author of the French version of the Chronicle notes, "that it was a marvel to behold."³⁴ Yet the barons, including the duke of the Archipelago, do not always seem to have responded to their suzerain's summons in the manner expected of them. Thus, when William of Villehardouin heard that the Byzantine

28. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 139, 272-273.

29. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 48; PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, p. 245.

30. DANDOLO, *Chronica*, p. 311. Giacomo Tiepolo had served as duke of Crete from 1207 to 1214; see PAPADAKI, Κατάλογος των δουκών της Κρήτης, in *Ροδωνιά. Τιμή στον Μ. Ι. Μανούσακα*, II, Rethymno, 1994, p. 392. On the policies he pursued as the duke of Crete, see THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne*, pp. 88-91.

31. See below.

32. "et de ipsius insulis imperatori qui tunc erat humagium et servitium quod facere < debebant > ipse fecit sua vita": LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 279, doc. B2, lines 17-26.

33. "en el plano del ducame con todo su poder": *Libro de los fechos*, p. 56, §§ 252-253.

34. "Si passa a la despotee, si trova le despot son frere qui avoit aussi amassè tant de gent que c'estoit merveilles a veoir": *Chronique de Morée*, pp. 98-99, §274.

forces dispatched to the Peloponnesos in the spring of 1263 had counterattacked, "he sent messengers to the lord of Athens, to Negroponte, and to the islands requesting that the knights come to his assistance with their armies. But they disobeyed him and did not go, embittering the prince and inciting his anger."³⁵ They did come to their senses in the end, however, and rushing to his aid defeated the Byzantines in Prinita.³⁶

The obligation to provide *consilium* entailed the vassal taking part in his suzerain's court. It was in fulfillment of this obligation as liege vassal of the islands of Skopelos and Skyros that Lorenzo Tiepolo, husband of Marchesina Ghisi and a future doge of Venice, participated in the negotiations between William II, prince of Achaia, and the Venetians of Negroponte that resulted in the conclusion of the treaty of May 1262. On the signing of the treaty, the prince granted Tiepolo a village in the vicinity of Coron in fief, presumably as a token of gratitude for his services.³⁷

Moreover, the council of barons, which came into being some time prior to 1278, allowed the island lords to play an active role in shaping feudal law and overseeing its application. Their refusal to swear an oath of allegiance to the representative sent to the Peloponnesos by King Charles I on the occasion of the suzerainty passing to the Angevins illustrates the importance Marco II Sanudo and Bartolomeo I Ghisi attached to maintaining their privileges and safeguarding the institutions of the principality, as well as their belief in the necessity of a closer personal relationship between vassal and overlord.³⁸

Quite apart from the feudal relationships that bound them to their suzerains, the island lords continued to be Venetian subjects: a fact the Serenissima never ceased to acknowledge. The Republic of St. Mark considered the island lords to be its natural allies in the region, and, especially after 1250, used their citizenship as a pretext for involving itself in the internal affairs of the islands as part of its policy of extending its control to the small, independent lordships of the Aegean. For their part, the island lords did not delay in expressing their determination to remain politically independent of Venice, even if that meant coming into conflict with the mother city.

It was the rebellion of the Agiostefanites which broke out on Crete in 1211 that first strained relations between the duke of Naxos and the Venetian Republic. Unable to deal with the rebels alone, Giacomo Tiepolo, the duke of Crete, sought assistance from Marco Sanudo, promising him thirty knightly fiefs in return. However, when Tiepolo either refused to make good on his promise or delayed in doing so, Sanudo joined forces with the Greeks, forcing the Venetian duke to flee and request reinforcements from Venice. After a number of bloody encounters in the course of which Stefano Sanudo, Marco Sanudo's brother, was killed, the duke of Naxos decided to sue for peace in late 1212 or

35. μαντατοφόρους ἔστειλε ἐκεῖ στὸν Μέγαν Κύρην, στὸν Εὐριπὸν κ' εἰς τὰ νησιά νὰ ἔλθουν οἱ φλαμουριάροι μὲ τὰ φουσσᾶτα ὅπου εἶχασιν διὰ νὰ τὸν συμμαχήσουν. Κ' ἐκεῖνοι τοῦ ἐπαρήκουσαν κι οὐδὲν ἦλθαν ἐνταῦτα. Ὁ πρίγκηπας ἐχόλιασεν μεγάλως πρὸς ἐκείνους: *Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μωρέως*, ed. ΚΑΛΟΝΑΡΟΣ, P. P., lines 4594-4613. Cf. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Istoria*, pp. 124-125, 253-254, in which Sanudo differs from the Chronicle of the Morea in upholding that they rushed to his aid.

36. On the clashes in the Peloponnesos between 1263 and 1264, see the Aragonese version of the Chronicle of the Morea, *Libro de los fechos*, pp. 69-79, §§ 311-358 and pp. 75-76, §338.

37. The village in question was Borgon, in the Coron area, which K. Hopf identifies with the fief of Dragami in the Kalamata area; see ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Istoria*, pp. 116-117, 244-245. On the etymology of "Borgon," see ΑΝΑΓΝΟΣΤΑΚΗΣ, Ε., *Ιστορικογεωγραφικές σημειώσεις*, *Symmeikta* 8, 1989, p. 72 and n. 5, which includes the bibliography relating to the identification of the village.

38. *Chronique de Morée*, p. 215, §541. *Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μωρέως*, lines 7881-7901; JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 25, 45-46, 70.

early 1213, even though he was still in control of at least seven castles. Sanudo's actions during this first Cretan rebellion have been interpreted in a number of ways over the centuries, the earliest theory, treachery, being that detailed in the Venetian chronicles. What stands out most clearly from the whole affair, however, is his desire to decide and act without guidance and in line solely with his own interests.³⁹

The sources also condemn as an act of treachery the decision taken by Marco Sanudo's son, Angelo, to withdraw his forces from Crete during the rebellion of the Melissinos and Skordiles families between the years 1228 and 1233. However, it has recently been argued that the sudden withdrawal of the duke of Naxos was in all likelihood prompted by worries over the security of his territories, either because he feared reprisals being carried out against his lands by the forces of John Vatatzes, or because of the urgent need to repair the damage the Byzantine fleet had caused on its way to Crete as a diversion tactic.⁴⁰ In the light of everything we know about the policy pursued by the dukes of the Archipelago, this would seem a far more credible explanation than treachery. At the same time, it is now much clearer why the Venetian chroniclers could not fathom the reasons for which Sanudo may have placed the security of his duchy over the interests of Venice.

The capture of the castle of Andros by the brothers Geremia and Andrea Ghisi shortly before August 1243, coupled with the confiscation of the property of Marino Dandolo and his sister Maria Doro, presented Venice with an opportunity to intervene in the domestic affairs of the island lordships. Although we do not know how the castle came to be captured, all the available evidence points to the Ghisi brothers having acted with the forbearance – if not the approval – of Angelo Sanudo, the duke of Naxos, with whom at least one of the brothers had financial dealings.⁴¹ More specifically, Andrea Ghisi had loaned the duke the sum of 400 hyperpers interest-free for a year, a loan the duke was only able to repay in January 1245 on Andros. If we assume that Sanudo had similar dealings with the other brother, the seizure of Andros could well have been connected to his financial difficulties at the time. Indeed, we cannot rule out the possibility that he had granted Geremia and his brother the revenues of Andros, as well as the right to occupy the island temporarily as security on the loan, just as Duke Giovanni Sanudo was to do with the island of Melos in a similar situation nearly a century later.⁴² This interpretation of

39. On the rebellion of the Agiostephanites, see BORSARI, S., *Il dominio Veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1963, pp. 27-36; MALTEZOU, CH. A., Η Κρήτη στη διάρκεια της περιόδου της Βενετοκρατίας (1211-1669), in *Κρήτη. Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός*, Irakleio, 1989, pp. 115-117; FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 80-97. On the treaty signed between Marco I Sanudo and the duke of Crete, see TAFEL-THOMAS, II, pp. 156-166.

40. See THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne*, p. 97; BORSARI, *Il dominio*, pp. 40-45; LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 38; MALTEZOU, Η Κρήτη στη διάρκεια της περιόδου της Βενετοκρατίας, pp. 117-120; FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 100-101; cf. ΠΑΡΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Istoria*, pp. 269-270.

41. Marino Dandolo and his lengthy legal dispute over the island of Andros are discussed in depth by LOENERTZ, R.-J., Marino Dandolo, seigneur d'Andros, et son conflit avec l'évêque Jean, *OCP* 25, 1959, pp. 165-181 (= IDEM, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, Raccolta di Studi e testi 118, pp. 399-419, and IDEM, *Les Ghisi*, p. 39; also see JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 273-278. On this case and the history of Andros in general during the 13th century, see SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 579-602, which is based on unpublished archival material.

42. In 1352 Giovanni Sanudo, the duke of the Archipelago, granted the revenues of Melos to Fantino and Leonardo Dandolo, the sons of Andrea Dandolo, the doge of Venice, along with the right to occupy the island until he had repaid in full the 805 gold ducats lent him by the brothers: "Cum nos Johannes Sanuto, Egyopellagi dux, fecerimus cartam manifestationis et promiserimus vobis nobiles viris dominis Fantino et Leonardo Dandolo, filiis illustris domini domini Andree

events is strengthened by a recently discovered document which provides a great deal of interesting information on feudal relationships on Andros in the thirteenth century.⁴³ The document in question is a grant in fief drawn up in Negroponte on 19 August 1251, by which Duke Angelo Sanudo conveyed lands in the north of the island to Matteo, Sergio, and Maio de Comite Maurone. The style of the document implies that Andros was not in the duke's possession at the time, but that he was counting on its reverting to him in the very near future. The absence of a single reference to either Geremia Ghisi or his brother in the document, even though the two had been occupying the island for about a decade, suggests that Sanudo considered himself the sole legitimate lord of the island and did not feel the least threatened by their presence there, because he knew that it was only temporary and, more importantly, that it did not affect his rights of suzerainty. This explains why his son, Marco II Sanudo, did not consider it expedient to mention the brief period of Ghisi domination in 1282 when he presented to the Venetian authorities the case for the legitimacy of his family's rights to Andros.⁴⁴

Dandulo Venetiarum ducis, dare, reddere et restituere vobis ducatos octingentos et quinque boni auri et iusti ponderis, ut continetur in carta facta eisdem anno, mense, die et indictione per notaium infrascriptum, et insuper, cum nobilis vir ser Nicolaus Michael Scaço quondam ser Marci Michaelis de confinio sancte Marie Jubanico ad preces et instantiam vestram se constituerit seu constiturus sit plezium et proprium appachatorem communi Venetiarum vel officialibus suis de ducatis trecentos, quos dictum Commune nobis mutuavit pro necessitatibus nostris, ut vos domini Fantinus et Leonardus sitis bene securi de rationibus antedictis hanc manifestationis et promissionis cartam nobis duximus taliter faciendam quia manifestum facimus cum nostris heredibus et successoribus vobis suprascriptis dominis Fantino et Leonardo et vestris heredibus, quam obligamus vobis vestrisque heredibus et ex nunc obligata esse intelligantur personam et omnia bona nostra, mobilia et immobilia, presentia et futura et specialiter ac nominatim et expresse insulam nostram Melli cum omnibus iuribus, jurisdictionibus, homagiis et pertinentiis quibusque, tam pro capitali, quam pro pena llet omnibus aliis contentis in suprascripta cartall predictorum ducatorum octingentorum et quinque, et pro danno et interesse que quomodolibet pateremini seu incureretis pro plezaria predicta quam pro nobis fieri fecistis ut dictum est, et ex nunc volumus quod vestra auctoritate propria possitis dicta [[insulam]] bona omnia et specialiter et nominatim dictam insulam Melli cum omnibus suis iuribus et pertinentiis [[im]]intromittere, usufructuare, tenere et possidere fructus, census, redditus, obventiones et proventus colligere, exigere, recipere et habere absque contradictione nostro vel alicuius alterius persone quousque vobis restituerimus et satisfecerimus integraliter omnia et syngula suprascripta et lide aliis nostris bonis in peccunia numeratall, et ad omnem requisitionem vestram seu nuncii vestri tenemur et debemus vos vel vestrum procuratorem ponere et inducere in tenutam et corporalem possessionem dictorum bonorum nostrorum, et specialiter insule Melli predictae, promittentes vos non molestare seu inquietare in possessionem dictorum [[insule]] bonorum, et specialiter insule supradictae sed potius vos conservare, manutenere et defendere in tenuta et possessione predicta omnibus nostris propriis sumptibus et expensis donec vobis ut suprascriptum est restituerimus, persolverimus et satisfecerimus lintegraliterll in peccunia numerata de aliis nostris bonis omnia et syngula suprascripta... : ASV, *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 32 (notary Rafaino de Caresini), fols. 27v-28r (four deeds dated 24 March 1352). It is worth noting that thirty years earlier, in 1325, Marino Ghisi, Bartolomeo II Ghisi's brother, had been forced to sell his share of the island of Kea to Ruggiero Premarin for the sum of 4,000 hyperpyra in settlement of a debt owed: see LEDUC, Venise, Marin Falier, l'Égèe au début du XIV^e siècle, pp. 610-618, 706-708 (doc. 1).

43. The document was analyzed for the first time by SANDINI, L., *Tra Francia, Venezia e il Levante. Da Niolas e Venier dai Santi Apostoli: Due famiglie mercantili nel secolo XIII*, Università di Venezia, Facoltà di lettere, anno acc. 1988-1989, pp. 149-150 (typed doctoral thesis). I wish to thank Prof. Gherardo Ortalli, who kindly allowed me to consult his copy of the thesis. A far more detailed analysis is provided by SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 584-587, 618 (doc. 1).

44. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 281-282, lines 103-106. See also JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 275-276, and SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 584-585.

Whatever the case may have been, following his expulsion from Andros, Marino Dandolo – or, since he had died in the meantime, some other party with a direct involvement in the matter – sought recourse to Venetian justice. In 1243 the Great Council requested Geremia and Andrea to hand the island over to the bailo of Negroponte or some other representative of Venice, to return property confiscated from Marino and his sister, and to present themselves before the doge as a sign of submission. If the two brothers failed to comply within the designated time, the authorities would confiscate their property and ban them from Venice. However, despite the severity of these sanctions, the Ghisi did not back down, presumably because the financial benefits accruing to the possession of Andros outweighed the losses they suffered in Venice itself. And when Andrea Ghisi eventually declared himself willing to negotiate the handover of the island to the plaintiffs nine years later in March 1252, he did not do so because of the financial pressure exerted on him. Rather, since Andros was now in the hands of Angelo Sanudo, his reasons for not doing so had ceased to exist.⁴⁵

Filippo Ghisi, Geremia's brother-in-law, adopted a similar stance in relation to the problem that arose following the seizure of Skopelos from Marchesina, his sister-in-law and wife of Lorenzo Tiepolo, the doge of Venice.⁴⁶ Unfortunately for Filippo, however, times had changed, and the Byzantine fleet under Licario captured the island in the summer of 1277, shipping both him and his wife back to Constantinople as prisoners.⁴⁷ When he finally got back to Chalkis, weak from prolonged captivity, a widower, and financially desperate, he sought to resolve his differences with Marchesina and ensure the return of at least the property that had been confiscated from him.⁴⁸

Until at least the mid-fourteenth century, Marco I Sanudo's heirs passionately defended their independence from the Serenissima, a course of action that often led to the imposition of severe political and economic sanctions against themselves and their subjects. However, the radically different state of affairs ushered in by the anti-Latin policies of Michael VIII Palaiologos in the Archipelago after 1261 revealed the need for closer cooperation between the Venetian lords of the Aegean and Venice itself.⁴⁹

The Byzantine policy, which sought to recapture those parts of the Aegean that had been occupied by Latins, led to a number of islands, including Lemnos and Skopelos, finding themselves under imperial jurisdiction once again for varying lengths of time. Other islands, such as Kea, fell to Western corsairs operating in the name of the Byzantine emperor, who used them as bases for their raids on Latin targets. At the same time, Michael VIII succeeded in winning over both Bartolomeo Ghisi and the brother of Marco II Sanudo, whose actions could not fail to elicit an immediate response from their suzerain, Charles of Anjou, who lost no time in expressing his displeasure in a letter to the duke of Naxos.⁵⁰

45. Historians who have dealt with the case agree that the island remained in Geremia Ghisi's possession until his death, sometime prior to 14 March 1252, when it must, under the laws of Romania, have reverted to the duke of Naxos, since Marino Dandolo had left no heirs: see JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 275-276.

46. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 136-137, 268-269. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 48, 317-322 (relevant extracts from the chronicles).

47. On Licario's activities and the conquest of Skopelos, see PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 259-262, 269.

48. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 49-50, and 288-293, doc. B5 (testament of Filippo Ghisi dated 25 April, 1299).

49. On the policies of Michael VIII Palaiologos in the Aegean, see GEANAKOPOLOS, D. J., *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282: A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 138ff; AHRWEILER, H., *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 328ff; and BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 64-77.

50. BORSARI, *Studi*, p. 75 n. 83.

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, the Venetian authorities demanded that the territories of Marco II Sanudo and Bartolomeo Ghisi be included in the terms of the treaty they drew up with the Byzantine emperor on 19 March 1277 and again when it was renewed in the summer of 1285.⁵¹ For their part, the island lords were forced to accept the Republic's enhanced role in the region and to make a number of compromises – or so, at least, it would appear from two developments. The first is the fact that Marco II Sanudo and Bartolomeo Ghisi sought recourse to the arbitration of the Venetian bailo of Negroponte in 1288-1289 following a period of conflict which, triggered by an act of piracy, had culminated with the lord of Tinos and Mykonos laying siege to Syros.⁵² The second concerns the outcome of the dispute between the duke of the Archipelago and the Venetian Nicolò Querini della casa Matta, which was also resolved through the mediation of the bailo of Negroponte. Although from the very start Sanudo rejected Querini's assertion that he had inherited half of Andros from his mother, Felisa, Marino Dandolo's widow, he eventually decided to compromise out of a desire for "good and peaceful relations with the Venetians, and because he knew that these Querini were powerful men in Venice, and wielded considerable influence."⁵³

During the Veneto-Byzantine war of 1296-1302, the islands of Amorgos, Kea, and Santorini – which had been recaptured by the Byzantines – passed into Venetian control, as a result of the initiative of private individuals who responded to the call of the Venetian authorities on Crete and Negroponte to man ships and participate in operations against the empire.⁵⁴ The inclusion of these islands in the Veneto-Byzantine treaty of 1302 lent legitimacy to the act of conquest and sealed their two-way relationship with the Republic.⁵⁵

It is well known that the incorporation of the territories of the Ghisi brothers and Marco I Sanudo into the feudal structure of the Latin Empire of Constantinople resulted in the introduction of the feudal system on the islands. Although the fragmentary material at our disposal makes it difficult to form a complete picture of the internal life of the islands during the first century of Latin domination, it does provide us with some insights into how the newly arrived lords organized their states.

51. For the text of the treaties, see TAFEL-THOMAS, no. CCCLXVIII (19 March 1277), pp. 133-149 and esp. pp. 138-139; nos. CCCLXXVIII - CCCLXXIX, pp. 339-353, and esp. pp. 344-345. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 75-77. NICOL, D. M., *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 197-201.

52. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 120-121, 248-249. LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 98, 325-326, doc. C12.

53. "e miser Marco Sanudo, finalmente, per star bene con i Veneziani in pace, sappendo che questi Quirini erano grandi huomini in Vinegia e che avevano gran potere, contentò di dar per la mita lire 5mila de grossi in 5anni, e così si fece il concordio e il pagò": PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 118-119, 246-248. See JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 275-280, who clarifies the order of events in this complex affair.

54. On the war between Venice, Genoa, and the Byzantine Empire, see LAIOU, A. E., *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328*, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 101-114. On pirate and corsair activity during the war, see LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, pp. 100-103; PAPADOPOULOU, E., Πειρατές και κουρσάροι στο Αιγαίο τον 13^ο αιώνα, *Diptycha* 6, 1994-1995, pp. 101f. On the conquest of Amorgos and Kea, see ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΙ, Μ., Για ένα κομμάτι γης. Η διαμάχη Σανούδων-Γκίζη για το νησί της Αμοργού (14^{ος} αι.), *Thesaurismata* 29, 1999, pp. 45-89, with the earlier bibliography, and LEDUC, Venise, Marin Falier, l'Ègèe au début du XIV^e siècle. On Santorini, see below.

55. *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, ed. THOMAS, G. M., and PREDELLI, R., vol. I, Venice, 1880, pp. 12-19, nos. 7-8.

Regarding the internal organization of Tinos and Mykonos, there is a complete absence of contemporary sources until their annexation by Venice in 1392. Everything we know about the two centuries of Ghisi rule on the islands (1207-1390) is indirectly drawn from Venetian documents of a later era. Thus we learn that the Ghisi introduced the feudal institutions of the Latin Empire of Constantinople to their islands and that they granted fiefs to Greeks, most of whom were drawn from the lower orders, in exchange for military service. The feudal system was significant to the extent that it brought about changes in the stratification of the local population. Nonetheless, the feudalization of island society would seem to have been somewhat superficial, since the direct nature of the bonds of vassalage and dependence binding landowners to the lords of the two islands – that is, the absence of subinfeudation – did not favor the development of a strict and clearly defined Western-style hierarchy within the class of feudatories.⁵⁶

We are presented with a more complex situation in the territories constituting the duchy of the Archipelago. From very early on, feudal relationships on Andros were regulated in accordance with the common law in force over most of the territories in the Latin Empire of Constantinople, and which has come down to us via its later codification, the “Assizes of Romania.” It seems that a system of inter-dependence and vassalage had become established by 1240, under Marino Dandolo. In accord with the privilege of 1251, Dandolo had relinquished extensive lands in the north of the island – stretching from Vitali in the northeast to the port of Gavrio in the northwest, and incorporating at least one settlement: the village of Gides – as a fief to the Amalfitan nobleman, Matteo de Comitè Maurone.⁵⁷ Part of this fief had previously belonged to the Venetians Gueterio and Marino Nadal. We know nothing more about them or about the circumstances in which they came to lose their lands. When, upon the death of Marino Dandolo without heirs, the island reverted to the direct control of Angelo Sanudo, he recognized Matteo’s prior privileges, extending them to the beneficiary’s two brothers, Sergio and Maio. In exchange for the land, one of the brothers was obliged to provide personal mounted service, and the other two had to bear the cost of his equipment.⁵⁸ Moreover, the three brothers swore an oath of fealty to the duke of Naxos, but did not renounce their allegiance to the Republic of St. Mark, presumably because they wished to retain the chiefly commercial privileges enjoyed by Venetian subjects.⁵⁹ In addition to enjoying the revenue from the fief, which was still in their possession in the mid-1270s, the de Comitè Maurone brothers were also highly active commercially beyond the narrow confines of Andros, trading among other things in silks that may well have been produced on their estates. Their activities

56. JACOBY, *La féodalité*, pp. 237-252.

57. See the analysis provided by SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 584-587, 618 (doc. 1). The village of Gides covered a large area and was divided into three settlements: Upper Gides, the main village of Gides, which is inhabited to this day, and Lower Gides. A wealth of medieval ruins and potsherds have come to light in the area; see PASCHALIS, D. P., *Ιστορία της νήσου Άνδρου*, Athens, 1925-1927, reprinted 1995, pp. 604, 606; POLEMIS, D., *Οι αφεντότοποι της Άνδρου. Συμβολή εις την ερευναν των καταλοίπων φεουδαλικών θεσμών εις τας νήσους κατά τον δέκατον έκτον αιώνα*, Andros, 1995, p. 28 n. 4.

58. For the types of military service owed by suzerains and the various rules involved, see PARMEGGIANI, A., *Libro delle uxanze e statuti delo Imperio de Romania*, Spoleto, 1998, §§ 29, 53, 55, 67, 89, 126f.

59. See ORTALLI, G., *Spazi marittimi e presenze amalfitane nella prospettiva di Venezia, Rassegna del Centro di cultura e storia Amalfitana* 17, 1999, pp. 38-40. Cf. SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 590-591.

extended to Venice and elsewhere.⁶⁰ In fact, they developed such close ties with this northern Cycladic island that they gradually discarded their family name in favor of the appellation *de Andro*.

A hitherto unpublished document drawn up in Venice on 17 November 1343 by the notary of the ducal chancery, Rafaino Careseni, sheds further light on feudal relations on Andros during this early period.⁶¹ The document, a grant of fief, is of particular interest because it fills many of the gaps in our knowledge of the types of fief on the island, the origin of the landlords, and the rights and obligations they owed to the grantor of the land.⁶²

It was by this document that Giannouli Sanudo, the duke of the Archipelago, granted in fief the village of Mileda on Andros to the Venetian patrician Simonetto Dandolo and his heirs.⁶³ In fact, this was a renewal of an older grant dating from the rule of Duke Marco Sanudo. Although the deed does not explicitly state whether it concerns Marco I Sanudo, the founder of the duchy, or his grandson and namesake, who was duke between 1262 and 1303, we can safely assume that it concerns the latter, given that Andros was enfeoffed to Marino Dandolo throughout the lifetime of the former.

The fief included the village of Mileda, the villains who inhabited it, the taxes (*jura*) burdening it, the common land under the jurisdiction of the village, and everything else within its boundaries. The location of the medieval village cannot be identified on the

60. SAINT-GUILLAIN, *Deux îles au temps de l'Empire latin*, pp. 591-602.

61. See Appendix.

62. It is, however, of interest for a further reason: it details the particular reasons and conditions under which the fief was granted. Although Simonetto Dandolo had inherited the fief from his father, Fantino, the death of duke Giannouli Sanudo's predecessor – his brother Nicolò – was considered to necessitate its renewal. Article 82 of the Assizes of Romania does indeed state that a vassal who is under no obligation to offer personal service to his lord – which, as we shall see below, was the case here – was permitted to travel beyond the borders of the Principality of Achaia whenever and for as long as he deemed necessary, on condition that he provide the service required. However, within two years and two days of his lord's death, the vassal was obliged to return to give an oath of fealty to his lord's heir or successor. It seems, however, that reasons of the utmost seriousness prevented Simonetto from leaving Venice and traveling to the duchy of the Archipelago within the prescribed period. He was therefore in grave danger of forfeiting his fief, since the Assizes of Romania required him to present himself before Giannouli Sanudo in person and prohibited him from sending a representative. Simonetto contacted Giovanni Sanudo, the duke's deputy in Venice, on 17 January 1342, in order to inform him of the difficulties he was facing. Sanudo made a written commitment to the effect that there would be no legal prejudice against Simonetto as a result of his exceeding the prescribed period, and that the duke would renew his grant. Giovanni Sanudo then departed for Negroponte, where he outlined the situation to Giannouli Sanudo. On 8 October 1343 the duke empowered Giovanni Sanudo to return to Venice in order to proceed with the investiture in his place. For this purpose, Giovanni was provided with an official document bearing the ducal seal, and the fief was indeed granted about a month later. The solution to the problem was in full accord with the provision of the Assizes of Romania and article 65 in particular, which states that the lord of a fief can in exceptional circumstances appoint a deputy to receive the oath of fealty. Of course, the fact that Simonetto's brother was Andrea Dandolo, the new doge of Venice, undoubtedly played a key role in these events. See *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, XXXII, s.v. Dandolo, Andrea. The vassal was usually obliged to take possession of the lands within a year and a day of the investiture. Failure to do so would result in forfeiture. However, it would appear that special provision was made for the fact that Simonetto was a permanent resident of Venice, which made it difficult for him to travel to the duchy of the Aegean: he was given the right to proceed to take possession of the fief at his leisure. See PARMEGGIANI, *Libro*, §§ 55, 65, 82.

63. It is worth noting that Bertuccio Zorzi, a hitherto unknown son of Nicolò I Zorzi, the marquis of Bodonitsa, appears among those witnessing the deed.

basis of the information provided in the deed. However, just a short distance west of the village of Pitrofos, in the southwestern foothills of Mount Petalo in central Andros, stands the hamlet of Melida, whose name might well be a corruption of medieval Mileda. Moreover, the eleventh-century church of the Taxiarchis on the outskirts of Melida is incontrovertible proof that the area was inhabited during the Byzantine period.⁶⁴

In contrast to the grant of 1251, the vassal was allowed to provide a squire (“unum servientem ad equum”) from his estates instead of performing personal military service. This not only confirms that the institution of military service was in force, but also demonstrates the existence of different grades of service of the sort laid down in the Assizes of Romania.⁶⁵ The provision in question permitted a vassal lord to absent himself from his lands at will and for as long as he saw fit, as well as ensuring that the grantor would receive the prescribed military assistance. It should be noted that, as in the case of the de Comite Maurone brothers, Simonetto Dandolo preserved his allegiance to the Serenissima when making homage to the duke of the Archipelago, remaining before and above all else a Venetian.

We can conclude from the available information that on thirteenth-century Andros the class of feudal lords was made up of Venetian colonists, most of whom were of noble birth, who began to settle on the island after 1207 and stayed for varying lengths of time. The historian Marino Sanudo is clearly referring to this social group when he writes about Duke Marco II’s “men,” with whom he had conversed on Andros shortly before the turn of the fourteenth century.⁶⁶

It is generally accepted that Melos, Paros, and the neighboring island of Antiparos passed under the immediate control of Duke Marco I Sanudo following the naval expedition of 1207. We know absolutely nothing about the fate of the island of Paros and its inhabitants during the thirteenth century, apart from a very brief reference to Marino Sanudo, the lord of Paros and half of Naxos, in the *Istoria de Romania*, unconfirmed by any other source.⁶⁷

We are comparatively far better informed about the island of Melos. A letter sent by Pope Innocent IV to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople in March 1253, concerning the promotion of the cantor of the Church of Crete to the bishopric of Melos, informs us that an unknown number of Latins were established on the island at the time.⁶⁸ When Pope Innocent writes that he had learned about the difficulties and dangers the prolonged absence of a Catholic bishop posed to the faithful from the “nobiles viri domini et alii homines insule Milonis,” he would seem to be hinting that the colonists did not form a single body with common characteristics: the bishop’s throne had remained vacant for five years, so the children of the Latins had to be baptized by, and receive communion from, Orthodox priests, which created an obvious risk of their converting.

But who were these “nobiles viri domini et alii homines insule Milonis,” and what sort of relations existed between them? The available data allows us to draw certain conclusions, at least about the last three decades of the thirteenth century (1270-1300). During the period in question, Melos was ruled by Francesco Sanudo, the son of the duke of

64. MALAMUT, *Les îles de l'Empire byzantin*, I, p. 211.

65. See above, note 58.

66. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 120-121.

67. *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

68. *Acta Innocentii papae IV (1243-1254)*, ed. HALUŠČYNSKYI, T., vol. IV.1 of Pontificia Commissio ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis: Fontes, ser. 3, Rome, 1962, no. 87 (22 March 1253).

Naxos, and his wife, Cassandra, both of whom are known to us from the *Istoria*.⁶⁹ Taking into account the initiatives she took to prevent Bartolomeo Ghisi from conquering Syros, it would seem that Cassandra had already succeeded her husband by 1288/89. Moreover, she should be identified with the “lady of Melos” (“domina insule Melli”) mentioned in a contract drawn up in Candia in 1300 by the notary Pietro Pizzolo regarding the purchase and sale of a certain quantity of honey and oil from Melos.⁷⁰

According to an act drafted by the Venetian notary Leonardo Marcello in September 1280 in Candia, Giovanni Scutario, Vasili Vassalo, and Blasio Filacanevo – all three inhabitants of Melos – lent the sum of 306 hyperpers “in Creta currentia” to Vitale, the bishop of Melos, for a month to enable him to cover certain personal expenses and the running costs of his church.⁷¹ Apart from Vasili, we also know that a second member of the Vassalo family was resident on Melos between 1283 and 1300: Andrea Vassalo, the son of Tomà, who possessed a fief on the island. On 14 August 1283 the Great Council ordered the duke of Crete to see to it that the male and female villains who had fled Melos for Crete be returned to Andrea, on condition that he undertake to return the villains of the state who had sought refuge “ad suas partes.”⁷² It is worth noting that Andrea Vassalo was linked to both Blasio Filacanevo and Cassandra Sanudo through a common acquaintance, Giuliano Vassalo, a permanent resident of Candia, who was almost certainly related to the former.

According to Karl Hopf, the island of Santorini was conquered in 1207 by Giacomo I Barozzi, who then recognized the suzerainty of Marco I Sanudo. His assertion, however, is not borne out by the contemporary sources. Moreover, as Silvano Borsari has demonstrated, the first member of the Barozzi family to bear the title “Dominator insularum Sancte Erini et Thirasiæ” was in fact the grandson of Giacomo I Barozzi, the supposed conqueror of Santorini.⁷³

A ruling made by the court of the duke of Crete concerning the revindication of a villain enables us to reconstruct the events surrounding the Latin settlement of Santorini to a great extent.⁷⁴ In the fall of 1336, Marino Barozzi sought recourse to the Venetian authorities on Crete, claiming that Matteo, the son of Pincivalis Desde of Santorini, was his villain. Matteo argued in his defense that his father was a free man, and a natural son of Guglielmo Desde, a Venetian citizen. More specifically, he stated that his grandfather “tempore quo acquisite fuerunt insule Agipelagi, interfuit dicte acquisitioni et habuit dominium tercii et in dicto dominio habuit usque ad tempus quo dicta insula accepta fuit de manibus Latinorum per gentem domini Imperatoris Constantinopoli.” This made Matteo a descendant of the first feudal lords to settle on Santorini. Although he risked

69. PAPADOPOULOU, *Istoria*, pp. 120-121.

70. PIETRO PIZZOLO, *Notaio in Candia (1304-1305)*, ed. CARBONE, S., vol. I, Venice, 1985, p. 255, no. 556 (2 June 1300) and p. 257, no. 560 (3 June 1300).

71. LEONARDO MARCELLO, *Notaio in Candia (1278-1281)*, ed. CHIUDANO, M., and LOMBARDO, A., Venice, 1960, no. 223 (6 September 1280). On Blasio Filacanevo or Filachanavo, see also no. 133 (20 September 1279), and PIETRO PIZZOLO, *Notaio in Candia*, p. 140, no. 295 (23 March 1300).

72. CESSI, R., *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*, III, Bologna, 1931-1950, pp. 42, 125 (14 August 1283). On Andrea Vassalo, see also PIETRO PIZZOLO, *Notaio in Candia*, p. 258, no. 562.

73. See BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 36-37, and *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VI, Rome, 1964, s.v., Barozzi, Andrea and Iacopo, with the earlier bibliography.

74. ASV, *Archivio Duca di Candia*, b. 29, fasc. 4, 27 September 1336. The ruling is published in part by SANTSCHI, E., *Quelques aspects du statut des non-libres en Crète au XIV^e s.*, *Thesaurismata* 9, 1972, p. 112.

forfeiting his rights on account of an earlier perjury, Matteo was eventually acquitted, a fact that lends considerable weight to his testimony. Desde's deposition would indicate that Santorini was conquered thanks to a collective, rather than individual, effort. In fact, it would seem to have been a strictly family affair, given that a notarial deed states that a certain Guido Desde – clearly a relative of Guglielmo – possessed half of Santorini in 1271.⁷⁵

Although Matteo Desde does not clarify whether his forebear had recognized the suzerainty of the duke of Naxos, the fact that the Catholic bishopric of Santorini was suppressed and adjoined to the Latin archdiocese of Naxos constitutes indirect proof that the two islands were closely linked during the thirteenth century.⁷⁶

Following the expulsion of the Desde family by the emperor's "men" around 1275, Santorini remained under Byzantine jurisdiction for a quarter century or more. In August 1301, during the course of the Veneto-Byzantine war, the Anconitan pirate Marciliano Ferante agreed to reconquer the island on Guglielmo Sanudo's behalf, on condition that he would hand it over only after a five-day period of pillage.⁷⁷ The operation would seem to have failed, since we find the island in the possession of Giacomo Barozzi shortly afterwards. An experienced official who had served in a number of key positions in the Venetian Aegean, Barozzi did not miss the opportunity presented by the war to acquire rights over one of the most singular islands in the Aegean.⁷⁸ His actions, and the fact that he had recognized Venetian suzerainty, enraged Duke Guglielmo Sanudo, who had Barozzi arrested, only releasing him after the intervention of the Great Council.⁷⁹ The descendants of Giacomo Barozzi and the Sanudo family continued to contest the possession of the island with unflagging vigor for decades to come. An attempt was made to settle the dispute by legal process between 1325 and 1331, in which, however, Venice refused to take sides. Nicolò Sanudo finally succeeded in wresting the island from Marino Barozzi once and for all around 1335, after a period of open warfare.⁸⁰

Concerning Naxos, the capital of the duchy, and its organization under the first three dukes, our information is derived solely from later sources, most of which are of dubious credibility. According to one such account, the founder of the duchy divided the island into fifty-six fiefs, which he then distributed among his officers and the nobles who arrived to settle on the island. Although this is simply a projection onto the past of the situation on Naxos during the seventeenth century, when most of the estates on the island had passed into Greek hands, there can be no doubt that Sanudo did seize land after the conquest, subsequently dividing it among the colonists as fiefs. We have seen that a similar procedure was followed on the other islands under his rule. However, would the landowners not have rebelled on being deprived of their estates? Our almost total

75. *Documenti della colonia veneziana di Creta. I. Imbreviature di Pietro Scardon (1271)*, ed. LOMBARDO, A., Turin, 1942, p. 60, no. 157 (15 March 1271).

76. BORSARI, *Studi*, pp. 36-37.

77. BENVENUTO DE BRIXANO, *Notaio in Candia (1301-1302)*, ed. MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA, R., Venice, 1950, *Fonti per la Storia di Venezia*, p. 102, no. 297 (18 August 1301); LOENERTZ, *Les Ghisi*, p. 104.

78. Before being elected to the office of duke of Crete (1301-1303), Barozzi had served as governor of Chania (prior to January 1296) and bailo of Negroponte from 1295 to 1297 or possibly 1299.

79. *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VI, s.v. Barozzi, Iacopo.

80. *Ibid.*, s.v. Barozzi, Andrea; ZACHARIADOU, E., *Trade and Crusade. Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300-1415)*, Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies 11, Venice, 1983, p. 94.

ignorance of the composition of the island population during the late Byzantine period, and of the relative proportions of small, medium, and large estates, makes this an extremely hard question to answer. As, indeed, does our ignorance of the relative proportions of public, church, and private land. Without this information, it is very difficult to calculate who would have suffered most – and who least – as a result of the new situation. Were there inhabitants here, too, who chose to go into exile rather than collaborate with the foreign conquerors, as happened in other parts of the Greek territories?⁸¹

The students of the history and institutions of the duchy of the Archipelago are in agreement that the conciliatory policy Marco I Sanudo adopted toward the local population, coupled with the numerical inferiority of the conquerors, led to numerous Greeks being inducted into the ranks of the feudal lords from very early on. The conciliatory nature of his policy may be inferred from his marriage to the sister of the emperor of Nicaea, Theodore Laskaris, the close ties he established with part of the Cretan aristocracy during the rebellion of the Agiostefanites, and from the religious tolerance he demonstrated toward the Greeks.⁸²

One could counter the above by arguing, first of all, that the duke's marriage to the Greek princess is not verified by a single Byzantine source, and, second, that we do not know if Cretan archons followed him to Naxos, and, if so, how many, although it is certain that Constantine Skordiles remained behind on Crete. Finally, his expropriation of the property of the Naxian monastery of San Salvatore and transferring it to the monastery of Santa Trinità and San Michele Arcangelo di Brondolo in Venice in 1227, shortly before his death, directly contradicts the assertion made by the Jesuit Robert Sauger concerning the religious policy of the founder of the duchy. Sauger wrote that "he [Marco I Sanudo] ratified the privileges of the Greek archbishop, priests, and monks in their entirety, relieving the monasteries of the Order of St. Basil from every form of taxation."⁸³

This raises the question of whether the incorporation of the indigenous population into the feudal hierarchy – about which there can be no doubt – was, in fact, a much slower and more complex process than previously thought. Perhaps, ultimately, the tranquil decades following the conquest constituted a period of regrouping and waiting. It was not, perhaps, by chance that the first problems between conquerors and conquered arose during the rule of Marco II Sanudo, a particularly crucial period for the survival of the duchy that coincides with the revival of the Byzantine Empire in Constantinople and its attempts to regain the territories lost to the Latins. The episode was sparked off by the

81 MALTEZOU, CH. A., *Les grecs de la Mer Égée pendant la période de la latinocratie*, in *ERYTHEIA, Ediciones y Textos 2, Actas de las VIII jornadas sobre Bisancio*, Vitoria - Gasteiz, 1993, pp. 140-145.

82. FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 65-68, 109-110. JACOBY, *La féodalité*, p. 284. JACOBY, D., *Les états Latins en Romanie: Phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204-1350 environ)*, *XV^e Congrès International d'Études byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, Athens, 1976 (= IDEM, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XII^e au XV^e siècle*, London, 1979, no. 1, pp. 3-51 and esp. p. 26). MALTEZOU, *Les grecs de la Mer Égée*, pp. 143-145.

83. LANFRANCHI STRINA, *SS. Trinità e S. Michele Arcangelo di Brondolo*, p. 439, no. 679 "... il conferma l'Archevêque Grec, les Prêtres et les Religieux dans tous leurs privileges; il exempta tous les Monasteres de l'Ordre de Saint Basile de tailles et de toutes sortes d'impositions": FOTHERINGHAM, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 115-116; see also SAUGER, R., *Ιστορία των αρχαίων δουκών και λοιπών ηγεμόνων του Αιγαίου Πελάγους μετά περιγραφής των κυριώτερων νήσων και των αξιολογώτερων μνημείων αυτών*, trans. into Greek KARALIS, A. M., Syros, 1879 (reprinted in *Aperathitika* 1, 1992), p. 22.

duke's attempt to outlaw a local custom relating to the worship of Agios Pachomios,⁸⁴ which led to an uprising in Drymalia, the most fertile area on the island. Although the rebellion, which was led by priests and monks, does not seem to have spread further afield, Sauger informs us that the duke, for fear that the disorder would become more generalized, began the construction of the Apano Kastro (Upper Castle).

A sensitive indicator of change and silent witness to developments on the island, Naxian art clearly records the islanders' ideological orientation, as well as the changes brought about by the Latin conquest in the life of the local community. Whereas few works were produced during the first half of the thirteenth century, the three decades that followed witnessed a boom in the construction and redecoration of churches.⁸⁵ This development must surely be linked to a reawakening of Orthodox consciousness after the recapture of the Byzantine capital and the efforts made toward the union of the churches at Lyons in 1274. The churches built during this period are smaller and humbler than in earlier eras, and the founders no longer appear to be archons, but villagers, priests, and painters with their families. On the other hand, the wall paintings that decorate them, though conservative, are of higher quality and attest to the island's unbroken links with the "free" artistic centers of the Byzantine Empire. Finally, the limited Western influences – less marked than in other areas under Venetian rule – coupled with the intense conservatism of the artists, reveal both the gulf separating the conquerors from the conquered and the tenacity with which the latter held on to their tradition.

84. SAUGER, *Ιστορία των αρχαίων δουκών και λοιπών ηγεμόνων του Αιγαίου Πελάγους*, p. 40. On Naxos, it was believed until relatively recently that Agios Pachomios – whose name has become associated with the Greek adjective *pachys* meaning "fat" – could fatten up sickly and stunted children if they were passed through openings in the walls of churches dedicated to the saint. On this custom (known as *trypoperasma*), see IMELLOS, S. D., Περὶ του εν τη νήσω Νάξω εθίμου του "Τρυποπεράσματος," *Epeteris tes Etaireias Kykladikon Meleton* 1, 1961, pp. 515-528.

85. CHATZIDAKIS, M., Η μνημειακή ζωγραφική στην Ελλάδα. Ποσοτικές προσεγγίσεις, *Praktika tes Akademias Athenon* 56, 1981, pp. 375-390. IDEM., ed., *Βυζαντινή τέχνη στην Ελλάδα, Νάξος*, Athens, 1989, pp. 10-16.

APPENDIX

The duke of the Archipelago, Giannouli Sanudo, grants the village of Mileda on Andros in fief to the Venetian noble, Simonetto Dandolo.

ASV, *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 32 (not. Rafayno de Caresini), fols. 61v-62r.

The original deed, which the party concerned would appear to have kept, has been lost. Presented below is the draft recorded in the register by the notary.

1343, 17 November

Carta privilegii investiture facte domino Symoneto Dandulo de casali vocato Mileda de insula Andre per dominum Janulium Sanuto Agyopellagi Ducem.
facta est carta¹

In nomine domini nostri Yhesu Christi amen. Anno nativitate eiusdem millesimo trecentesimo quadregesimo tercio, indictione undecima, die decimo septimo novembris, Venetiis, in ecclesia sancti Johannis Confessoris de Rivoalto, presentibus nobilibus et sapientibus viris dominis Johanne Sanuto, quondam domini Marini, sancti Apolinari, Phylippo Contareno, quondam domini Johannis, sancti Sylvestri, Andrea Contareno, quondam domini Nicolai, sancti Paterniani, Bertucio Georgio, filio domini Nicolai Georgio Marchionensis Bondenza, Manfredino de Pasqualibus, juris perito, et aliis testibus ibi vocatis specialiter et rogatis. Cum nobilis et sapiens vir dominus Symonetus Dandulo, filius quondam egregii viri domini Fantini Dandulo, de confinio sancti Sylvestri, ac progenitores sui habuerint et recognoverint unum casale, vocatum Mileda, situm in insula Andre, in pheudum a magnifico quondam domino Nicola Sanudo, Ayopellagi duce, et a progenitoribus suis, et idem dominus Symonetus, iuxta consuetudinem Imperii Romane, teneretur se personaliter presentare coram illustre domino Janulio Sanuto, Ayopellagi duce, quondam fratre et herede prefati domini Nicole defuncti, infra duos annos et duos dies ad petendum investituram pheudi et casali predicti, et ei promittendum ea qua per forma suorum privilegiorum dicto domino Janulio facere debet, et cum ipse dominus Symonetus personaliter illuc se transferere non possit pluribus impedimentis iustis et verisimilibus impeditus. Et nobilis vir dominus Johannes Sanuto, filius quondam domini Phylippi Sanuto, virtute commissionis quam habebat a prefato domino Janulio Sanuto, facte manu Nicole, notai Veneciarum ac cancellarii Nigropontis, in millesimo trecentesimo quadregesimo primo, mensis octubris, die quinto, intrante indictione decima, Nigroponte promississet soleniter eidem domino Symoneto quod dictus dominus Janulius nunquam dicet vel alegabit contra eum aliquem discursum temporis sed potius investituram predictam confereret, lapsu temporis non obstante; ut de dicta promissione constat carta facta manu Johannis Trivisani, presbiteri sancti Samuelis et notai, in millesimo quadregesimo primo, mensis januarii, die decimoseptimo, intrante indictione decima, Rivoalti, a me infrascripto notaio visa et lecta. Idcirco suprascriptus dominus Johannes Sanuto habens speciale mandatum a prefato domino Janulio Sanuto ad infrascripta exercenda, ut patet, ibi, in presentia testium predictorum et mei notai infrascripti, constitit et constat per patentes litteras ipsius domini Januli, sui veri sigilli in cera viridi impressione munitas, quarum tenor talis est: Nos Janulius, Agyopellagi dux, de amicabili nobilitate et consanguinitate nobilis viri domini Johannis Sanuti, habitatoris Nigropontis, dilecti consanguinie nostri, merito confidentes, tenore presentium nostrarum patentium litterarum,

1. in margine

committimus eidem domino Johanni et plenam bayliam et auctoritatem nostram concedimus investiendi nobilem virum dominum Symonetum Dandulo, honorabilem civem Veneciarum, hominem nostrum legium, de feudo et jure feudi quod a nobis tenet in insula nostra Andre, ac omnibus et singulis ad iddem feudum spectantibus quoquo modo, recepto ab eodem domino Symoneto pro nobis fidelitatis debite iuramento sed bonum usum et laudabilem consuetudinem Imperii Romanie. Concedentes et committentes eidem domino Johanni in predictis omnibus et dependentibus ex eis plenarie iures nostras, ac decerentes et laudantes ex nunc quod per eum in predictis actum fuerit prout per nos ipsos perpetua firmitate valere. Et ad clariorem certitudinem omnium promissorum, nos Janulius, Agyopellagi dux prefatus, has nostras patentes litteras mandavimus inferius nostri sigilli impressione muniri. Datum Nigroponte, anno nativitatis Domini millesimo trecentesimo qudragesimo tercio, indictione duodecima, die octavo, mensis octubris. In ipso autem sigillo sculpta et figurata erat arma propria et consueta ipsius domini Januli in uno clipeo, et in rotunditate illius sculptum et figuratum erat sic: +Sigillum Ianulli: Sanuto: Agiopelagi: Ducis. Igitur iamdictus dominus Johannes Sanuto, commissionem, mandatum et intentionem prefati domini / (fol. 62r) Januli sequutus, nomine et vice ipsius domini Januli ac omni modo, jure et forma quibus melius potuit, in presentia testium predictorum et mei notai infrascripti, ratificans, approbans et confirmans promissionem alias factam per eum nomine predicto, quod aliquid preiudicium non generaretur ipsi domino Symoneto pro aliquo lapsu temporis, nomine et vice ipsius domini Januli, et per ipsum dominum Janulium et suos heredes, nomine recti et legalis feudi, secundum usum et bonam consuetudinem Imperii Romanie, investivit, confirmavit, donavit et concessit suprascripto domino Symoneto Dandulo, nato olim domini Fantini, et eius heredibus, in perpetuum, terram et feudum quam et quod olim bone memorie domini Marcus Sanuto, ducatus Nichixie et Andre dominator, et ceteri progenitores prefati domini Januli, per se et eorum heredes, predicto domino Fantino et aliis progenitoribus dicti domini Symoneti; et subsequenter dominus Guillelmus Sanuto, predicto Fantino et postmodum eidem domino Symoneto, et similiter dominus Nicola Sanuto ipsi domino Symoneto et eius heredibus in perpetuum donaverunt, concesserunt et dederunt in feudo hereditagio. Videlicet casale quod vocatur Mileda, situm in insula Andre, cum villanis, rationibus, juribus, pertinentiis, honore et jurisdictione eiusdem casali pertinentibus, taliter quod dictus dominus Symonetus et eius heredes decetero dictum casale, vocatum Mileda, cum villanis et predictis suis rationibus et pertinentiis, et cum omni honore et jurisdictione dicto casali pertinentibus, habeat, teneat et possideat et ex inde trahat omnem suam utilitatem et profectum, sine dicti domini Januli suorumque heredum contradictione, dans dictus dominus Johannes, nomine antedicto, eidem domino Symoneto liberam potestatem, sua auctoritate, quando volet intrandi tenutam, sasinam et possessionem dicti casalis cum villanis et omnibus predictis suis juribus, et ipsum casale perpetuo habendi, tenendi et possidendi in eo et suis heredibus a dicto domino Janulio et suis heredibus ut predictum est. Et pro dicto feudo seu casali, dictus dominus Symonetus ibi soleniter et legitime prestitit eidem domino Johanni Sanuto, recipienti nomine quo signa debite fidelitatis juramentum, et fecit homagium legium contra omnes personas de mundo, salva et anteposita fidelitate domini ducis et communis Veneciarum. Et pro servicio dicti feudi seu casalis dictus dominus Symonetus, per se et suos heredes, dicto domino Janulo et suis heredibus dare debet unum servientem ad equum, servitutum dictum feudum, secundum bonum usum Imperii Romanie. Promisit quoque dictus dominus Johannes, nomine domini Januli et per heredes dicti domini Januli, dicto domino Symoneto et eius heredibus dictum feudum sive casale perpetuo ab omni persona defendere et guarentare suo posse. Et ad maiorem firmitatem et in testimonium huius rei hanc presentem cartam privilegii dictus dominus Johannes, dicto nomine, ex suo sigillo pendenti iussit et fecit communiri.