

Joseph Naci, his *locotenente* Francesco Coronello, and the State of the Duchy of the Archipelago (Naxos), 1566–1579

BENJAMIN HENDRICKX & THEKLA SANSARIDOU-HENDRICKX
University of Johannesburg

This article examines the duchy of the Archipelago under Joseph Naci and Francesco Coronello, leading to the abolition of the duchy, which was created in 1204 after the occupation of Constantinople by the crusaders. The duchy, which survived the final fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks in 1453, came itself to an end with the death of Joseph Naci in 1579 and its transformation into an Ottoman *sancak*. Nevertheless, some Byzantine and mainly medieval 'Frankish' institutions and titles did survive. This article studies the legal, institutional and practical implications of this process, thereby paying due attention to elements of continuity of feudal 'Frankish' institutions and traditions as well as to its gradual replacement with the Ottoman system. However, the new world order of the sixteenth century, which drastically changed the existing values and worldviews, had an inevitable influence on the Mediterranean lands, even on backwaters such as the Archipelago. This article shows how even Naxos could not escape these changes.

The Duchy of the Archipelago (or Naxos), in the Aegean Sea, was a by-product of the Fourth Crusade and the creation of the 'Latin' Empire of Constantinople in 1204.¹ It is generally accepted that its

¹ B. Hendrickx, 'Les duchés de l'Empire latin de Constantinople après 1204: origine, structures et statuts', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 93 (2015): 303–28. The title of Duke (*Dux*, *Doukas*) was already used by the Byzantine governors, but with the meaning of an appointed governor, neither hereditary nor for life.



Figure 1: The Duchy of Naxos

transformation from a Latin-Italian principality into an Ottoman-Hebrew duchy and finally a *sancak* dates from ca. 1540 to ca. 1580.² To understand the transition of the duchy's status and institutions as well as its place in the sixteenth-century eastern Mediterranean, one firstly should place it in the political, military, financial and cultural context

² B.J. Slot, *Archipelagus Turbatus: Les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation ottomane c.1500–1718*, 2 vols (Istanbul, 1982), I, 88–104; N. Moschonos and Lily Stylianouides (eds), *Δουκάτο του Αιγαίου. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης* (Athens, 2009); B. Hendrickx and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx, 'The post-ducal "Dukes of Naxos" of the "per dignitā First Duchy of Christendom": A Re-examination and Assessment', *Journal of Early Christian History* 3 (2013): 94–107. See also B. Hendrickx, 'Joseph Nazi', in A. Savvides, B. Hendrickx, Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx and S. Lambakis (eds.), *Encyclopedic Prosopographic Lexicon of Byzantine History and Culture*, 3 vols to date (Turnhout, 2007–2013), III, 404–05.

of early modern Europe and the apogee of the Ottoman Empire under Suleyman the Magnificent. The Muslim Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (reigned 1520–1566) and his immediate successors were responsible for the Golden Period of the Ottoman Empire, but the latter also for the beginning of its decadence.³ Turkey and the Habsburgs became for at least one century by far the main players in the eastern Mediterranean, and bankers such as the Fuggers⁴ and the Mendez/Benveniste/Naci family⁵ were now more important for the rulers than their feudal vassals. Indeed, while the Fuggers were the principal bankers of the Habsburg dynasty and the German princes, the Jewish Mendez (Mendes) family had built up a financial network that stretched from Spain (and its colonies) to Antwerp and then to Ottoman Turkey. Both families could hold princes and political rulers at ransom and could exert crucial influence on decisions and events.

Whilst the almost legendary figure of Joseph Naci, Jewish Duke of the Archipelago (Naxos) has received due attention by scholars, some questions regarding the appointment of a Jew as Duke of this ‘*per dignità* First Duchy of Christendom’ remain unanswered or require more precision: thus, why did the Ottoman sultan, Selim II, appoint a Jewish refugee to this dignity? Why was Joseph so keen to ask for and then accept the nomination and what were his intentions? What were the effects on the institutions of the duchy and its population? What

³ Selim I (reigned 1512–1520), Suleyman the Magnificent (reigned 1520–1566), Selim II (reigned 1566–1574), Murad III (reigned 1574–1595), Mehmed III (reigned 1595–1603). See André Clot, *Soliman le Magnifique* (Paris, 1983), esp. pp. 13–41; B. Rogerson, *The Last Crusaders: East, West and the Battle for the Centre of the World* (London, 2009), pp. 260–72, 289–338. For an extensive biography and a solid bibliography of Suleyman, see A. Savvides, *Δοκίμια Οθωμανικής Ιστορίας* (Athens, 2002), pp. 79–92 and G. Veinstein, ‘Süleymân’, in H. A. R. Gibb et al. (eds), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edn, 11 vols (Leiden, 1960–1999), IX, 832–42.

⁴ M. Kluger, *The Fugger Dynasty in Augsburg: Merchants, Mining Entrepreneurs, Bankers and Benefactors* (Augsburg, 2014); E. Crankshaw, *The Habsburgs* (London, 1971), pp. 35, 38, 53–57, 61.

⁵ Herman Prins Salomon and Aron Leoni, ‘Mendes, Benveniste, de Luna, Micas, Nasci: the State of the Art (1532–1558)’, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 88 (1998): 135–211; B. Cooperman, ‘Nasi Family’, in Jonathan Dewald (ed.), *Europe, 1450 to 1789: Encyclopedia of the Early Modern World*, 6 vols (New York, 2004), IV, 242–43; Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II* (1949), trans. Klairi Mitsotaki as *Η Μεσόγειος και ο μεσογειακός κόσμος την εποχή του Φιλίππου Β΄ της Ισπανίας*, 2 vols (Athens, 1991), II, 538–39.

was there in the political, cultural and geo-economic context of the period, enabling this appointment? How did Joseph rule his duchy and how did it fit into the Ottoman worldview and policy as well as in the new sixteenth-century world order? When and why did the duchy cease to be considered as an independent or autonomous state and became *de facto* and *de jure* incorporated into the Ottoman Empire?⁶ This article will attempt to shed some light on these questions.

As early as 1699 a Jesuit missionary in the Archipelago, Father Saulger, published a kind of chronicle of the islands of the Archipelago, which is not always reliable, but which traces with relative accuracy the lines of the history of the duchy and presents some interesting details.⁷ More recent historians of the *Frankokratia* or *Venetokratia* after 1204 have at least mentioned or taken notice of the Duchy of the Archipelago, i.e. of the more 'glorious' periods of the duchy before Joseph Naci took over. Thus Buchon, Miller and Longnon, among others, have paid scant attention to the later history of the Duchy of the Archipelago.⁸ Carmoly, Levy, Galante and Reznik as well as Roth have

⁶ For the framework and the context in which our research can be placed, see Braudel, *Μεσόγειος*, vol. 2; K. G. Tsinakakis, 'Ο ελληνικός χώρος στη διάρκεια της βενετοκρατίας', in Chryssa Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα. Προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, 2 vols (Athens and Venice, 2010), I, 21–72; Ch. Gasparis, 'Εμπόριο και φορολογία προϊόντων', in Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα*, I, 253–276; B. Arbel, *Trading Nations: Jews and Venetians in the Early Modern Eastern Mediterranean* (Leiden, 1995). For the Venetian-Ottoman wars, see Photeine Perra, *Ο Λέων εναντίον της Ημισελίνου* (Athens, 2009), pp. 31–66, and for the Ottoman military superiority, R. Crowley, 'The Guns of Constantinople', *Military History* 24.6 (September 2007): 42–49; Clot, *Soliman*, 68–73 and 406–07 and B. Hendrickx, 'Το Οθωμανικό πυροβολικό ως τον 18ο αιώνα', *Stratiotiki Istoria* 39 (Nov 1999): 65–67.

⁷ Robert Saulger, SJ, *Histoire nouvelle des Ducs et autres Souverains de l'Archipel ; avec les descriptions des principales îles, et des choses remarquables qui s'y voient encore aujourd'hui...* (Paris, 1698). There is a Greek translation of the text, published in 1878 by A. M. Karalis, and more recently republished in the periodical *Απεραθίτικα* 1 (1992): 19–136.

⁸ J. A. C. Buchon, *Recherches historiques sur la Principauté de Morée et ses hautes baronies*, 2 vols (Paris, 1845), I, 463–75 (Diplômes); idem, *Recherches et matériaux pour servir à une histoire de la domination française aux XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles dans les provinces démembrées de l'empire grec à la suite de la quatrième croisade*, 2 vols (Paris, 1811), I, 359–73 (with the letter of Giovanni Crispo of 1537); J. Longnon, *L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949), pp. 339, 356; W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant: A History of Frankish Greece, 1204–1566* (1908), trans. Angelos Fouriotis as *Η Φραγκοκρατία στην Ελλάδα. 1204–1566* (Athens, 1960), pp. 685–705.

tended to focus chiefly on Joseph Naci's Jewish identity.⁹ Nevertheless, their works also contain useful documents. Charrière's collection of documents on the French in the Levant remains important for the context of the Ottoman Empire in Naci's time and comprises some very valuable diplomatic material on the Naci family.¹⁰ Zerlentos has contributed much to the study of the later period of the Duchy of Naxos through his publications of documents and translation of imperial Ottoman documents from Ottoman into Greek.¹¹

Paul Grünebaum-Ballin (1871–1969) has written the most complete study, integrating the findings of most of the earlier scholars on Joseph Naci and his duchy, and consulting the relevant existing archives. Although Grünebaum, a Jew by birth, has many times during his brilliant political career in France insisted that he no longer had ethnic feelings about Jewish ethnicity and religion,¹² his book on Naci rather suggests enthusiasm for the 'Jewish cause' and pride of being a Jew. Grünebaum treated Naci's life from his birth in Portugal until his death in Istanbul, focusing on Naci as a Jew and his role as a businessman, as well as on his and his family's role in Jewish history. He also examined the role of the Spanish-Portuguese, Francisco Coronello, Joseph

⁹ E. Carmoly, *Don Joseph Nassy Duc de Naxos* (Frankfurt, 1868); M. A. Levy, *Don Joseph Nasi* (Breslau, 1859); A. Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi duc de Naxos* (Constantinople, 1913); J. Reznik, *Le Duc Joseph de Naxos* (Paris, 1936); C. Roth, *The House of Nasi; The Duke of Naxos*, 2 vols (Philadelphia, PA, 1947).

¹⁰ E. Charrière, *Negociations de la France dans le Levant, ou Correspondances, Mémoires et Actes Diplomatiques*, Collection de Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, 4 vols (Paris, 1848–49); Charrière has included the important documents regarding Naxos and Joseph Naci which can be found in different Archives in France, Italy, Portugal, England, Austria and Germany.

¹¹ P. G. Zerlentos, *Γράμματα τῶν τελευταίων Φράγκων δουκῶν τοῦ Αἰγαίου πελάγους, 1438–1565; Ἰωσήφ Νάκης Ἰουδαῖος δούξ τοῦ Αἰγαίου πελάγους, 1566–1579; Τὸ σαντζάκ τῶν νήσων Νάξου, Ἄνδρου, Πάρου, Σαντορήνης, Μήλου, Σύρας, 1579–1621* (1924; rpt Athens, 1985). Zerlentos's contribution has been very important for the study of the latest period of the duchy of the Archipelago. In this study he also published Greek translations of Ottoman archival documents which were previously published in Ottoman Turkish by Safvet Bey in the *Revue Historique, publiée par l'Institut d'histoire ottomane* [Türk Tarih Encümeni mecmuası], vols 3–4 (1912–13); see the review of Zerlentos by J. Ebersolt in *Revue des Études Grecques* 37, fasc. 170–171 (1924): 237–38.

¹² P. Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci duc de Naxos* (Paris and La Haye, 1968), esp. pp. 7–9. Grünebaum-Ballin was a strong supporter of separation of Church and State in France and of the laicization of society.

Naci's governor of the Archipelago, and paid some attention to the institutions of Naxos under the latter's governance. Moreover, he was much intrigued by the rumours and stories around Naci and strongly believed that a legend had grown around the Jewish Duke, thereby probably exaggerating the latter's reputation and influence. However, he did not always analyse in depth the nature of the relationship between Naci and the Ottomans nor the reasons why Naci insisted so much on being recognized as Duke of Naxos, despite his never, as it is generally believed, having resided in the Archipelago.

More recently B. Slot has published a solid study of the Archipelago, and the present authors have published an article on the duchy after Naci's death.¹³ Benjamin Arbel's book on trade, Venice and Jewish trade in Istanbul and the Mediterranean is an excellent contribution to our knowledge in that field, especially the activities of and problems around Solomon Ashkenazi, Abraham Castro and Hayyim Saruq, but does not analyse the Duchy of Naxos. Finally, Neoklis Sarris has recently – in his monumental study of the Ottoman system and institutions – examined the institutions of the duchy/*sancak* from the time of the last Crispo to modern times from a strictly Ottoman viewpoint.¹⁴

Joseph Naci as Duke of the Archipelago: context, role and ambitions

Juan (or Joseph or Johannes) Micas (Micques), later known as Joseph Naci (Nasi, Nassi, Nazi, Nasci), belonged to the Mendes (Mendez) family. A Spanish-Portuguese *marano*,¹⁵ he was born in Portugal, his family migrated from Portugal to Flanders and he was educated in

¹³ See note 2.

¹⁴ N. Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα: Vol. 1: Το δεσποτικό κράτος; Vol. 2: Η δογματική διοίκηση* (Athens, 1990), II, 263–271.

¹⁵ This Spanish term (meaning 'pork') was used as an insult to indicate the Jews who were obliged to convert to Catholicism, and were officially known as 'New Christians'. Most of them reverted to Judaism after they were chased out of Spain in 1506 and then out of Portugal, where they had originally been welcomed by King João II. In Jewish circles their descendants are still known as the Sephardic Jews. See P. Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 11–16, and L. Wolf, *Les Marranes ou crypto-juifs de Portugal* (Paris, 1926).

Antwerp, at that time arguably the richest Western city.¹⁶ He studied at the University of Louvain¹⁷ and had friendly contacts with Queen Maria of Hungary, sister of Charles V and governess of the Low Countries. He was knighted by Maximilian, nephew of Charles V. However, being suspected of return to Judaism, he preferred to leave the Low Countries in 1547, first for Venice and then (in 1554) from there for Istanbul (Constantinople). Under Suleyman the Ottomans had opened their boundaries to the Iberian Jews, correctly assessing their skills, artisanship and knowledge as very useful for the development of the Turkish Empire.¹⁸ Naci's appointment as Duke of Naxos¹⁹ by Sultan Selim in 1566, after the demise of the last Italian duke, Giacomo IV Crispo, shocked the Christians in Europe, who had considered the Duke of Naxos as '*per dignità* the first duke of Christendom.'²⁰

¹⁶ Naci belonged to the rich Mendez bankers family which also had contributed to the prosperity of Antwerp: see G. Asaert, 1585: *De val van Antwerpen en de uittocht van Vlamingen en Brabanders* (Tielt, 2004), p. 159, and Marianna D. Birnbaum, *The Long Journey of Gracia Mendes* (Budapest and New York, 2003), pp. 15–35 (chap. 3, 'Life in sixteenth-century Antwerp').

¹⁷ He registered on 1 September 1542 as '*Dominus Johannes Micas lusitanus institulatus in specie nobilis*' (Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 38). His course of study is unclear, law or medicine. Also it remains unknown whether he finished his studies and obtained any degree.

¹⁸ The centre of reception was Thessaloniki rather than Constantinople itself. As a result, Thessaloniki became a partly Jewish city and an important port, where trade and commerce flourished. The position acquired in the city by the Jewish Community there continued until World War II. See N. Vourgoutzis, '*Εμποροι στον Θεσσαλονικό*' (Thessaloniki, 2003), pp. 45–52.

¹⁹ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 82 and 89–90, citing the report of the Venetian *rector* of Tinos. Note the very negative attitude of the French diplomats in Constantinople in their reports to the King of France about Naci: see the text of letters of de Petremol to Charles IX (11 August 1564) and Juyé to Henry III (13 August 1579), in Carmoly, *Don Joseph*, 8 and 11.

²⁰ On the Crispo House in general, see D. Kasapidis and A. Savvides, 'Archipelago or Naxos, Duchy of', in Savvides et al. (eds), *Encyclopedic Prosopographic Lexicon of Byzantine History and Culture*, I, 345–348 (with bibliography); Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 81–82, 90–91. For the story of the last Frankish dukes, see Miller, *Η Φραγκοκρατία στην Ελλάδα*, and especially Slot, *Archipelagus*, 88–90.

Biographers of Joseph Naci have paid much attention to his ambition, on the grounds of his nomination as Prince of Tiberias,²¹ his appointment as Duke of Naxos by Sultan Selim II in 1566,²² and his (alleged) intrigues to become king of Cyprus.²³ He combined his diplomatic skills and his financial and economic experiences simultaneously to the advantage of the Ottoman Empire and for his own and his family's benefit.²⁴ Thus, he was involved in procuring loans for the Spanish court and the French king.²⁵ The ambassadors of these countries in Constantinople and the special envoys of the royal Houses of Europe often had meetings with Naci, who established his power through loans, negotiations and projects, which continued to his death. All these had nothing to do with the Duchy of Naxos itself, a possession of which the title was nevertheless useful for his status and his international business. But there were also risks involved: although the Ottomans, and especially the sultans relied on him, he created many enemies, such as the Grand Vizier Sokollu. His ambition led him to support the group of Ottoman politicians and military leaders who were in favour of conquering Venetian-occupied Cyprus, there being a strong indication that Naci aspired to become King of Cyprus under the hegemony of the sultan.

²¹ In 1561 Joseph Naci obtained a grant from Selim II to rule Tiberias, where he wanted to settle Jews. The plan was soon afterwards abandoned.

²² Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 82.

²³ Naci, Lala Mustafa Pascha, Hoca Sinan Pacha and Piyale Pacha formed the group in favour of the conquest of Cyprus, which was not supported by the Grand Vizir Sokollu. See Clot, *Soliman*, 418–19; J. Morris, *The Venetian Empire* (London and Boston, 1980), pp. 101–02, 145; Charles A. Frazee, *The Island Princes of Greece: The Dukes of the Archipelago* (Amsterdam, 1988), pp. 138–59 and – in an apocalyptic and eschatological context – the recent thesis of T. Kiss, 'Cyprus in Ottoman and Venetian Political Imagination, c.1489–1582', PhD diss., Central European University, Budapest, 2016, especially pp. 100–06.

²⁴ Rogerson, *The Last Crusaders*, 371–72.

²⁵ It appears that Naci – for a short while – even contemplated abandoning his duchy. Moreover, The French ambassador, Grandchamp, was hindered in his activities at the *Porte* by Miqués (i.e. Naci), who helped the Spaniards bribe several Ottoman dignitaries: see the *dépêche* of ambassador de Noailles to King Charles IX, 8 July 1572, in I. de Testa, *Recueil des traités de la Porte Ottomane. Vol. 1: France* (Paris, 1864), pp. 106–09, esp. 108.

Naci had presented himself in Constantinople as a servant of the King of France, acting as Henri II's *chargé*, with the functions of '*argentier du roi*'. Ambassador Jean Cavenac de la Vigne strongly opposed Naci,²⁶ but his successor, Jean Dolu, followed a reconciliatory approach to Naci, and on 5 February 1560 the young King Francis II sent an amicable letter to Naci, confirming his '*estat d'argentier et trésorier général des paiements ... au pais du Levant*'.²⁷ Meanwhile Naci had become less interested and more hesitant in giving loans to French officials and Court. Moreover, his *demarches* did not obtain the desired payment of the French debts.²⁸ By 1566 the debt of the French kings had still not been paid to Naci. When in that same year the new king, Charles IX (reigned 1560–1575), sent yet another new French ambassador, Guillaume de Grandchamp, an ambitious and arrogant youngster, who asked Naci for a loan, the latter refused on account of the debt of the French king. Grandchamp then – very undiplomatically – recognized France's debt officially and in writing.²⁹ The Ottomans seized several French ships in Alexandria in November 1568,³⁰ sold off the merchandise cheaply and paid the proceeds to Naci before returning the ships to their owners in Marseilles.³¹ Grandchamp then tried to cover up his gaffe to the French king by vehemently accusing Naci.³² The so-called 'case of Alexandria' lingered on indefinitely without result. Neither the merchants of Marseilles, who had lost their stock, nor Naci himself, who remained unpaid by France, were ever compensated. Even after Naci's death, his widow had still to deal with the case for some time. The Ottomans had in principle always supported Naci in the matter, but the latter was well aware of his precarious position, since the affair could result in the French doing less commerce with the Ottomans. Therefore, Naci soon followed

²⁶ Charrière, *Négociations*, II, 403, 415–416.

²⁷ Text of document in Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 103–04.

²⁸ For a detailed overview and discussion of Naci's relations with the French Kings and their ambassadors, see Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 99–117.

²⁹ Charrière, *Négociations*, III, 87.

³⁰ Charrière, *Négociations*, IV, 743; Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 31–32 (document IX).

³¹ Charrière, *Négociations*, III, 62.

³² Charrière, *Négociations*, III, 35.

another line, namely to fortify the Franco-Turkish friendship and alliance at all costs, especially in view of the looming Cyprus crisis.³³

Joseph Naci does not appear to have been interested in the daily feudal administrative and judicial government of his duchy. The rich store of documents regarding Naci's involvement with rulers, politicians and merchants of Holland and Antwerp,³⁴ Poland and Transylvania,³⁵ Austria, France and Spain contrasts with the paucity of correspondence regarding his duchy. He even complained that the islands of his duchy had financially ruined him and that he was sorry to have accepted the grant,³⁶ but this complaint too – we believe – was not a reflection of the reality but a diplomatic ploy. The use of the high title of duke was very important to Naci, who in fact insisted in his correspondence with European monarchy and aristocracy that his title should be respected. He thus wished to underline that he was part of them, the islands being only a power basis for his political negotiations, business deals and further ambitions. The European powers and their representatives in general obliged, although often reluctantly. For them Naci was and remained probably an opportunist and an *arriviste*. The Venetians, in particular, were very hesitant to accept him as a duke and remained hostile for a long time, supporting the ousted Duke Giacomo Crispo.³⁷ Although they had given up all their rights on the duchy, they still tried to interfere in the duchy and to consider themselves as 'protectors', because for them it was not so

³³ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 122–32, using diplomatic published sources as well as archival material, gives a detailed overview of the problem of the debt of the French King towards Naci. See also documents in Charrière, *Négociations*, III, 63–93 and 814–27.

³⁴ Mehmet Bulut, *Ottoman-Dutch Economic Relations in the Early Modern Period 1571–1699* (Hilversum, 2001), p. 112. Naci incited the Low Countries to revolt against Spain.

³⁵ See Naomi E. Pasachoff and R. J. Littman, *A Concise History of the Jewish People* (Lanham, 2005), pp. 162–163 and *passim*; see also Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 19 and 28–29 (documents IV and V: imperial *ferman* to the King of Poland, 17 March 1568, and imperial order to Piyale Pasha regarding Naci's wine export to Moldavia, 20 March 1568). For Naci's interference with Moldavia and Wallachia, see Roth, *The House of Nasi*, 33–35.

³⁶ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 128.

³⁷ See Slot, *Archipelagus*, 88–91.

much a question of prestige as of commercial power and especially of the survival of their pressurized colonial territories in the eastern Aegean.

As for his direct interference in the Archipelago, Joseph Naci used his full title in one rare surviving document, addressed to ‘*universis et singulis ministris et officialibus nostris*’ in his duchy as: *Josephus Naci Dei gratia Dux Aegei Pelagi Dominus Andri*.³⁸ Duke Joseph is also mentioned with his titles in documents by his representatives. The titles of each of them and their context illustrate their rank and importance as well as their real power and function in the duchy itself. Thus, in the confirmation on 15 February 1575 of a *privilegium* given to the Greek monk, Malachia Zancaropullo, by a previous Duke of the Archipelago, Giovanni Crispo, we read at the beginning: ‘*per ill^{mo} ed ex^{mo} sig^r il sig^r d. Joseph Naci duca di Naxia et signore d’Andro ...*’.³⁹ Naci never resided in his duchy, but left the administration of the island to his deputy Francesco Coronello, a Spanish-Portuguese lawyer, also of Jewish descent.⁴⁰ The latter’s title was *locum tenens* (*locotenente*), the duke’s lieutenant, ‘the one who took his place’. He had no specific aristocratic title and thus was a functionary of the duchy, not a ‘*grandee*’ of it. He never pretended to be the duke (although Saulger implies that ‘never a duke was more beloved than him’).⁴¹ When he was captured by the Venetians on the occasion of the Latins’ revolt

³⁸ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 95: the text is written in sixteenth-century Italian and mentions Coronello as ‘*juris utrusque doctoris e luogotenente nostro nell’amministrazione di dutte le isole nostre*’ (see also Levy, *Joseph Nasi*, 52, and Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 14–15).

³⁹ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 97–98.

⁴⁰ It is generally believed that Naci never visited Naxos. Roth has made for the contrary, by arguing that Naci visited Naxos in 1566, and then probably again in 1570 and 1568 (*The House of Nasi*, 238–39, n. 9), but his interpretation remains uncertain and he himself concedes that anyway Naci was never long absent from the Court in Constantinople. C. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin, 1873), p. 499, has published a genealogy of the Coronello family, stating that he originated from Segovia, was appointed governor of Naxos by Naci in 1566 and received fiefs on 15 July 1577. On the other hand, the Italians believed that Coronello was not a genuine Christian, but was still a Jew, opposing Venice and Christianity: see the documents in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 86–88, 88–90, 90–91. See also note 90 below.

⁴¹ Even Buchon erroneously stated that Selim II in 1566 gave the duchy to Coronello (*Recherches et matériaux*, II, 368).

against the Turks in 1570, he was replaced by Demetrio de Naxio and then by Nicolo de Mari, probably two Latins.⁴²

Several other dignitaries and functionaries are mentioned in the documents, including at least three Cohens: Samuel, Joseph and Mose. Grünebaum-Ballin has incorrectly stated that Samuel Cohen stood in for Coronello during the latter's captivity and was thus Naci's *lieutenant par interim*;⁴³ both he and Slot appear to have considered only this one Cohen as important, but sometimes two Cohens are mentioned in the same document with different functions. Dr Samuel Cohen appointed the priest Marco Belogna as chaplain and guardian of the monastery of the Annunciata on 8 November 1571. The document was signed by Samuel Cohen as *auditor et consiglier* of Duke Naci and by Joseph Cohen, *secretario de mandato*. The latter is mentioned as *secretarius et cancelarius* in an important document by Joseph Naci, in which the duke on 15 July 1577 informed all his agents and officers that he was investing Coronello with grounds in Naxos as a compensation for his services.⁴⁴ Mose Choen (*sic*) was the *secretario* of the confirmation, mentioned above, of the *privilegium* of Malachia Zancaropullo.⁴⁵ In the cases of Coronello and Samuel Cohen, their professional (academic) titles were used. They were both 'doctors in both laws' (*dotor unico de una et l'altra legge* or *juris utriusque doctor*), meaning that both had studied canonical as well as Roman law, a speciality perhaps surprising for Jews, but probably explicable by the fact that both may have been *maranos*.

Not only Joseph Cohen is mentioned as *cancelarius*, but we also find Antonio Anselmo as *cancellor d'Andro* in February 1573, while George Cafari is cited as *factor* (*πρακτικός*; carrier of letters, messenger) in the same document.⁴⁶ We find Lodovico Salvago *de via cancelliero* and Thodoro Rivaro as *cidraco publico* (*δηλαλητής πούπλικος*) in

⁴² Documents in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 92–93; see also Slot, *Archipelagus*, 94.

⁴³ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 95–96.

⁴⁴ Text in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 95–97. Grünebaum-Ballin calls Joseph Cohen 'secrétaire et ammanensis' (*Joseph Naci*, 96).

⁴⁵ See document in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 94–95.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 99–100.

documents of Coronello in 1568.⁴⁷ Johanus Gatus is *carcelliere (sic)* in 1573.⁴⁸ In Melos Angelo Gozadino signed as *cancelliere Melli* and Thomas d'Girardi as *cancellieri exci.* in 1577.⁴⁹ The documents thus show that without doubt the islands had local chancelleries with local secretaries and also their own local nobles and dignitaries, which reflects the continuity of local customs and institutions. On the other hand, Naci's influence is apparent in the appointment of Jewish dignitaries, who were not local staff or local products, and who most probably were directly responsible to the duke. Similarly, Naci used some Jews as messengers and carriers of his business letters from his palace in Belvedere in Constantinople, although these letters had nothing to do with his Duchy of Naxos. Coronello himself, who integrated his family through marriages with the islands' Latin nobility, was without doubt the actual head of the locals.

The continuation of feudal traditions in the duchy: the *taxis* and the *Assises de Romanie*

There are two main aspects of Coronello's administration that deserve special attention, namely (i) the continuation of the traditional *taxis* in the duchy and (ii) the problem of the application of the *Assises de Romanie*.

In 1537 Barbarossa, admiral of Sultan Suleyman, had taken possession of the Aegean islands, and in 1540 Venice signed a treaty with Sultan Suleyman, by which the *Serenissima* ceded among others all its rights in the Archipelago to the Ottomans.⁵⁰ Giovanni Crispo survived as duke on condition that he would rule as the sultan's

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 85–86.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁵⁰ John Julius Norwich, *A History of Venice* (Harmondsworth, 1983), pp. 454–55; idem, *The Middle Sea* (London, 2006), pp. 298–99; Clot, *Soliman*, 147–52; Perra, *Ο Λέων εναντίον της Ημισελήνου*, 49. The text of the treaty (*ahdnâme*) can be found in T. Gökbilgin, 'Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki Vesikalar', *Belgeler* 1 (1964): 121–28; also in H. Theunissen, 'Ottoman–Venetian Diplomats: the 'Ahd-names ...'', *Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies* 1 (1998): 437–69.

vassal.⁵¹ Nevertheless, the duchy under Naci preserved many aspects of its traditional rights and customs, as documents from Ottoman as well as from 'Latin' origin regarding the Archipelago demonstrate. The *taxis*, privileges, laws and taxes were basically to remain as they were before, as explained by Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent in his *berat* of 29 April 1565,⁵² when Giacomo IV Crispo was still Duke of the Archipelago.⁵³ That meant that the *taxis* was to remain as it had been under the Frankish dukes, and that consequently a statute was maintained which was at least theoretically dictated by the *Assises de Romanie*.⁵⁴ The Byzantine term *taxis*, used in its original (Byzantine) meaning of 'established order' within the framework of the divine *oikonomia*,⁵⁵ is also indicative of the continuity of Byzantine political theory in the Ottoman period.

The Ottomans did not immediately transform the institutional traditions of the islands, where Greeks, Italians and some Turks continued to live mainly according to the old pattern. Indeed, this state of affairs is clearly illustrated on the occasion of a petition addressed to Sultan Murad by a number of Greek messengers from the Archipelago in 1580 (after Naci's death), which led to the issue of a *berat* of the sultan which clearly pictures the continuation of the existing *taxis* under the reign of Naci, after the deposition of the last Italian duke,

⁵¹ Buchon has published the letter of Giovanni Crispo of 1537 addressed to the Christian rulers, in which he comments on his dependence on Suleyman (*Recherches et matériaux*, II, 360–68). For the different sources and interpretations concerning Barbarossa and Duke Giovanni Crispo, see Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 15–25.

⁵² The main Ottoman imperial documents that are important for this article are the following: the term *ferman* indicates any imperial document; the *berat* is a 'letter', of which the *hüküm* (written order of the sultan on any item) is one of its types; the *fetihnâme* is an imperial letter sent by the sultan to neighbouring rulers on the situation political-military matters; the *ahitnâme* (*ahdnâme*) is a mutual agreement between the sultan and the ruler of foreign country or ethnical group, which Westerners have named *capitulations* or sometimes *privilegia*; see Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, I, 431–39, where all types of documents are described with their protocol and diplomatic composition.

⁵³ Text in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 75–78.

⁵⁴ G. Recoura (ed. and trans.), *Les Assises de Romanie*, with a foreword by Jean Longnon, L'École des Hautes Études, fasc. CCLVIII (Paris, 1930).

⁵⁵ Hélène Ahrweiler-Glykatzi, *L'idéologie politique de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1975), *passim*, especially Appendices.

Giacomo IV Crispo.⁵⁶ Then, the sultan divided the privileges and duties of the deceased Joseph among several dignitaries,⁵⁷ while a *bey* and a *kadı* were sent to Naxos.

It appears that Coronello was a scrupulous observer of the old customs. One of his documents, dated 7 February 1578, describes the feudal investiture of vassals in a picturesque way:⁵⁸ in the *camera grande* of the old palace of the Sommaripa in Andros, Coronello invested Marino d'Argenta with the fief which belonged to Luca d'Argenta, his uncle, who had passed away. This uncle had left his fief to his brother Nicolo, but on 16 September 1577 Nicolo renounced his possessions in favour of his son Luca. Coronello accepted the validity of Luca's action. Then followed the traditional ceremony of feudal investiture: oath and promises by the vassal and feudal kiss of the lord (Coronello) in the presence of an important number of nobles, who acted as witnesses, and dignitaries.

Grünebaum-Ballin has argued that Coronello applied the old, often feudal, customs in a much more generous way than his predecessors had done, who had made veritable slaves of the 'villains' of Naxos. The French scholar sees herein the hand of Naci and bases his theory on Saulger's Chronicle and on two Ottoman documents, which he calls 'Capitulations', one of 1580 by Sultan Murat III and a much later one of 1645 by Sultan Ibrahim.⁵⁹ This also led Grünebaum to the conviction that Joseph Naci was very much beloved by his

⁵⁶ Text of *berat* in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 102: '... και ἐτότεσ ἐδόθη τὸ δουκάτον τοῦ Ἰωσήφ Ἐβραίου, ὁ ὁποῖος τὸ ἀφέντεψε πολοὺς χρόνους κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τωσ· και εἰς τὸν καιρὸν του ἦτον ὄλοι εὐχαριστημένοι και δίχως πείραξες. Τὴν σήμερον διατὶ ἀπόθανεν ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰωσήφ ἐψηφίσθη εἰς τὸ γκοβέρνον ἐκείνων τῶν νησιῶν ἕνας σαντζακόμπεης και ἕνας καδῆς.' ('... and then the duchy was given to Joseph the Jew, who ruled for many years according to the *taxis*; and during his time [of governance] everyone was pleased and without any trouble. Today, since the mentioned Joseph has died, a *sancakbey* and a *kadı* were appointed to the government of these islands.')

⁵⁷ The exploitation of the wine tax was given to Salomon Velezit, a favorite of the Grand Vizier, Mohamed Sokollu (Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 166).

⁵⁸ Document of Coronello, dated 7 February 1578, in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 97–99.

⁵⁹ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 97–98. For the text, see note 56. The text of *berat* can be found in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 102; it is also almost literally repeated in an imperial *ahitnâme* of 1621 by Sultan Osman II (Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 122), which is not cited by Grünebaum. See also Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 22, who refers to a *ahitnâme* of 1640, and not to one in 1645.

subjects. In fact, both assertions of Grünebaum-Ballin are based on misinterpretations. Saulger wrote in 1699 that no duke was ever more beloved or respected. The context however makes it clear that he was referring to Coronello rather than to Naci.⁶⁰ Moreover the documents of Murad and Ibrahim are stereotype declarations, flattering the wise decisions of the Ottoman sultans Suleyman and Selim, and not reflecting the feelings of the population of the Archipelago, as we know from documents emanating from the Greeks of Naxos and the Latin-Italian reactions.⁶¹

The *Assises de Romanie* define in detail the military obligations of the vassals under Naci and Coronello. However, Naxos did not play any military role during this period and there was not even a trace of a feudal army any more. The revolt of the Latin inhabitants of Naxos in 1570 against the Turks was the result of Venetian interference, not of the invocation of their feudal rights as defined in the *Assises*.

Scholarly interpretation of the *Assises* is inconclusive. In 1930 G. Recoura, the editor of the *Assises of Romania*, analysed the *Assises* in detail, and formulated some critical reservations about their application in Naxos, but these have not been addressed by later scholars such as Grünebaum-Ballin and Slot. Recoura argued that Venice succeeded in imposing its jurisdiction on the Archipelago so that the feudal court of the dukes of Naxos had ceased to exist in the 15th century. As a result, all processes were judged by the Venetian jurisdiction of the Metropolis. Thus, Recoura states: '*Il résulte de tous les développements qui précèdent qu'aux XIVE et XVE siècles le duché de l'Archipel était, avec l'île de Négrepont, le seul et véritable terrain d'application des Assises de Romanie*'. But, he continues, '*l'application des Assises est un phénomène tout à fait factice*' and that '*l'application des Assises par les tribunaux de la République [vénitienne] est complètement déconcertante*'.⁶² On the other hand, the local inhabitants were not collaborative, and thus we find some juridical decisions referring to the *Assises*, and other judgements without any reference to the *Assises*,

⁶⁰ Saulger, *Histoire*, trans. Karalis, 118.

⁶¹ See, for instance, Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 81, 83, and Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 82 and 89–90.

⁶² Recoura, *Assises*, 56–57.

the law of the strongest being the rule.⁶³ Recoura also rejected the alleged existence of a Naxian version of some of the *Assises*, arguing that there had never existed separated ‘Usages of Naxos’. The texts suggesting such a phenomenon were in fact, he maintains, nothing more than an almost identical version of stipulation 3 of the *Capitoli Azonti* of the *Assises*.⁶⁴

Recoura’s thesis is based upon his own study of the documents in the Archives of Venice, the ones published by Zerlentos and the private communication to him by Grünebaum-Ballin of some unpublished *acta*.⁶⁵ He observes that there were different *formulae* in different documents, concluding that the references to the *Assises* are due to the zeal of *notarii* and the officers of the dukes of the House of the Crispos. His view, then, is that the *Assises* thus had no real influence on the jurisdiction itself because they had been superseded by Venetian law. Nevertheless, one should take into account that already in 1540, as we have noted, Venice ceded her rights in the Archipelago to Sultan Suleyman. By implication, Venice had officially no further role in the Archipelago’s jurisdiction.

The duchy as conceived by the Ottomans

In the previous sections we have discussed the Ottoman imperial *fermans* in as far as they refer to the survival of traditional customs and the status of the inhabitants. Almost all scholars have equally confined themselves to these problems. One important exception is the study by Sarris, who places Naxi as well as the duchy in a firm Ottoman constitutional and political framework. In this section special attention will be given to the direct imperial *fermans* regarding the administration, status and tax-gathering of the duchy as well as to the problem of the interpretation of the *ahitnâme* regarding the

⁶³ Ibid., 57–58.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 301–02 and 330–38; see Hendrickx and Sansaridou-Hendrickx, ‘The post-ducual “Dukes of Naxos”’, 103.

⁶⁵ M. Zerlentos, ‘Γράμματα Φράγκων Δούκων Αιγαίου πελάγους’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 13 (1904): 136–157, and Recoura, *Assises*, 57–59. Recoura refers to and partially quotes a charter of Duke Giacomo Crispo of 1 January 1442, and a charter of 9 November 1453 of Duke Guglielmo Crispo as well as three later *vidimus* of the latter document.

duchy and the Ottoman *privilegia* of the Orthodox Church. This will illuminate the fine and delicate equilibrium between Ottoman imperialism and the duchy's traditions. It will also contribute to a final answer to the question whether, when and why the duchy ceased to be considered as an (independent or autonomous) state and became *de facto* and *de jure* incorporated into the Ottoman State.

In the *berat* of Suleyman to Duke Giacomo Crispo in 1564 or 1565 the latter is already called *sandcakbey* and not duke, as well as *multezim*, i.e. tax farmer and *tasarruf*, someone who has the right to exploit semi-state ground.⁶⁶ A Venetian report states that the 'duchy *per dignità*' under Duke Giovanni IV Crispo had an income of 8 000 to 9 000 ducats *per annum* revenue from his duchy, of which 4 000 were paid as *carazo* (*karadj*; tribute) to the Sultan.⁶⁷ Giovanni was succeeded by his son, Giacomo IV, who was deposed in 1566 and replaced by Joseph Naci, who was to pay as tribute 130 000 *aspra*. The Grand Vizier, Sokollu, calls the Jewish duke a 'farmer of taxes'.⁶⁸ This remark is not only an ironic or sarcastic remark by the Grand Vizier, Naci's enemy, but also directly refers to the Ottoman institution of tax farming (*iltizāmm*), auctioning the taxation rights on land, cities, the production of goods (e.g. wine as for Naxos), and certain services.⁶⁹

After the appointment of Naci as Duke of the Archipelago by *berat* of Selim II,⁷⁰ several other imperial Ottoman documents refer to Joseph Naci or are the result of his requests. The originals of the latter have unfortunately not been preserved, but their contents as known from the imperial documents confirm that the duke was concerned about his islands and their inhabitants only in so far as economy, taxes and production were concerned. Naci's communications resulted in the following reactions of Sultan Selim II:

⁶⁶ Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, II, 265; see *berat* to Giacomo Crispo, in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 75–78.

⁶⁷ Report by the Venetian *rector* of Tinos, cited by Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 90. See also notes 52 and 71 for definitions.

⁶⁸ Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 90–92.

⁶⁹ See Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, II, 195–97.

⁷⁰ Imperial appointments were made by *berat*. This proves once again that the sultan considered the Archipelago as Ottoman territory. See Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, II, 265–66.

On the 24th November 1567, in an order to the *kadı* of Galata it was written that ‘Yousouf, the actual Duke of Naxos’ reported that the *rayades* (taxpaying serfs)⁷¹ of his islands had migrated to Galata, resulting in a diminution of production. Sultan Selim II ordered the *kadı* to send them back and punish them if they did not go.⁷²

In an order dated 29 November 1567 to the *kadı* of Chios, who had imposed the *charatz* to the *kefere* of the islands ‘under the authority of the actual *bey* of Naxos’, the sultan ordered that the *kadı* himself should go to Naxos and check on the married and unmarried people of every family and impose the legal tax on them through *katastichon* (i.e. through registration into a *defter*) and that having sealed them, he should send them to the sultan’s ‘happy throne’. This should be done in a just way.⁷³

In a document of 20 March 1568 to Piyale Pasha⁷⁴ the sultan ordered the Pasha not to allow Muslims of military units to settle in the islands in an irregular way, when there were no Muslim communities, and to chase away the ones who had already settled there, in order to prevent troubles.⁷⁵

⁷¹ In the texts under discussion, several Ottoman terms are used which are sometimes synonymous, but which nevertheless indicate some differences in status. Thus a *raya* is a taxpaying serf, Muslim or not, in most cases a labourer at the farms; the *zimi* is a taxpaying non-Muslim; the *kefere* are the infidels; the *cizye* is a tax to be paid by all non-Muslim male adults, because they did no military service; the *charatz* (*haradj*) is the group of taxes on ground and products, to be paid by the non-Muslims: see Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, I, 241–45, 247, 330–1, and II, 159–160, 163.

⁷² Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 81, and Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 34–35. R. Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1962), p. 56, observes that the Greeks became the masters of the maritime commerce in the Mediterranean and that Galata was their centre of activity and information, while the islands of the Archipelago were the places where they trafficked and exchanged their goods.

⁷³ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 82.

⁷⁴ On the career of Piyale Pasha, see Savvides, *Δοκίμια*, 87–88 n. 22 (with extensive bibliography), and F. Babinger, ‘Piyale Pasha’, in Gibb et al. (eds), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, VIII, 316–317.

⁷⁵ Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 28, and Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 82–83.

On 23 March 1568, a *hüküm* was sent by Selim II to Piyale Pasha, stating that Naci had sent a messenger to the *Porte* complaining that the *levend* Samban Reis (= captain Samban) had plundered his island's *rayades* and even kidnapped some of the *zimi*. This disturbed the order in the islands, and the sultan ordered that Samban Reis and his pirates should be captured.⁷⁶

In his discussion of the first three of the above mentioned orders of the sultan, Slot has noted that the *ferman* to the *kadı* of Galata had as purpose the safeguarding of the revenues of Naci.⁷⁷ But the texts suggest rather that the sultan acted in order to maintain the *ciyiza* of the islands for himself. The order to Piyale Pasha – says Slot – was directed to put an end to the establishment of the so-called ‘*levends*’ (being ‘*chiourmes irrégulières de la flotte ottomane*’) in the duchy, because they would cause troubles and because as Muslims they would not have to pay taxes. Thus, the Ottoman sultan did not wish a ‘turkization’ of the islands, but opted instead for a Christian society under a non-Muslim administration, all that in order to promote the interests of Duke Joseph.⁷⁸ If that was so, the sultan would have maintained the Christian dukes and not appointed a Jewish one.

Slot has not only ignored the fourth document, but it appears that he has in some way confused the third *ferman* with the *hüküm* to Piyale Pasha. The third document does not use the term *levends* as such, which term appears only in the last document. Slot's interpretation that the military units installed themselves between the *rayades* as *levends*, i.e. – according to him – as irregular Muslim guards of the Ottoman navy, is not accurate. The *levends* were for a great part crimped among the inhabitants of the Aegean islands, and many were Greek and Christian.⁷⁹ It is therefore not evident that

⁷⁶ Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 31, and Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 83–84.

⁷⁷ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 91, also mentions a report of the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople, who states that these migrants from Naxos in fact were in Galata in order to petition the demise of Naci: Galante, *Don Joseph Nassi*, 242.

⁷⁸ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 91–92.

⁷⁹ Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, I, 536–41. The term *levend* has also the meaning

they would establish themselves in the island to plunder and to make trouble. In fact, they would prefer to retire or to be returned to their original places of origin. The role of the *levends* in the islands and their definition are explained – although not with clarity – in a *berat* of Sultan Suleyman to Giacomo Crispo of 29 April 1565, in which he stipulates, *inter alia*, that Giacomo should not allow ships of the *levends* to enter his ports, and that he should not give them food and weapons. The sultan moreover states that infidels made prisoners by the *levends* or by whoever wherever, should declare themselves and that if they had already become Muslims they should be freed, while the ones who had remained infidels should be delivered to their own governor (*bey*).⁸⁰ It is clear that the *levends* were not seen in a positive light by the sultan and the Ottoman authorities, as it is clear from different earlier *fermans*. Thus, already in February 1537 Suleyman, referring to complaints made at the *Porte* by Andro Crussino Summarippa of Andros, notes that *levends* took prisoners from the island and that some *levends* molested the island of Negroponte.⁸¹ In October 1564 the same sultan, in an order to the *beglerbey* of the islands, declared that 12 Franks had plundered the islands, raped the women, Greeks and Albanians, killed some of them and provided food to war- and pirate ships and provokes troubles.⁸² Finally Sultan Selim II sent a *hüküm* to Piyale Pasha – as we have seen *supra* – ordering him to arrest the *levend* pirate Sampan Reis for plundering the islands, and also because other *levends* followed his bad example and continuously disturbed and plundered the islands. It is thus beyond doubt that the *levends*, who were considered to be pirates by the sultans, were a great nuisance to the sultan as well as to the islanders of all religions, and that it was not only because of financial reasons and taxes that the sultans wanted to control them or to get rid of them. It was certainly not in order to support the interests of Naci.

It is of importance to note also that the sultan did not act (or react) through Coronello or the Latin nobility on the islands, but only

of *pirate*.

⁸⁰ Text in Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 75–78.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 79–80.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 80–81.

through his own Ottoman functionaries, although he refers to Naci, whom he evidently considers as his subject and certainly not as an independent feudal ruler or as a dignified duke (in the Occidental sense).

The above discussions of the functionaries and witnesses in official documents of the Duchy of Naxos as well as the official *fermans* of the sultans to Ottoman admirals regarding piracy in the Archipelago, lead to the question what *symbiosis* the different ethnic and religious elements of Naxos' population had realised during the reign of Naci and Coronello.

Where the Ottoman *fermans* refer to pirates, one may have the impression that only Muslims plundered the Christian islands. Christian *levends* also were active as pirates, and Venice and Genoa were even active in organised slave trade.⁸³ The capture of Christians by pirates is documented in several documents, the captors being Muslims as well as Christians.⁸⁴ Greeks were also very involved in maritime trade and as crew members on Ottoman warships, some of them converting to Islam. On the islands of the Archipelago the Greeks lived mainly on low ground by the sea, while the *bourg* of the islands was inhabited by the Latin (Italian) *cittadini*, forming a privileged and still dominant elite, imposing their seigneurial rights and exploiting their fiefs according to the *Assises de Romanie*.⁸⁵ Although the term *villani* seems to disappear during Naci's reign,⁸⁶ the bulk of the Greek population still were regarded as *paroikoi* (serfs), having to perform services.⁸⁷ The Greek islanders were also obliged to provide 'human material' to the Turks, i.e. rowers for the Turkish galleys, while other

⁸³ Peter Lock, *Οι Φράγκοι στο Αιγαίο 1204–1500*, trans. G. Kousounelos (Athens, 1998), pp. 410–11, and D. A. Zakythinos, *Η Τουρκοκρατία* (Athens, n.d.), pp. 16–17.

⁸⁴ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 80–81. See I. K. Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης. Ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Thessaloniki, 2001), p. 123.

⁸⁵ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 42, 95.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 95, 363 n. 36.

⁸⁷ Grunebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 168. It appears that the Frankish *seigneurs* retained their feudal '*droits du verrat*' until 1719, when a certain Francisco Coronello, a member of the old Coronello family, lost not only these rights, but indeed all his seigneurial rights over the villagers.

ones also served as *mariolides*, *galiontzides*, *pilotai* and *soprakomites* for the Ottoman navy.⁸⁸

There were no Turks in the Archipelago, simply because the sultans were not willing to allow Turkish settlement in the islands, in order to avoid disturbances and a loss of fiscal income. As for the Jews, there was a small Jewish colony in Naxos already before the reign of Naci.⁸⁹ The Jews mentioned in the official local documents of Naxos and those in the letters of Naci regarding Naxos, were not local Jews, but agents of Naci, whose basis was not Naxos, but Galata. We know that during the episode when the Venetians tried to recover the Archipelago, there were 17 Jews and 11 Jewesses on the island, who were delivered to the Venetians. There existed an anti-Jewish feeling among the islanders, of which Coronello himself became a victim. In 1570, during the revolt in favour of Venice, Coronello was arrested and held prisoner in Tinos for some months. A letter of the ‘*universtà*’ of Tinos to the Senate of Venice refers negatively to Coronello’s Jewish origin, pointing out that he was the son of Solomon, a friend and business partner of Naci, while several other documents give testimony to the anti-Jewish feeling and attitude of the Latin Christians and Venice against the ‘false Christian’ Coronello.⁹⁰ Whatever the facts, Coronello was not really attached to his *marano* origins and married his daughter into the ruling Catholic Italian nobility. Finally, the thesis that Naci obtained or used Naxos in order to prepare the invasion of Cyprus, which then would become a kingdom with Naci himself as king, is not substantiated beyond any doubt, nor is it established that he founded a Jewish colony at Naxos for that purpose or for populating a Jewish Palestine.⁹¹

In the previous pages we have often – following the existing publications of Ottoman documents and the general interpretation

⁸⁸ Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 71, 123, 147. Some Greeks became *stradioti* for the Venetians. The ones that got banned or became renegades were exiled by Venice and became known as *banditi*.

⁸⁹ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 91, 360 n. 16.

⁹⁰ V. Lamansky, *Secrets d'état de Venise* (St Petersburg, 1884), p. 82; Slot, *Archipelagus*, 92; Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 86–88, 88–90, 90–91. There is no evidence for the allegation that Coronello was the son of Solomon Ashkenazi, friend of Naci, physician, businessman and diplomat. See also note 40 above.

⁹¹ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 91. Slot does not believe that Naci was a Jewish idealist.

and use by certain documents – spoken of *capitulations* awarded by the sultans to the Archipelago. As far as the Ottoman Empire's relations with Christian states are concerned, the term 'capitulations' is generally used. The term 'capitulation' derives from the Latin *capitulum* (chapter, article). Indeed, the 'capitulations' were divided in chapters or articles. The oldest 'capitulation' was – according to tradition⁹² – 'French', dating from February 1535, being a treaty between Francis I of France and Sultan Suleyman II. It can be explained only within the framework of the political and military constellation in Europe during the first half of the sixteenth century. The war between Francis and Charles V had been disastrous for the French king, who sought an alliance with the Ottomans in order to restore the balance of powers.

The question whether the Ottoman imperial privileges (*ahitnâme*) and other *fermans* regarding the Duchy of Naxos were 'capitulations' in the generally accepted definition of the term or were not, is not simply of academic importance, but needs to be analysed because it will shed light on whether the Ottomans regarded the duchy as a 'foreign' or 'independent state' and till when and why. By 'capitulation' is generally understood a treaty between the Ottoman *Porte* and a foreign State, by which the *Porte* gives privileges to that State, but which also sets the obligations of that State and the boundaries of the privileges. Scholars speak in their works about the 'capitulations' given by the sultans to the Duchy of Naxos. The latest example is the 'capitulation' of Sultan Murad of 1580, which in fact was a supplement and partly repetition of the one given by Suleyman to Giacomo Crispo in April 1565.⁹³ Both documents are *fermans* of the berat type, i.e. Ottoman imperial orders, and are written as *ahitnâme* to the leader of the people (*ethnos*) of the Archipelago, not to an independent ruler of another state.⁹⁴ They were written as such while using *kephalia* (or *capitula*, articles), in which the privileges were explained in order. Already in the *ferman* of 1565, the *ciziye* was imposed on the duchy and the commerce was regulated. Therefore, one must accept that already during the reign of the last Crisos the sultan considered the duchy as a subdued territory which by his favour was governed by

⁹² De Testa, *Receuil*, I, 1–41, examined this tradition in 1864.

⁹³ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 75–79.

⁹⁴ See note 52 above.

a non-Muslim Christian leader. This implies that it was not during Naci's reign over Naxos that the Ottomans initiated a 'new regime' in the duchy, as Slot has maintained,⁹⁵ but that the transitional period of the duchy had already started in 1537 under the last Crispos and continued to exist until the death of Naci. In fact, taking into account the *ahitnâme* of 1621 by Sultan Osman II, it appears that the special status of Naxos was still respected, at least partly. It would therefore be imprudent to state categorically that Naci's death changed completely the attitude of the sultans regarding Naxos or that it was the absolute cut-off point of the special status of the Archipelago.

During this same period, the Ottomans also progressed with their own internal religious-political organisation, dividing their population into nations according to religion.⁹⁶ These *millet*s continued to exist until the late nineteenth century. The Greek population formed part of the *Rum Millet*, the Patriarch of Constantinople being appointed as its head (*ethnarchis, milletbaşı*). Orthodox tradition has it that in 1453, after the conquest of Byzantium, Mehmed the Conqueror had appointed the Patriarch Gennadios to this dignity and had given him written *privilegia*, which has been subjected to much discussion by contemporary scholars.⁹⁷ No trace of the *millet*-system and the patriarchal *privilegia* is found at Naxos in the period we have examined. The Orthodox Christians were, however, protected by the sultan's privileges given from time to time to the Greeks under the name of *kanûnnâme*.⁹⁸

Conclusion

The Duchy of the Archipelago itself played no role in the international politics of the sixteenth century, except for the relations between Venice and the Ottoman Empire. Selim II appointed Joseph as Duke of Naxos mainly for financial reasons and as compensation for his

⁹⁵ Slot, *Archipelagus*, 94–97.

⁹⁶ P. Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο* (Athens, 1998), pp. 295, 303, 305–08, 310–13, 315, 368, 370.

⁹⁷ Sarris, *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*, I, 267–68; Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις*, 295–96.

⁹⁸ Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 72.

political and economic services to the Ottoman Empire. This in turn helped Naci with his commercial transactions and increased his status.

The contents and style of administrative documents clearly indicate that Coronello had a free hand in local decision-making, where Naci's name was only invoked as the duly recognized suzerain. Coronello thus played the role and had the powers of '*seigneur haut et bas justicier*', governor of the 'State of the Archipelago' and feudal lord (albeit it by proxy) of the inhabitants.⁹⁹ The official documents of the Archipelago strongly suggest that during Coronello's administration one can distinguish between three groups of dignitaries/officials: a local Latin group (with some Greeks) representing feudal continuity (under Coronello), a Jewish group (directly representing Naci), and an Ottoman group (*kadı, emin, beys*, directly appointed by the sultans). It is evident that the financial power was strictly controlled by the Ottomans, and that Naci entrusted, next to Coronello, some Jews with key positions. The local feudal traditions could continue – almost in a folkloristic way – as long as they were not an impediment for the Ottomans.

After Naci's death, the sultan no longer recognized Coronello as an official representative, merely allowing him to stay on in Naxos as a tax-paying resident.¹⁰⁰ The sultan then also abolished the duchy and nominated his own representatives and governors, Turkish *beys*, but – perhaps surprisingly – also some Greeks.¹⁰¹ The Ottoman sultans switched to Ottoman regulations in a prudent and unhurried way, which took many years, beginning with the last Crispos and even continuing after Naci's death. The use of *ahitnâme* by the sultans shows that they considered the Duchy of the Archipelago as an ethnic unit, i.e. Christian, non-Muslim, and, since the *millet* status was not yet applied to them, therefore different from the purely Ottoman Muslim territory. The long tradition of the Archipelago being a duchy was not completely abandoned by later sultans, who – for political reasons – twice bestowed the title of Duke of Naxos upon Christian Occidental

⁹⁹ See Grünebaum-Ballin, *Joseph Naci*, 95, 96–97.

¹⁰⁰ Zerlentos, *Γράμματα*, 40.

¹⁰¹ Hendrickx and Sansaridou-Hendrickx, "The post-ducal "Dukes of Naxos"", 97–101.

nobles, but nothing came from it in reality.¹⁰² Thus the Ottomans effectively replaced the transitional administrative arrangements of the Archipelago with their own system.¹⁰³

Works Cited

- Arbel, B. *Trading Nations: Jews and Venetians in the Early Modern Eastern Mediterranean*. Leiden, 1995.
- Ahrweiler-Glykatzi, Hélène. *L'idéologie politique de l'Empire byzantin*. Paris, 1975.
- Asaert, G. *1585: De val van Antwerpen en de uittocht van Vlamingen en Brabanders*. Tiel, 2004.
- Babinger, F. 'Piyale Pasha'. Gibb et al. (eds), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, VIII, 316–317.
- Bey, Safvet. *Türk Tarih Encümeni mecmuası: Revue Historique, publiée par l'Institut d'histoire ottomane* 3–4 (1912–13).
- Birnbaum, Marianna D. *The Long Journey of Gracia Mendes*. Budapest and New York, 2003.
- Braudel, Fernand. [*La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*] *Η Μεσόγειος και ο μεσογειακός κόσμος την εποχή του Φιλίππου Β' της Ισπανίας*. Trans. Klairi Mitsotaki. 2 vols. Athens, 1991.
- Buchon, J. A. C. *Recherches et matériaux pour servir à une histoire de la domination française aux XIIIe, XIVE et XVe siècles dans les provinces démembrées de l'empire grec à la suite de la quatrième croisade*. 2 vols. Paris, 1811.
- Buchon, J. A. C. *Recherches historiques sur la Principauté de Morée et ses hautes baronies*. 2 vols. Paris, 1845.
- Bulut, Mehmet. *Ottoman-Dutch Economic Relations in the Early Modern Period, 1571–1699*. Hilversum, 2001.
- Carmoly, E. *Don Joseph Nassy Duc de Naxos*. Frankfurt, 1868.
- Charrière, E. *Négociations de la France dans le Levant, ou Correspondances, Mémoires et Actes Diplomatiques*. Collection de Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. 4 vols. Paris, 1848–49.
- Chasiotis, I. K. *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης. Ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας*. Thessaloniki, 2001.
- Clot, André. *Soliman le Magnifique*. Paris, 1983.

¹⁰² Ibid., 101–02.

¹⁰³ We wish to thank the National Research Foundation of South Africa (NRF) for their continued support for our research projects. We also thank the two reviewers for their critical and useful commentary as well as the editor for placing this article.

- Cooperman B. 'Nasi Family'. Jonathan Dewald (ed.), *Europe, 1450 to 1789: Encyclopedia of the Early Modern World*, 6 vols (New York, 2004), IV, 242–43.
- Crankshaw, E. *The Habsburgs*. London, 1971.
- Crowley, R. 'The Guns of Constantinople'. *Military History* 24.6 (September 2007): 42–49.
- Ebersolt, J. [Review of Zerlentos] *Revue des Études Grecques* 37, fasc. 170–171 (1924): 237–38.
- Frazer, Charles A. *The Island Princes of Greece: The Dukes of the Archipelago*. Amsterdam, 1988.
- Galante, A. *Don Joseph Nassi duc de Naxos*. Constantinople, 1913.
- Gasparis, Ch. 'Εμπόριο και φορολογία προϊόντων'. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα*, I, 253–276.
- Gibb, H.A.R., et al., eds. *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edn. 11 vols. Leiden, 1960–1999.
- Gökbilgin, T. 'Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki Vesikalar'. *Belgeler* 1 (1964): 121–28.
- Grünebaum-Ballin, P. *Joseph Naci duc de Naxos*. Paris and La Haye, 1968.
- Hendrickx, B. 'Το Οθωμανικό πυροβολικό ως τον 18ο αιώνα'. *Stratitotiki Istoria* 39 (November 1999): 65–67.
- Hendrickx, B. 'Joseph Nazi'. Savvides et al. (eds), *Encyclopedic Prosopographic Lexicon of Byzantine History and Culture*, III, 404–05.
- Hendrickx, B. 'Les duchés de l'Empire latin de Constantinople après 1204: origine, structures et statuts'. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 93 (2015): 303–28.
- Hendrickx, B, and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx. 'The post-ducal "Dukes of Naxos" of the "per dignità First Duchy of Christendom": a Re-examination and Assessment'. *Journal of Early Christian History* 3 (2013): 94–107.
- Hopf, C. *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues*. Berlin, 1873.
- Kasapidis D., and A. Savvides. 'Archipelago or Naxos, Duchy of'. Savvides et al., *Encyclopedic Prosopographic Lexicon of Byzantine History and Culture*, I, 345–48.
- Kiss, T. 'Cyprus in Ottoman and Venetian Political Imagination, c. 1489–1582'. PhD diss., Central European University, Budapest, 2016.
- Kluger, M. *The Fugger Dynasty in Augsburg: Merchants, Mining Entrepreneurs, Bankers and Benefactors*. Augsburg, 2014.
- Konortas, P. *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο*. Athens, 1998.
- Lamansky, V. *Secrets d'état de Venise*. St Petersburg, 1884.
- Levy, M. A. *Don Joseph Nasi*. Breslau, 1859.
- Lock, Peter. [The Franks in the Aegean, 1204–1500] *Οι Φράγκοι στο Αιγαίο 1204–1500*. Trans. G. Kousounelos. Athens, 1998.

- Longnon, J. *L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*. Paris, 1949.
- Maltezos, Chryssa, ed. *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα. Προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*. 2 vols. Athens and Venice, 2010.
- Mantran, R. *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 1962.
- Miller, William. [*The Latins in the Levant: A History of Frankish Greece, 1204–1566*] *Η Φραγκοκρατία στην Ελλάδα. 1204–1566*. Trans. Angelos Fouriotis. Athens, 1960.
- Morris, Jan. *The Venetian Empire*. London and Boston, MA, 1980.
- Moschonos, N., and Lily Stylianoudes, eds. *Δουκάτο του Αιγαίου. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης*. Athens, 2009.
- Norwich, John Julius. *A History of Venice*. Harmondsworth, 1983.
- Norwich, John Julius. *The Middle Sea*. London, 2006.
- Pasachoff, Naomi E., and R. J. Littman. *A Concise History of the Jewish People*. Lanham, 2005.
- Perra, Photeine. *Ο Λέων εναντίον της Ημισελίνου*. Athens, 2009.
- Recoura, G., ed. and trans. *Les Assises de Romanie*. Foreword by Jean Longnon. L'École des Hautes Études, fasc. CCLVIII. Paris, 1930.
- Reznik, J. *Le Duc Joseph de Naxos*. Paris, 1936.
- Rogerson, B. *The Last Crusaders: East, West and the Battle for the Centre of the World*. London, 2009.
- Roth, C. *The House of Nasi: The Duke of Naxos*. 2 vols. Philadelphia, PA, 1947.
- Salomon, Herman Prins, and Aron Leoni. 'Mendes, Benveniste, de Luna, Micas, Nasci: the State of the Art (1532–1558)'. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 88 (1998): 135–211.
- Sarris, N. *Οσμανική πραγματικότητα*: Vol. 1: *Το δεσποτικό κράτος*; Vol. 2: *Η δογματική διοίκηση*. Athens, 1990.
- Saulger, Robert, SJ. *Histoire nouvelle des Ducs et autres Souverains de l'Archipel; avec les descriptions des principales îles, et des choses remarquables qui s'y voient encore aujourd'hui ...* Paris, 1698.
- Saulger, Robert, SJ. [*Histoire nouvelle des Ducs et autres Souverains de l'Archipel*], trans. A. M. Karalis (1878). *Απεραθίτικα* 1 (1992): 19–136.
- Savvides, A. *Δοκίμια Οθωμανικής Ιστορίας*. Athens, 2002.
- Savvides, A., B. Hendrickx, Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx and S. Lambakis, eds. *Encyclopedic Prosopographic Lexicon of Byzantine History and Culture*. 3 vols to date. Turnhout, 2007–13.
- Slot, B. J. *Archipelagus Turbatus: Les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation ottomane c. 1500–1718*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1982.
- Testa, I. de. *Receuil des traités de la Porte Ottomane*. Vol. 1: *France*. Paris, 1864.
- Theunissen, H. 'Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: the 'Ahd-names ...'. *Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies* 1 (1998): 437–69.
- Tsiknakis, K. G. 'Ο ελληνικός χώρος στη διάρκεια της βενετοκρατίας'. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα*, I, 21–72.

- Veinstein, G. 'Süleymân'. Gibb et al. (eds), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, IX, 832–42.
- Vourgoutzis, N. *Ἐμποροι στον Θερμαϊκό*. Thessaloniki, 2003.
- Wolf, L. *Les Marranes ou crypto-juifs de Portugal*. Paris, 1926.
- Zakythinos, D. A. *Ἡ Τουρκοκρατία*. Athens, n.d.
- Zerlentos, M. 'Γράμματα Φράγκων Δούκων Αιγαίου πελάγους'. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 13 (1904): 136–157.
- Zerlentos, P. G. *Γράμματα τῶν τελευταίων Φράγκων δουκῶν τοῦ Αἰγαίου πελάγους, 1438–1565; Ἰωσήφ Νάκης Ἰουδαῖος δουξ τοῦ Αἰγαίου πελάγους, 1566–1579; Τὸ σαντζάκ τῶν νήσων Νάξου, Ἄνδρου, Πάρου, Σαντορήνης, Μήλου, Σύρας, 1579–1621*. 1924; rpt Athens, 1985.