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Note on Nomenclature

I have applied the following principles to the perennial problem of standardising nomenclature. Where possible I have usually anglicised Christian names, and I have generally tried to give the form of surnames which is commonly accepted in the belief that ready identification is more important than pedantic accuracy. The particle 'de' is translated 'of'. I have used the normal spellings for the principal towns in Cyprus. I have given the standard transliteration of the modern Greek spelling of the names of Cypriot villages where they are the same as the mediaeval. But the names of some places have changed over the centuries and there are other places which cannot be identified. In these cases I have given the names, as they appear in the text, in quotation marks.
INTRODUCTION

In 1841 the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres announced an essay competition on the subject: 'Histoire de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan'. The Académie specified that it did not want a simple narrative and called for a more accurate account of events with discussion relating '... à la géographie, aux lois, aux coutumes et aux institutions religieuses, politiques et civiles de ce royaume ...'; it also asked for research into Cypriot political and commercial relations with Europe and Asia, and in particular with Genoa, Venice and Egypt.¹

One of the joint prizewinners was Count Louis de Mas Latrie, who proceeded to make the subject an important part of his life's work, and in a long and prolific career which spanned the following half century, established the foundations of all modern studies on Frankish Cyprus.² Since his death in 1897 various scholars have continued his work; for example, Charles Kohler established the relationship of the 'Gestes des Chiprois' to the chronicle wrongly attributed to Francesco Amadi³ and discovered new materials on the crisis of 1306,⁴ and Jean Richard has, among other things, helped to explain

2. For a survey of Mas Latrie's career and publications, see the unsigned obituary in ROL, iv (1896), pp.462-71.
4. 'Documents chypriotes du début du XIVE siècle', ed. C. Kohler, ROL, xi (1907-8).
the assassination of Peter I and, by his investigations into the Instrumenta miscellanea in the Vatican archives, has increased considerably our understanding of Cypriot life and society in the fourteenth century. With Cyprus under British rule for most of the last hundred years, it is understandable that British scholars too should have given it their attention.

The most important contributions have been from Sir George Hill, whose four-volume history of Cyprus is the best and most comprehensive written in any language, and Richard Dawkins, whose edition of Leontios Makhairas's chronicle is exemplary.

No one since Mas Latrie has attempted a general re-evaluation of what the Académie des inscriptions termed '... lois ... coutumes et ... institutions


3. A History of Cyprus (Cambridge, 1940-52). The second and third volumes cover the period, 1192-1571.

... politiques et civiles de ce royaume...'.

Mas Latrie himself realised that it was impossible to study the institutions of Cyprus without reference to those of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, for throughout the thirteenth century their fortunes were inextricably linked and they possessed a common aristocratic society ordered by similar social and legal concepts. Though comparatively little has been published in this century on Cypriot institutions, much has been produced in Jerusalem. Together Maurice Grandclaude, Jean Richard, Joshua Prawer and Claude Cahen have revolutionised our understanding of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the twelfth century by showing that the picture given by the thirteenth-century legal writers of a 'pure' feudal state presided over by a king acting as primus inter pares is false. Recently another study has appeared which examines in detail the ideas of the feudal lawyers of the thirteenth century and the whole question of the wealth, sources of income and rights of the nobility in Jerusalem in the light of this re-interpretation, placing the entire subject in a new perspective.

Our understanding of the constitutional and social organisation of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem has been considerably


2. J.S.C. Riley-Smith, The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174-1277 (London, 1973). I am grateful to Dr. Riley-Smith for allowing me to see this work in typescript before its publication. For a convenient list of the main contributions to the re-appraisal of the powers of the Jerusalemite monarchy in the twelfth century, see Riley-Smith, op. cit., p. ix note 4 (p.232).
modified: no one as yet has studied the implications of these changes with regard to the institutional developments in its sister-state, the kingdom of Cyprus.

Frankish rule in Cyprus began later and ended much later than in Palestine. The Arabs conquered the island in the seventh century and, for most of the period 688-965, ruled it in an uneasy condominium with the Byzantines. It was under sole Byzantine control from 965 to 1164 when Isaac Comnenos, a kinsman of the Emperor Andronicus I, seized power and ruled independently. In 1191 Richard I of England, en route for Palestine, defeated Isaac and conquered Cyprus, selling it first to the Templars and then, after a popular insurrection in 1192 had led them to cancel the deal, to Guy of Lusignan, the dispossessed king of Jerusalem. It was under Guy that the Frankish settlement was established, and on his death Cyprus passed to his brother Aimery who in 1196 acknowledged the suzerainty of the Western Emperor in return for the elevation of Cyprus to a kingdom. Aimery's

3. For the idea of Richard and Philip Augustus that lands conquered by them were theirs by right of conquest to dispose of as they wished, and the effect of this concept on the Palestinian nobility, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.113, 116-20, and also pp.136-7.
descendants ruled until the late fifteenth century; in 1489 the island became a part of the Venetian colonial empire and was lost to the Turks in 1571.

The kingdom of Cyprus had a comparatively trouble-free internal history: there were of course natural disasters - earthquakes, locusts, famines and plague - but only two periods of civil war, 1229-1233 and 1459-1464, and only two foreign invasions, by the Genoese in 1373 and 1374 and by the Mamlukes in 1426. The important port of Famagusta, however, was occupied by the Genoese from 1373 to 1464, during which time the Cypriots made several attempts to recover it. The long periods of peace were no doubt due in part to the fact that Cyprus is an island; but its wealth would have given ample incentive to any potential enemy.

The island's riches and fertility were noted and commented on by

1. Aimery's direct descendants died out in the male line in 1267. The crown then passed to the son of Aimery's grand-daughter, Hugh III. Though strictly speaking a cadet line of the princes of Antioch, Hugh and his heirs used the name of 'Lusignan'. In the civil war of 1459-1464 the legitimate heiress was ousted by her bastard brother, James II. His widow transferred the sovereignty over Cyprus to the Venetians.


3. There were also coastal raids by men of various nationalities, for example Turks, Mamlukes and Genoese, at different times throughout the centuries of Latin rule.
various writers, the most celebrated description being by Ludolf of Suedheim who was there in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, when Cyprus was at the height of its commercial prosperity. After 1291 Famagusta had to a large extent inherited the position formerly held by Acre as the principal market in the eastern Mediterranean for trade between Europe and the Orient. Merchants from the West had traded in Cyprus before 1291, but

1. For example, writing of the Third Crusade, Gislebert of Moos speaks of '... Cyprum ... terram omnibus opulentam ...'. 'Hannoniae Chronicon', RHF, xviii, p.403. Wilbraam of Oldenburg (1212) wrote that Cyprus '... est insula summe fideliss, optima habens vina ...'. Wilbraam of Oldenburg, 'Peregrinatio', ed. J.C.M. Laurent, Peregrinatorum medii aevi quatuor (Leipzig, 1864), p.180. For the 'Templar of Tyre', writing about a century later, Cyprus was '... munita et bona et bie

1. For example, writing of the Third Crusade, Gislebert of Moos speaks of '... Cyprum ... terram omnibus opulentam ...'. 'Hannoniae Chronicon', RHF, xviii, p.403. Wilbraam of Oldenburg (1212) wrote that Cyprus '... est insula summe fideliss, optima habens vina ...'. Wilbraam of Oldenburg, 'Peregrinatio', ed. J.C.M. Laurent, Peregrinatorum medii aevi quatuor (Leipzig, 1864), p.180. For the 'Templar of Tyre', writing about a century later, Cyprus was '... munita et bona et bie


after the fall of Acre the situation radically changed. Westerners, banned by papal decree from trading with the Moslems, came to Famagusta and there bought the eastern goods which had been shipped from Syria by local entrepreneurs. The presence of western merchants was essential for this trade, but relations between them and the Cypriot authorities were often far from good. Prominent were the Genoese who in the thirteenth century, thanks to the concessions granted them for helping the Ibelins in their struggle against Frederick II's supporters in the 1230's, were the most privileged. By the late thirteenth century they were on poor terms with the king and for most of the fourteenth century tension increased. In 1372, following an anti-Genoese riot in which several merchants were killed, war was declared and the following year the Genoese forces captured Famagusta and overran most of the island. The peace terms were heavy: Cyprus was placed under tribute and a large number of knights and the city of Famagusta were held as security for its payment. Once in Genoese hands Famagusta's commercial prosperity seems to have declined rapidly, but it would be wrong to see this simply as a direct result of the conquest; other factors were probably already at work such as the general effects of the Black Death, changing trade routes in Asia, the

---

1. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 91.

2. See for example, Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.183, 205-6, 209-12, 217, 228-9, 278-81, 287-90, 312-16. The quarrels could make life difficult for Genoese clergy benefited in Cyprus; thus in 1317 John XXII permitted the dean of Nicosia and the archdeacon of Paphos, both Genoese, to live in Genoa should the quarrel between Henry II and the Genoese render it impossible to them to remain in their benefices. John XXII, Lettres communes, ed. G. Mollat (Paris, 1904-47), nos. 2735, 2736.
slackening of papal prohibitions on trade in Muslim ports and the
dislocation resulting from Peter I's wars; the Genoese invasion may well
have done no more than aggravate the situation. From the late fourteenth
century the Cypriots drew closer to the Venetians with whom they had had
better relations.  

The importance of Cyprus in the East Mediterranean, especially during
the first two centuries of Lusignan rule, was due partly to its commerce,
partly to its role as a crusader state. It was founded by crusaders and
throughout the thirteenth century was seen as a staging post for crusading
expeditions: thus Honorius III wanted the participants in the Fifth Crusade to
go there in 1217; 2 control of the island was important to Frederick II in
1228; 3 in 1239 Thibaut of Champagne was advised to go there by a group of
leading Palestinian and Cypriot clergy and nobles who promised to meet him
there to discuss strategy; 4 Louis IX made Cyprus his base on his first
crusade and wintered there, 5 and Edward I took on supplies there in 1271. 6

1. For Cypriot trade, see Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, i, pp.359-65, 
4. Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, ed. E. Martene and U. Durand (Paris, 1717),
i, cols. 1012-13.
6. B.T. Beebe, Edward I and the Crusades (unpublished Ph.D thesis, 
St. Andrews, 1970), p.52. I am grateful to Dr. Beebe for permission
to consult this work.
After 1291, though many propagandists doubted the usefulness of Cyprus in crusading strategy,¹ the king of Cyprus and the masters of both the Hospitallers and the Templars envisaged the island as a base for military expeditions to Palestine.² In the middle years of the fourteenth century the emphasis changed to military alliances directed against the Turks in Asia Minor in which the king of Cyprus participated together with the Byzantines, the Hospitallers and the Italian maritime republics.³ It was in the reign of Peter I (1359-1369) that the military capacity of Cyprus was demonstrated: Gorgos was occupied, Adalla captured, and then in 1365, after Peter had raised an army of western knights to augment his Cypriot forces, Alexandria was taken and sacked. This was followed by raids on the coast of Syria and Palestine.

Compared with the futile campaigning at the beginning of the century and the

1. These included Raymond Liull and Marino Sanudo; Hayton of Gorgos and Burchard gave Cyprus a subsidiary role in their schemes. See A.S. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1938), pp.63-4, 80, 101, 122.


perhaps rather lukewarm participation in the leagues formed against the Turks under Peter’s predecessor, this was spectacular even though the successes were limited. Peter himself hoped to be able to hold Alexandria and to proceed from there to occupy the Holy Places. With the benefit of hindsight that ambition may seem totally unrealistic, but this was the last occasion on which a crusade came anywhere near to achieving that end.  

Before 1291 Cyprus had close contacts with the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Guy of Lusignan and his brother Aimery had both left their mark there before going on to Cyprus; from 1197 to 1205 Aimery was ruler of both kingdoms and from 1269 the kings of Cyprus were also kings of Jerusalem. At the end of the fourteenth century they acquired a third crown, that of Armenia. Many members of the Cypriot nobility had come from Jerusalem and until 1291 many families and individuals held fiefs in both countries. Cypriot knights served in the defence of the mainland, and those mainland knights with estates in Cyprus undoubtedly would have used their revenues for the same purpose. The Military Orders and other Jerusalemite religious foundations had estates in the island as well. When at the end of the thirteenth century the remaining cities on the Syrian coast were conquered, Cyprus was a refuge for the survivors. Until well into the fourteenth century the titular holders of Jerusalemite lordships such as Arsour or Beirut – the direct descendants of the occupants of those fiefs in the thirteenth century - lived in Cyprus. From the mid-fourteenth century the kings of Cyprus revived long defunct Jerusalemite

1. For Peter’s campaigns, see Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, chaps. vii-xi; Attiya, Crusade in the Later Middle Ages, chaps. xiv-xv; Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp. 317-60.
titles to reward distinguished vassals or to honour members of the royal family.

The nobility in Cyprus was foreign; the knights came either direct from Western Europe or from Jerusalem and thus indirectly from the West. They spoke a different language from the majority of the inhabitants and had a separate church. Wilbrand of Oldenburg, a traveller of the early thirteenth century, described how the Greeks,

all obey the Franks and pay tribute like serfs.

From this you can see that the Franks, whom the Greeks and Armenians obey like slaves ('ut coloni'), are lords of this land. ¹

No Greeks are found among the nobility until the latter part of the fourteenth century, and even then they had first to be converted to Latin Christianity.

The Greek church was kept in subjection to the Latin hierarchy although numerically it was far stronger. ² The nobility, as we shall see, was organised along western, feudal lines, suitably adapted to this alien environment, and, as a western society placed in a non-western state, is as intriguing and anomalous as the thirteenth-century French-gothic cathedral


² For surveys of the relations between the Greek and Latin churches, see J. Hackett, A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus from the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45-1878) together with some Account of the Latin and Other Churches existing in the Island (London, 1901), pp.74-189; Hill, History of Cyprus, II, p.47, III, pp.1041-1104 passim.
placed in the centre of the near-eastern city of Nicosia.  

The aspects of Cypriot history which caught the attention of the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres over a hundred and thirty years ago are precisely the kind which are of interest to historians today. Reference has already been made to the close ties between Cyprus and Jerusalem and to the fact that little thought has been given to the institutions of the Kingdom of Cyprus in the light of recent work on Jerusalem. This dissertation is directed towards a re-examination of Cypriot history to take account of the advances in Jerusalemite history and towards a re-appraisal of Cypriot political, economic and social institutions. Because of the ties between Cyprus and the mainland it is possible that by a better understanding of Cyprus, a better understanding of Jerusalem and, in consequence, of the whole subject of the crusades may be achieved.

To have attempted an all-embracing study of Cyprus under the Lusignans with this in mind would have been over-ambitious and so I have limited myself in two respects. Rather than study every aspect of society, I am concentrating on the nobility, for it was they who together with the crown derived their livelihood from the exploitation of the peasantry and the taxes on commerce; it was primarily for their benefit that the Latin church was instituted in Cyprus; as a class they are of importance in themselves; their relationship with the

1. C. Enlart (L'art gothique et la Renaissance en Chypre (Paris, 1899), 1, pp.90-141) gives a full description of the former Latin cathedral in Nicosia, drawing attention to architectural parallels in Northern France.
crown is fundamental for an assessment of the powers of the crown, and
their ability to act in concert and to provide military strength is relevant
to the international role of Cyprus.

1192 - the date of the beginning of the Latin settlement under Guy of
Lusignan - is an understandable starting point for the present thesis. On the
other hand, 1400 is of no special significance as a closing date. The
immediately previous decades, however, had seen changes of great significance
if Cyprus is to be considered in the context of the crusading movement. They
saw the last attempt to land a crusading army within reach of the Holy Places,
the end of the commercial prosperity which sustained first Acre and then
Famagusta, and the first major weakening of the Frankish crusading families
who were an important element in the Cypriot ruling class. Many old families
survived until the civil wars of the mid-fifteenth century, but the effect on them
of the Genoese war was serious. James I (1382-1398) gave the island a
measure of stability, but by 1400 the days of Cyprus's greatness as a
crusading kingdom were over.
Chapter I

THE CYPRiot FEUDAL CLASS

Two factors differentiated the Cypriot feudal class from other social groups: they were governed by feudal convention, and they possessed a quality or 'nobility' which set them apart. By a feudal class is meant simply a fief-holding class. The nature and importance of the feudal bond is a subject which will be dealt with in full later;¹ the most important consequence of holding a fief was that it implied the obligation to perform services. John of Jaffa placed military service at the head of his list of the forms feudal obligations could take,² and the whole system of feudal law was geared to ensure that every fief was capable of providing the military service due from it. A fief had to be large enough to equip its holder for the amount of service due, and so alienation in mortmain was forbidden³ and division or sub-infeudation had to be accompanied by a corresponding division of services. The proportion of a fief that could be sub-infeudated was limited.⁴ Fiefs owing the service of only

1. See below, part II.
2. John of Ibelin, 'Livre', RHC Lois, i, pp.345-7. For further discussion of the services of auxilium and consilium see below, pp.265-89.
4. The jurists were uncertain about the extent to which it was limited. Phillip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.553-4. See John of Ibelin, pp.284-5; Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.12-13.
one knight could not be divided. 1 If a man inherited two separate fiefs, each
burdened with the service of one knight, he was obliged to serve with a
companion and the fiefs had to be divided among his heirs on his death. 2 A
man who was over sixty or disabled had to place his horse and his arms at his
lord's disposal. 3 Male heirs took precedence over females in the same degree
of relationship to the previous holder of a fief, since they could perform
services in person. 4 When a woman inherited she was obliged to marry and the
lord had extensive control over whom she chose, as he had the right to ensure
that the husband would perform the services required. 5

The most important form of personal military service was knight service.
What distinguished 'service de ... cors come chevalier', 6 from the service owed
by a sergeant was the knight's arms and equipment. John of Ibelin gave a
detailed description of the knight's armour in the mid-thirteenth century: 7 he

2. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.538-41; John of Ibelin, pp.223-4. See Riley-
Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.11-12.
4. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.539; John of Ibelin, p.224. See Riley-Smith,
Feudal Nobility, p.15.
See J. Richard, 'Le statut de la femme dans l'Orient Latin', Recueils de la
société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des Institutions, xii, 2, pp.378-
82. See below, pp.233-7.
7. John of Ibelin, pp.170-71. His description is à propos the armour for appeal
of battle in cases other than homicide. It is clear from this passage and from
the remarks of other writers (Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.455; 'La Clé des
Assises de la Haute Cour du royaume de Jérusalem et de Chypre', RHC Lois,
1, p.589) that this was the knightly equipment at this period; John was
describing it to ensure equality between the parties. From fourteenth century
tomb stones it would appear that plate armour was also known. T.J.
Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicossienses. Recueil d'inscriptions funéraires, la
plupart françaises existant encore dans l'île de Chypre (Paris, 1894), plates
xviii, xxviii.
wore a hauberk, a helmet with a vizer, and iron leg pieces, and carried a lance, swords and a shield; the horse was protected by an iron head piece and mail to guard its legs and flanks. Jerusalemite evidence suggests that a knight had to provide himself with four mounts. Whether knights had always to come fully equipped in this way is not clear; the jurists do not discuss the question of a knight who had answered a summons for service de cors, but arrived at the muster not properly armed. Perhaps one mount and a hauberk was an accepted minimum.

The class of sergeants à cheval was a product of the twelfth century. With the development of heavier armour and notions of a noble caste, the term 'knight' became restricted to the wealthier, better armed cavalry, and contemporaries found it necessary to distinguish the latter from the more lightly armed mounted men. In what is one of the earliest references to them in the East, it was recorded that, at the time of the Latin settlement, Guy of Lusignan enfeoffed two hundred sergeants à cheval in Cyprus; at the same time three hundred knights were enfeoffed. Philip of Novara referred to fief-holding sergeants, and made

1. For a knight with a vizer-less helmet (1229), see 'Gestes', p.689.
2. Cartulaire général des Hospitaliers, no.2985.
3. This can perhaps be inferred from Philip of Novara's discussion ('Livre', pp. 552-3) of the position of a knight who had sold his equipment and then was summoned to perform military service. See also John of Ibelin, pp.357-8.
It clear that the rules governing the inheritance and division of fiefs were the same for both knights and sergens. There is some evidence to suggest that in Cyprus after 1192 sergens à cheval were identical with turcopoles. One version of the account of the settlement described turcopoles being enfeoffed instead of sergens à cheval in a way which suggests that the terms were interchangeable. But there is a reference to turcopoles in 1306 who are differentiated from 'homini ligil fanti ha cavallo', by whom are apparently meant liege sergens à cheval, though the precise distinction is not clear. The turcopoles enfeoffed in the 1190's were to serve protected by a hauberk and with two mounts, and as a class of feudatories they continued to exist in the early fourteenth century. After the first decade of the fourteenth century, there are


2. 'Eracles', ii, p.192 (ms. 'A'). (By ms. 'A' is to be understood not only ms. 'A' itself, but also such other mss. as are collated with it by the editors to form the principle text in the published edition on those pages where a variant text is given.) Describing events of 1231 in Cyprus, Phillip of Novara mentioned turcopoles and valès à cheval ('Gestes', p.700) whereas in the corresponding passage, the writer of 'Eracles' (ii, p.386) spoke of sergens à cheval. For turcopoles in the twelfth century, see Small, Crusading Warfare, pp. 111-12, 179-80, 184.

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', ed. R. de Mas Latrie, Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi (Paris, 1891-3), i, p.252. For another possible example of a passage in which they are differentiated, see 'Eracles', ii, p.322 (ms. 'A'). The chroniclers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries never otherwise mention more than one type of lightly armed mounted men below the rank of knight on any one occasion.

4. 'Eracles', ii, p.192 (ms. 'A').

5. A liege turcopole is mentioned in the account of the events of 1308. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.264.
no more references to sergens à cheval and no indication that turcopoles held fiefs. Irrespective of whether a distinction was made between mounted sergens and turcopoles, there was a type of cavalry in Cyprus in the thirteenth century whose members were less heavily armed than the knights but nevertheless were feudatories.

It was possible, as John of Ibelin expressly stated, to hold a fief free of service altogether, but it can be assumed that this form of tenure was uncommon. In 1310 it was agreed that Hugh, son of Amaury of Tyre,

... should be free, quit and immune from performing personal service on account of the aforesaid fiefs for as long as he shall live ...

In the narrative account of the same year we are told that Philip of Ibelin, count of Jaffa and one of the wealthiest Cypriot vassals, held his fiefs free. This was undoubtedly exceptional as service was owed by other prominent vassals; in 1310 it was due from Ballan, prince of Galilee, and from 1306, Hugh, later Hugh IV, owed the service of two knights, though this was probably a light

---

1. For evidence of turcopoles in the sixteenth century, see Stephen of Lusignan, *Description de toute l'île de Cypre, des roys, princes et seigneurs tant Payens que Chrestiens, qui ont commande en l'icelle* (Paris, 1580), fo. 215.

2. John of Ibelin, p.216. For a discussion of this with reference to Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, p.7.


5. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.385.
obligation as his fief was worth 10,000 besants annually. 1

By no means all knights, *sergens à cheval*, or turcopoles had fiefs. There were many mercenaries, and though there is no way of gauging the proportion of mercenaries to fief-holders, it is possible that at times they were in the majority. Though there are occasional references to turcopoles and sergeants as mercenaries, 2 most of the evidence relates to knights. The earliest surviving reference to mercenaries in Cyprus is for the year 1228 and the first Cypriot mercenary knight to be known by name was present at Aghirda in 1232. 3

In the accounts of the events from 1306-1310 there are to be found 35 named mercenary knights. About two thirds of them were apparently related to feudal families, which would suggest that serving as a mercenary was a normal occupation for younger sons and representatives of cadet lines not fortunate enough to have received fiefs. 4 Probably the most important group of mercenaries were those employed by the king and under the jurisdiction of the constable. 5


3. 'Gestes', pp.681, 715 (Peter of Montolif).

4. 'Gestes', p.871; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.259, 264, 266, 269, 275, 294, 330, 337, see p.386. Among the families represented are Antioch, La Baume, Brie, Costa, Flourney, Gibelet, Mainboeuf, Mimars, Montgisard and Montolif. See below, table 9 (pp.134-8).

appear that they were enlisted on a regular basis; in 1369 it was ordained that Cypriot mercenaries should give three months notice and those from overseas a year, though this was perhaps exceptional. Other mercenaries were employed by a vassal to complete his *servitium debitum*; this was known as *service des compagnons*. Mercenaries could also be employed by a widow or heiress who had not yet performed *service de mariage*, and when a fief had become fragmented in which case the holders of each fragment contributed towards the cost. There was an obvious disadvantage for the mercenary in that he could always be paid off, whereas the feudal knight's livelihood was secure; it is not surprising, as Leontios Makhairas hinted, that mercenaries should have aimed at being granted fiefs. On the other hand, they could leave their employment, though it was probably unusual for them to receive pay for periods spent abroad, as did Simon of Montolif, the mercenary knight who murdered Amaury of Tyre.

Not all fief-holders were knights; not all knights held fiefs. That those knights who held fiefs were called upon from time to time to discharge the service owed, there can be no doubt. The dispute of 1271 between Hugh III and

1. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.379 (for the correct date, see below, p. 204 note 1).
   See below, pp.206-7. Philip of Novara ('Livre', pp. 552-3) seems to indicate that mercenary knights were not enlisted just for the campaign, as he envisaged a situation in which a mercenary had sold his horse and arms immediately before being summoned to serve.


3. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.543, 559. The example given by Philip of a fragmented fief is from Jerusalem, but it is evidence that the measures against fragmentation were not totally successful.

4. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 79.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.330.
his vassals arose not because the vassals were being summoned to perform services, but because they felt that the services demanded were excessive. Hugh III presented a long list of occasions on which Cypriot knights had discharged their obligations outside Cyprus; James of Ibelin showed that in some cases the knights had not served out of obligation, but had gone voluntarily, but he was unable to prove this in every case, and certainly there is no suggestion that the feudal levy was an anachronism and had ceased to function. Although most fiefs were theoretically burdened with military service, there is no way of knowing how effective the feudal system was for putting an army in the field.

In the West the feudal levy was inefficient and was superseded during or before the fourteenth century. Most of our information for the Cypriot army comes from the period of Peter I's crusades and the Genoese war. Though we are given lists of knights who served on Peter's various expeditions, we are not told whether they were discharging their feudal obligations, were volunteers serving at their own expense or were mercenaries. These campaigns offered glory and booty and vassals might have been glad of the opportunity to participate of their own accord. Had they served in fulfilment of their services, the king would have been obliged to provide victuals, and so might have preferred volunteers. If they had been employed as mercenaries, they would have been more directly under royal control,

1. 'Document relatif au service militaire', pp. 427-34. See below, pp. 266-78. It should be noted that there is almost no evidence for the commutation of military services in the Latin East. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp. 7, 38-9.

2. William of Machaut, La prise d'Alexandrie ou chronique du roi Pierre 1er de Lusignan, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Geneva, 1877), pp. 138-45; Leontios Makairas, Ι, paras. 119, 163, 190, 194, 200.

and would have no excuse for failing to be properly armed. The king might have preferred to pay the feudatories to serve, for it is possible that in a society which demanded of a knight more expensive armour at a time of inflation, those vassals with fixed money-feiefs would have found it difficult to maintain themselves.¹

But there is a clear reference to feudal services in 1373:

The king sent, and the knights and many more of the vassals were summoned to come from Nicosia to Famagusta, with their horses and their weapons and the men to do the service which belonged to their fief: and at the king's command they started off and came to him. ²

The knights who obeyed were all imprisoned by the Genoese, and it is likely that many of the seventy-odd knights later taken as hostages to Genoa and Chios were identical with those who answered this summons.³

If military service was owed and performed in the later fourteenth century, it would appear that the legal provisions to prevent the fragmentation of feiefs and the consequent disappearance of services had had a large measure of success.⁴

It is safe to say that the feudal system provided fighting men throughout the first two centuries of Latin rule, though their importance relative to non-feudal forces cannot be gauged.

¹. Philip of Novara ('Livre', p.554) mentioned the king supplementing feiefs, and this could be evidence for royal recognition that the knights found they could not afford to serve. Whereas in the 1190's knights were given feiefs of 400 besants ('Eraclies', ii, p.192 ms. 'A'), by the mid-fourteenth century 800 besants was considered poor recompense for a mercenary knight. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 79. See also Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.10.

². Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 418.

³. See below pp.233-7.

⁴. But see above, p. 8 note 3.
Marc Bloch recognised hereditary status and legal privilege, in addition to owning land and fighting equipped as a knight, as the essential criteria for the description of a dominant feudal class as a nobility. During the twelfth century the idea that knights should be descended only from knights gained currency and at the same time the legal framework which governed the relationships of knights to lords on the one hand and to non-knights on the other acquired coherence and rigidity. By the time of the Latin settlement of Cyprus it would be true to say that someone who was both a vassal and a knight was held to be a noble.

In Cyprus the knights formed an exclusive caste. Philip of Novara stated that whereas a lord could free a serf, he had no right to make him a peer of the liege men, and if he tried to do this the knights would rightly object. One version of the account of the Latin settlement described with disapproval how Guy of Lusignan gave fiefs to Greeks, shoemakers, masons and Arabic scribes so that they became knights and 'grant vassors de l'isle de Chypre', but this would seem to betray the partiality of the writer rather than suggest the true origin of the Cypriot nobility. The only definite examples of burgesses being promoted to knighthood before 1400 are those of Thibaut Belfarage and Thomas Barech, both converts from Greek to Latin Christianity in the latter part of the

---

3. 'Eracles', ii, p.189 (ms. 'D').
fifteenth century. The only other non-knight known to have been promoted to knightly status was Henry of La Corte, a turcopole made a knight by Amaury of Tyre; in this case it may be significant that he was already a liegeman.

On the other hand, it was not unusual for foreign knights to be given fiefs and brought into Cypriot noble society. In fact this was apparently the normal means of recruiting new blood. Provided he was an adherent to Latin Christianity, was of legitimate birth and noble extraction, and was engaged in the profession of arms, any knight could be accepted. Greek and other Eastern Christians, not to mention Muslims, had legal disabilities which meant that it was impossible for anyone not a Latin Christian to enter the nobility. Like Thibaut Belfarage and Thomas Barech, John Lascaris Caloperos, the Byzantine adventurer who was prominent in Cyprus in the late 1360's, was a convert.

The nobles possessed various legal privileges: only a knight could purchase a fief owing *service de cors*; a knight could not be appealed in the courts by a non-knight except for murder, though a sergeant could challenge the witness of a

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 568, 579, 599. The 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p. 482) gives the impression that Thibaut was knighted in 1375, but he was already described as 'nobillis miles' in a document of 1370. 'Nouvelles preuves de l'histoire de Chypre', ed. L. de Mas Latrie, BEC, xxxiv (1873), pp.77-8.

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.381, see p.264.

3. For the legal disabilities of bastards, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.500, 502.


The most important right that the knights possessed was that of judgement by their peers and only by their peers. Geoffrey Le Tor defined peers as all the 'chevaliers homes ligea' and this definition was echoed by James of Ibelin. The interpretation of this depends on the emphasis. There is no doubt that as peers had to be liege men, mercenaries and other non-feudatories were excluded. It could be that Geoffrey was stressing the equality of the feudal class in law, irrespective of wealth, and was thereby reacting against the idea current in Jerusalem in the thirteenth century of a restricted peerage. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely in view of the statement to the effect that two-fifths of the men enfeoffed by Guy of Lusignan owed service as sergens à cheval, peerage was restricted to fief-holders owing knight service. In other words, one had to be both a knight and a liege man to be accepted as a peer by the nobility.

Wealth, however, was not a necessary characteristic of the noble class. Poor knights, according to Geoffrey Le Tor, were just as much peers in this sense as rich ones. Though Leontios Makhairas's story of the party given by the wealthy Nestorian merchant, Francis Lakha, for the king, his brothers and

1. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.483, 486, 502. If a knight challenged a sergeant he had first to dub him knight so that they fought as equals.

2. John of Ibelin, pp.115-16.


4. For this concept in respect of Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.16-20. For the question of whether the idea had any validity in Cyprus, see below, pp. 24-33.

5. See above, p.4.

twelve knights could be, at least in part, fictitious, it does illustrate the fact that non-nobles could be far richer than nobles.\textsuperscript{1} Although wealth was to be had through trade, there is little direct evidence to suggest that the nobility invested in commerce, though there is nothing to suggest that this was an un-knightly occupation. In the fourteenth century members of the Venetian Cornaro family were accepted into noble society and given the valuable fief of Episkopi where sugar was cultivated on a large scale;\textsuperscript{2} in 1300 we hear of a warehouse in Famagusta belonging to the lord of Arsur.\textsuperscript{3} But even if the nobility were dependent on the returns of their fiefs, to Ludolf of Sudheim the princes, barons, nobles and knights were the richest in the world.\textsuperscript{4} Taken as a whole, the nobles were bound together not only by their political and tenurial relationship with the crown, but also by the common class interests inherent in their privileges and caste, and based on their sense of social superiority.\textsuperscript{5}

A factor which is of fundamental importance for understanding the Cypriot nobility is that no vassal at any time during the two centuries under consideration held a castle or a city as his fief. Nicosia, Famagusta, Limassol and Paphos,

\begin{enumerate}
\item Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 92.
\item 'Actes passés à Famagouste de 1299 à 1301 par devant le notaire génois Lamberto di Sabuceto', ed. C. Desimoni, AOL, ii (1884), continued in ROL, i, (1893), no. 364.
\item Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.215.
\item John of Ibelin (p.187) epitomised this in the phrase: '... l'honour et la hautece que chevallers et chevalerie a et doit avoir sur totes autres manieres de genz.'
\end{enumerate}
the castle and town of Kyrenia, and the castles of St. Hilarion, Buffavento and Kantara were all held by the king. The fortresses of the Templars and Hospitallers at Castria and Kolossi were probably of little military significance. In Limassol the Genoese had a tower as did the Hospitallers whose house in Nicosia seems also to have been fortified. The crown seems to have followed throughout a policy of preventing the nobles from obtaining any strongholds.

Even in 1375 or 1376, at a period of great political weakness, Peter II resisted the demands of his favourite, Thibaut Belfarage, to be given the Armenian town of Gorhigos, then held by the Cypriots, as a fief. Consequently we never hear of a noble being besieged or using his fief as a centre for revolt.

There were no large territorial lordships in Cyprus comparable with those in Jerusalem, until the county of Karpasia was created in 1472. It is true

1. For descriptions see Enlart, L'art gothique, ii, pp.654-8, 683-95. The present keep at Kolossi is of mid-fifteenth century date; it is not clear what sort of fortress it replaced.
3. 'Gestes', p.680. It is possible that the fortress of Kolossi was indicated.
4. 'Gestes', p.686.
5. The towers at Pyla, Kiti, Alaminos and near Cape Akamas, some or all of which might have been controlled by vassals, seem to belong to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries. Enlart, L'art gothique, ii, pp.666-71.
6. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 565-7, see paras. 568-77. The king's refusal led to Thibaut murdering one of the royal counsellors, and this in turn resulted in his own downfall.
7. For lordships in Jerusalem see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.25-8.
8. See L. de Mas Latrie, 'Les comtes du Carpas', BEC, xli (1880), pp.376-7. The unsupported statement in one manuscript of 'Eracles' (Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.595) that Almery of Lusignan was given the 'conté de Baphe (Paphos)' by his brother Guy in about 1193 could be a confusion due to Almery's position as count of Jaffa ('Jaffe') at that time. The 'county of Paphos' is otherwise unknown.
that vassals often held villages as fiefs and the narrative sources sometimes described them as being the lords of these places, but closer examination shows that this was normally only a method of distinguishing the individual vassal from another of the same name.\(^1\) What is more, it appears that not even the leading vassals had rights of jurisdiction similar to those of their Jerusalemite counterparts. John of Jaffa, with reference to Jerusalem, had much to say about lords with rights of court, coins et juste, whereas Philip of Novara, writing primarily for Cyprus, mentioned these rights only once.\(^2\) Had these rights existed in Cyprus, the greater vassals would have been able to authenticate their own subinfeudations and exercise high justice over the inhabitants of their fiefs, but there is no evidence they did so; indeed, no charter of enfeoffment for rear vassals has survived. The lord's rights of jurisdiction probably did not extend beyond his seigneurial rights over the peasantry on his estates, or beyond limited powers over his own vassals, who, as liege men of the crown,\(^3\) most likely preferred to take their suits direct to the High Court.

There were, however, many holders of Jerusalemite lordships with interests

1. For example in the first decade of the fourteenth century we find John of Brie, lord of Paradisi, John of Brie, lord of Pistaki and John of Brie, regularly denoted as the 'son of Bohemond'. *Chronique d'Amadi*, pp. 283, 269, 305, 315, 333, 340, 359, 392. In the third quarter of the fourteenth century there was a Thomas of Montolif, lord of Klirou, who is distinguished from his name-sake, the auditor. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 108, 119, 147, 190, 200, 201, 320, 326. The unofficial nature of the designation of particular individuals as lord of a particular village is stressed by the fact that formal documents did not do this.


in Cyprus during the thirteenth century. Cremont, titular lord of Bethsan, seems to have made Cyprus his home early in that century,¹ and at the same time Walter, lord of Caesarea, was constable of Cyprus.² After the fall of the Christian states on the mainland, the heirs of the princes of Galilee, counts of Jaffa, and lords of Beirut and Arsura are found settled in the island. They remained there until the families became extinct in the male line, Galilee apparently after 1316, Beirut in 1326, Arsura in 1373 and Jaffa at about the same time.³ Amaury of Lusignan, lord of Tyre, a younger brother of Henry II, was given Tyre as an apance;⁴ after his death in 1310 his heirs lived mostly in Armenia and at least one of them used Amaury's title.⁵

During the fourteenth century various Jerusalemite titles were revived for members of the royal family or four prominent vassals. Hugh IV created his son Peter count of Tripoli and another son, John, prince of Antioch.⁶ Peter II was

1. Gremont is known in Jerusalem from documents of 1198 and 1206, but witnessed charters in Cyprus from 1210. See below, pp.449-50. In 1217 'Gautier de Bessan et son nevo Gremont, seignor de Bessan' came with Hugh I to Acre. 'Eracles', ii, p.322 (ms. 'A').

2. Walter was constable of Cyprus from 1210 if not earlier (see below, p. 420) and inherited Caesarea a few years later. For his career, see J.L. La Monte, 'The Lords of Caesarea in the Period of the Crusades', Speculum, xxii (1947), pp.154-6.

3. See below, pp.456, 460-61, 468-9, 473.

4. 'Gestes', p.804. The grant was made by 1290, for in that year Amaury was addressed as lord of Tyre by the pope. Nicolas IV, Registre, ed. E. Langlois (Paris, 1886-1905), nos. 4387, 4392, 4400.

5. In 1336 Guy, later king of Armenia (Constantine II), was addressed as lord of Tyre by the pope. Benedict XII, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, no. 820.

6. It appears that these creations were before 1346, and that the belief that Hugh's eldest son, Guy, was prince of Galilee is erroneous. See J. Richard, 'Patrie d'Orient latin: Les quatre baronnes des royaumes de Jérusalem et de Chypre', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, sér. 4, xxvii (1950), p.85 note 1.
Table 1. The Cypriot royal family in the second half of the fourteenth century to illustrate the grants of titular lordships.
also made count of Tripoli in his father's life-time and the succession of both Peters with this title led one near contemporary to assert that it was the normal title for the heir apparent. James I's son Janus, however, was known as prince of Antioch before his accession. The reason for this is that Prince John of Antioch's son James did not inherit his father's title, but was created count of Tripoli in his father's life-time at the coronation of Peter II in 1372. By 1395 James had been succeeded as count by his son John. James, count of Tripoli, is an obscure figure, and was overshadowed by his bastard half-brother, John, who was created lord of Beirut by James I. It is possible that the close association of the two titles, Antioch and Tripoli, with the royal family arose from the fact that in the early fourteenth century the kings had evidently inherited

1. Peter is given this title in the narrative accounts of 1367 and 1368. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 214, 262, 264. The earliest documentary reference to Peter as count of Tripoli is in January 1369 in the preface to the official version of John of Jaffa's legal treatise. John of Ibelin, p.3.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 87.


4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326. He is wrongly called prince of Galilee by Hugh of Montolif in his list of prisoners in 1374. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.83.


6. Little is known of James, count of Tripoli, except that he was in exile in Genoa, married his cousin, the sister of Peter II, and was made to hand over some of his estates to his half-brother. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 326, 529, 542, 561, 615, 620, 623. See Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France, ed. G. Mollat (Paris, 1962-5), no. 2119. For John's title, see Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 615. In the 1390's he was busy as an ambassador to the West. See J. Richard, 'Le royaume de Chypre et le grand schisme à propos d'un document recemment découvert', Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres (1965).
them, and so they belonged to the royal family by inheritance rather than by escheat. ¹ Hugh of Lusignan, grandson of Hugh IV, was created prince of Galilee; though a chronicler recorded that he was not formally invested with this title until the capture of Alexandria in 1365, he was evidently using it earlier that year.²

The earliest known example of the revival of a Jerusalemite title for a knight not of the royal family dates to 1365, when John of Morf was created count of Edessa (Rohais).³ The title has passed to a Philip of Morf by 1389, but the genealogy of John's descendants is too obscure for the history of the title to be fully explained.⁴ In 1375 Renier Le Petit is found with the title of count of Jaffa.⁵ Unfortunately he and his family disappear from view at this date.

Whether the title was revived for his benefit or he inherited it through a marriage

---

¹. Lucia, the last ruler of Antioch-Tripoli, is known to have escaped the fall of Tripoli in 1289 ('Gestes', p.804), but I have found no references to her after this date. The title of 'countess of Tripoli' then appears to have been adopted by Maria of Antioch, once claimant to the crown of Jerusalem. See Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 91 note 5. On her death the only surviving descendants of Bohemond IV would have been the members of the Cypriot royal family.

². Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 172. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.254. For a précis of a document, now lost, of December 1364 which described Hugh as prince, see Mas Latrie, op. cit., II, p.253. Hugh died in 1379 without issue, leaving his cousin, Louis II of Bourbon as his heir; the title thereupon lapsed. See Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 60 note 2.

³. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 172.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Henry II</th>
<th>Hugh IV</th>
<th>Peter I</th>
<th>Peter II</th>
<th>James I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surviving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lines from</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13th cent.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galilee</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td>Arsur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tyre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of the royal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Gallilee</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of knightly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>families</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. A chart to show which titular lordships were in existence in any particular reign in the fourteenth century. (Titles in brackets indicate that the holder was not resident in Cyprus at this time.)

1. For Renier Le Petit, count of Jaffa, see pp. 20, 22.
between his family and the Ibelin counts of Jaffa who still held the title in 1367 is not known. James I revived five Jerusalemite titles: 1 John of Brie was made prince of Galilee, 2 John of Neuville, lord of Arsur, 3 John Gorap, lord of Caesarea, 4 Realer of Scolar, lord of Bethsan, 5 and Montolif of Verny, lord of Sidon. 6 All the vassals honoured in this way were distinguished royal servants, but there is no evidence that the new holders of these titles received the Cypriot estates of the former holders. 7 It is interesting to note, however, that a fifteenth-century count of Jaffa, James of Floury, had the same armorial bearings as the famous jurist and mid-thirteenth-century count of Jaffa, John of Ibelin. 8 From the mid-fourteenth century onwards, these titles, presumably with theoretical

3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.421. For his tomb dated 11 January 1390 (1391 n.s.) on which he is designated lord of Arsur, see Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicosienses, p.45 and plate X. The 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p.494) wrongly states that he was made lord of Caesarea.
7. None of the villages said to have been given to John of Brie, John of Neuville, or John Gorap by James I (Leontios Makhairas, i, para.620; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494; there are discrepancies between these lists) can be shown to have belonged to previous princes of Galilee, lords of Arsur or lords of Caesarea. There is no information on the fiefs in Cyprus of previous lords of Bethsan and Sidon.
8. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.129. None of James of Floury's estates (op. cit., pp.124-5) are known to have held by the Ibelin counts of Jaffa in the thirteenth century. See above, p.6 note 4.
rights over lands in Syria and Palestine, seem to have been regarded as
honorable decorations and their appeal lay in the sense of nostalgia for a by-gone
era that they aroused.

John of Jaffa singled out four Jerusalemite lordships as baronies, the
characteristics of each of which were that the holder, in addition to rights of
court, coins et justice, owed service of a hundred knights, possessed his own
constable and marshal, and, most significantly, could not be judged 'de son cors
ne de s'onor ne de son fié' except by his fellow barons. A barony could not be
divided among heiresses, nor was the widow to hold half a barony as her dower
as she would in the case of an ordinary fief. ¹ John was hesitant as to which
lordships comprised the four baronies. The first was the county of Jaffa and
Ascalon with the lordships of Ramleh, Mirabel and Ibelin;² the second was the
principality of Galilee; the third the lordship of Sidon with Caesarea and Bethsan,
and the fourth either the county of Tripoli, or the lordship of Cultrejordain - Crac,
Montreal and Hebron. John opted for Tripoli on the grounds that there were at
least a hundred knights there, whereas Cultrejordain had only sixty. He also

2. The full title of the counts of Jaffa was 'count of Jaffa and Ascalon and lord
   of Ramleh'. See for example, Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p. 178. The
   rights to Ibelin passed to Margaret of Caesarea and her heirs. John of Ibelin,
   pp. 108-9. The title of lord of Mirabel seems not to have been used after the
   late twelfth century.
3. This poses a number of problems. Possibly Caesarea and Bethsan were rear
   fiefs of Sidon, though the evidence for this is extremely doubtful; the three
   lordships combined owed the service of a hundred knights. John of Ibelin,
   p. 422. See Richard, 'Pairie', pp. 72-3.
mentioned that some people thought that the constable and seneschal of Jerusalem were peers *ex officio* but was himself doubtful about this. The concept of a noble rank above that of the great majority of the nobles, distinguished by important legal privileges, was not fully accepted in Latin Syria at any time, and the extent to which that concept was translated into reality, even in the mid-thirteenth century, when it had perhaps its widest currency, was not great.¹

It is worth considering whether this concept was in any way adopted in Cyprus. Jean Richard has suggested that possibly Cyprus had, in imitation of Jerusalem, four baronies of its own, and that from the time of the fall of the Christian states in Syria, the four Jerusalemite baronies were transferred there.²

It is true that in Cyprus in the fourteenth century, many of John of Jaffa's lordships, as well as the titular seneschals and constables of Jerusalem, continued to exist.³ The counts of Jaffa lasted until after 1375, and their title was revived about 1440.⁴ There were titular princes of Galilee until 1316, from c. 1364 to 1379 and from 1385.⁵ The lords of Sidon and the lords of Caesarea died out towards the end of the thirteenth century, and both titles were revived by James I in the late fourteenth.⁶ The titular lords of Bethsan lived in Cyprus until the

¹. For a full discussion of the concept of baronial peerage in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, pp.16-20. See also Richard, 'Pairie', pp.72-80.

². Richard, 'Pairie', pp.80-82.

³. See above, pp. 17-23; below, pp.435-41.


⁵. See above, pp.17, 20, 22.

⁶. J.L. La Monte, 'The Lords of Sidon in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Byzantion*, xvii (1944-5), p.211; La Monte, 'The Lords of Caesarea', pp.159-60. See above, p.22.
early years of the fourteenth century; Aygue of Bethsan, the leader of the supporters of Henry II in 1310, was a descendant of the senior branch of the family.¹ The title was revived by James I.² There were counts of Tripoli for most of the time from 1346 until after 1400.³ In the thirteenth century the heirs to the lordship of Oultrejouardaín were the lords of Toron, a title which came by marriage to the Montfort family.⁴ There is some evidence that Philip of Montfort, lord of Tyre and Toron (died 1270), regarded himself as a 'baron' of Jerusalem in the sense that John of Jaffa gave the term.⁵ Philip's heirs in the early fourteenth century were the titular lords of Beirut.⁶

At no time between 1291 and 1400 were there titular occupants of more than three of John of Jaffa's baronies. But, with the exception of Oultrejouardaín, all were revived at least once, as were Caesarea and Bethsan, which John had apparently regarded as components of the lordship of Sidon. This in itself, however, is insufficient to prove that there was a conscious policy of keeping John's four baronies in existence, or to suggest that in the fourteenth century the holders of these titular lordships possessed the legal privileges which had characterised the baronies. The problem with the term 'baron' is that it was

¹. See below, p. 450-51.
². See above, p. 22.
³. See above, p. 17, 19.
⁵. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p. 19.
not used exclusively in the technical sense as given by John of Jaffa. Often the word was used in a probably imprecise way, signifying magnate or powerful vassal, and its use does not necessarily mean that the man concerned enjoyed a restricted peerage or the other privileges. There are many references to 'barons and nobles', 'barons and knights' and other similar combinations, and there is no way of knowing in any particular instance whether this indicated that a careful distinction was being made between barons in the narrow sense and ordinary nobles, or whether the use of the phrase shows only that the writer recognised that there were differences of wealth and power within the feudal class.

The use in Cyprus of the term 'baron' before 1300 is noticeably uncommon, and there are no examples of particular individuals being described as barons. Philip of Novara, in his legal treatise, used the word only once, and then in the context of the Assise sur la ligee and its promulgation by King Amaury of Jerusalem.¹ Similarly the term is infrequent in his historical writings.² But this was not just a personal idiosyncrasy, for the term appears in only one Cypriot royal charter surviving from the thirteenth century.³ Almost the only examples of its use are in various Latin documents relating to title agreements and other church matters, presumably drafted by churchmen, and in letters to

2. See 'Gestae', pp. 667, 682 where in neither case was the term applied exclusively to Cypriots.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.612: '... assensu baronum et militum ac hominum ...'. This document embodied the outcome of the 1220 Limassol agreement on the status of the Greek church and on the tithes to be paid by Latins.
Cyprus from successive popes. The chronicle account of the negotiations leading to the compromise agreement in 1273 on the dispute over military service is the only example of the use of the term 'baron' denoting solely the barons of Cyprus in the thirteenth-century narrative sources written in the East.

There therefore seems to be no grounds for supposing the existence of a baronial peerage from the thirteenth-century materials and it is even possible that the term 'baron' was deliberately avoided owing to the awareness of its specific meaning in Jerusalem.

Early in the fourteenth century the use of the word 'baron' became commoner. Jean Richard has drawn attention to a document dated 1306 which contains the words:

In jujus rei testimonium sigillarum fecimus present
instrumentum nostro (i.e. Amaloury of Tyre's) magno
sigillo pendentce et quattuor alterum sigillorum quatuor
baronum ipsius regni Cypri ...


Richard was aware that this passage is not necessarily to be construed to mean that there were only four barons in Cyprus and by implication that these barons had the privileges described by John of Jaffa, but he does not rule out the possibility. The document is one of a series which owe their survival to the fact that they were taken to the papal court by an embassy sent in 1307 or 1308 to induce the pope to recognise Amaury of Tyre's position as governor of Cyprus. 1 Two others of the series exist both in French originals and in Latin translations; in each case the term 'baron' is absent in the French, but appears in the Latin proem. 2 But the document which contains the reference to four barons exists only in Latin. It is verbose, and its content is largely a repetition of one of the French documents; it explains why an undefined body calling its 'nos' has installed Amaury as governor and incorporates the text of an oath sworn by him on his appointment. Almost certainly it was drawn up with the purpose of impressing the pope with the justice of Amaury's cause. The language and style suggest that it was propaganda for use not in Cyprus, but at the papal court. 3 If the document was intended to impress readers outside Cyprus, the word 'baron' might only have been inserted for effect.

Though this document seemingly differentiates 'barones, milites feudatarii et alli

2. 'Texte officiel', p. 538, see pp. 543-41; 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p. 442.
3. The style is more like the papal chancery cursus than that of Latin documents produced in Cyprus. For the use of French and not Latin as a means of communication to the people, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 286.
homoines ligii', the original French document spoke only of 'hommes' and 'nous la communauté des hommes'.

This is not the only example of the use of the word 'baron' at this period. Barones are also referred to in the privilege granted to the Venetians in 1306, though this was probably no more than an echo of the brief from the Venetian Senate dated 1302 to the ambassadors who were commissioned to negotiate for a privilege. The 'Chronique d'Amadi', in its description of the events of 1306-1310, uses the word several times, though it is possible that on some occasions it has been introduced in the translating. From such phrases as 'baroni et pheudati', 'baroni et altrì cavagliieri', 'baroni et altrì homini', it is apparent that barons were regarded as a group within the feudal class. In 1308 some knights from Paphos tried to rise on behalf of the king, but the royalists at Limassol refused to support them as they were without '... alcun capo notabile, zoè alcuni de li baroni del seguito del re ...'. Baldwin of Ibelin was '... de li conseglieri del signor de Sur con li altri baroni sol segazi ...'. In 1310 the queen-mother had 'tutti li baroni del paese' attach their seals to a letter calling for the release of King Henry. Barons were therefore magnates and

2. 'Texte officiel', pp. 534, 538.
3. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.43. (The witnesses who include the 'barons' of the previous document are all described as 'nobiles milites'.) See 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.55.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 265.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 268.
7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 352.
counsellors and had seals, but even so it is difficult to see what criteria were used to distinguish them from ordinary knights.

The 1366 document witnessed by four barons also described Amaury of Tyre as 'nobilis baro'. The four were Aimery of Lusignan, constable of Cyprus, Ballian of Ibelin, prince of Galilee, John of Ibelin, lord of Arsur and Baldwin of Ibelin. These five were the only individuals actually described as 'barons' in the early fourteenth century. Only one, Ballian of Galilee, held a lordship classed by John of Jaffa as a barony. Of Henry II's brothers, Amaury had married an Armenian and Aimery is not known to have married; presumably they held appanages provided by their father or brother. Baldwin was the grandson of Baldwin, son of John of Ibelin, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, and seneschal of Cyprus in the mid-thirteenth century; probably he had inherited a share of the 'Old Lord's' Cyproi1 lands, and in addition the younger Baldwin's father had married the Rivet heiress. The Arsur branch of the Ibelin family had perhaps not originally held lands in Cyprus, but John probably inherited important estates through his mother, the granddaughter and eventual heiress of Gauvain of Chenchi. But Richard's suggestion that the four 'barons' were

---

2. Wrongly called marshal here.
3. In 1310 Aygue of Bethsan was styled 'capitanus baronum, fidelium millium et communitatum regni Cypri'. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.117, see p. 136. The 'Chronique d'Amadl' (p. 265) implies that in 1308 there were barons supporting the king; presumably Philip of Ibelin the seneschal, and perhaps John of Dampierre, Rupin of Montfort, and Aygue of Bethsan.
4. For Ballian, see below, p.473.
5. See below, p.99.
7. See below, p.454.
barons of Cyprus is not convincing, especially as five barons are mentioned in the document of 1366, and as on one occasion Baldwin of Ibelin tried to conjure the knights sent to arrest him as his peers. 1

With one exception 2 it is not until the 1390's that there are recorded instances of other feudatories described by name as 'barons'. In 1390 and 1395, James I, '... in presencia et consensu et voluntate infrascriptorum nostrorum baronum hominum ligtorum, altam regiam curiam Cypri faciendium secundum morem et consuetudinem dicti regni ...' 3 appointed procurators for royal business overseas. Almost certainly the wording and the list of feudatories were intended to give the maximum effect when the ambassadors presented their letters of appointment to the foreign governments, and therefore are not necessarily a trustworthy guide to institutions. 4 Each of the 'barons' named in these documents, with a single exception, 5 held either a titular lordship or a grand sergeantry. Among the lordships were the principality of Galilee and the county of Tripoli, but also the lordships of Caesarea, Bethsan and Beirut. It is clear that John of Jaffa's criteria for baronies was not being followed, especially since the 1390

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 238. The knights included Philip of Ibelin the Younger and John of Brie, lord of Paradisis.

2. John prince of Antioch is described as 'inclusus et potens baro' in a document of 1380. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantnum, ii, p.64.


4. For comparison, the qualification for being a member of the High Court was through being a liege man and not a baron as might perhaps be thought on the basis solely of the wording of the 1390 document; by contrast, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p. 423.

5. The exception was Alnard of Soissons, auditor of Cyprus. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.428.
document which named the lords of Caesarea and Bethsan as barons, did not similarly designate the lord of Sidon who was also mentioned. There are various other references to barons during the fourteenth century, but no more than a general distinction between the great men and the ordinary knights is suggested by them. There is no evidence for special legal privileges, including the right to be judged only by those men who enjoyed the same privileges, and none that any Cypriot vassal owed the services of a hundred knights.

It would appear, therefore, that John of Jaffa's views on baronies were not followed in Cyprus during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But contemporaries did recognize differences in social status within the feudal class, and this is reflected in official and unofficial records. We have seen examples of barons contrasted with knights: other documents of the fourteenth century contrast 'nobilis et potentissimus vir' with 'nobilis miles', 'magnificus vir' with


2. Jean Richard's suggestion that John of Jaffa's concept had some currency in the late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ('Palrie', pp. 86-8) does not bear examination; it appears to be based on the coincidence that in that period there were only four lordships (the county of Karpasia and the titular counties of Jaffa, Tripoli, and Edessa) and that on one occasion they were referred to as 'baronies'. See Mas Latrine, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p. 551.

'nobilis vir', or 'lautitus dominus' with 'egregius vir'. Almost always the more grandiose title is given to a member of the royal family, a seneschal or constable of Jerusalem or Cyprus, or the holder of a titular lordship. There is no reason to doubt that such men were privileged in terms of wealth, and that there was a strong sense of class distinction within the feudal caste, but there is no evidence for differing legal privileges.

The Cypriot nobility were strongly aware of their western origins. Generally they kept aloof from the indigenous population, though on one occasion in the fourteenth century the pope found it necessary to censure female members of noble families who had been attending Greek churches. Inter-marriage between the Latin nobility and non-Latin Cypriots is unknown before 1400. As a class, the feudatories exhibited many of the features of their counterparts in the West, and despite their contact with the alien culture and Greek institutions in government, commerce and agriculture, it is easier to find parallels than contrasts with western noble society. With the passage of time, the social development of the Cypriot feudal class kept pace with that of the West, and did not diverge on a course of its own.

Some Cypriot families, for example the Montbéliards, Dampierre and Montforts, were related to important noble houses in western Europe. It is hard to know exactly how close were the contacts between different branches of the same


family, although the interest of contemporary historians in the East in Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and his family, was probably partly due to the fact that another branch of this family was prominent in the Latin East. As late as 1339, we hear of John, cardinal bishop of Porto, asking the pope to write to Hugh IV on behalf of his relative Eschiva of Montfort, the last member of the family in Cyprus. How Cardinal John and Eschiva were related is not clear, but the fact that he began his career as a canon of Narbonae and was later bishop of Toulouse, suggests that he might have been connected to the descendants of the leader of the Albigensian Crusade.

The Cypriot knights were almost certainly influenced by knights who came from the West on crusade or as pilgrims; for their part, western knights saw the Cypriots as their equals. John of Joinville described Guy of Ibelin, constable of Cyprus in the mid-thirteenth century, as 'one of the most accomplished knights that I have ever seen'. High praise indeed from a marshal of France! In externals, Cypriot chivalry matched that of the West: the knights used characteristically western heraldic devices; in the fourteenth century, the affair of Peter I and Florimond of Lesparre reflected the

---

1. 'Eracles', ii, pp. 450-51, 460, 469; 'Gestes', pp. 759-62, 800.

2. Benedict XII, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, no. 2500. For John's career, see C. Eubel et al., Hierarchia catholica medii aevi sive summorum Pontificum, S.R.E. Cardinallium, ecclesiastarum antistitum, 7 vols. (Münster, 1913-68), i, pp. 16, 48, 320, 488.


4. For examples see Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Neoossienses, plates passim. Cypriot heraldry has never been systematically investigated; for the royal arms, see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp. 69-72.
exaggerated ideals of chivalric honour of the period; Peter I's Order of the Sword was founded at about the same time as the celebrated orders of chivalry in the West. Peter's Order lasted until the end of the Lusignan dynasty, though its importance for the Cypriot nobility, as opposed to foreign knights who were honoured by admission to its membership, is not known.

Literary tastes seem to have been similar among the ruling classes of both Cyprus and the West. The Latin East is not noted for its contribution to literature, but Philip of Novara's memoirs, with the hatreds and dissiminations of Aimery Barlais and his faction matched by the love, generosity and wisdom of John of Beirut, and with the celebrations and jousts, especially in the early part, are reminiscent of contemporary epics of Roland or Arthur. Philip also introduced elements from the fabliaux into his narrative of the political events of the early 1230's. There is no doubt that he intended his work to be read by people who would enjoy finding themselves, their relations and their enemies cast in familiar epic or comic roles. As a work of literature, Philip's memoirs are without parallel in the Latin East, and they reflect in an original way the

---


2. According to William of Machaut (pp. 11-16, see pp. 277-8) who gives the impression that the members were mostly non-Cypriots, the Order was founded by Peter before his accession.

3. In particular, see 'Gestes', pp. 672-80 passim. For specifically literary allusions see 'Gestes', pp. 672, 702, and see p. 793.

tastes of western Europe.¹

Another work by Philip of Novara, *Les .lili. tenz d'age d'ome*,² expresses his own ideas and those current in noble society on the correct behaviour for people of gentle birth. This treatise on morals seems to have been readily accepted in France, although there is no positive evidence for Philip ever having been there. The society which Philip knew in Cyprus and on which the work is a commentary was so like French society that modern writers have considered it to reveal the conditions of life in France itself, and, indeed, it contains nothing peculiarly Cypriot.³

One activity of western feudatories which was taken up with enthusiasm by the Cypriot nobles was the chase. Contemporaries noted their passion for hunting with dogs, leopards and falcons.⁴ The science of falconry belonged

---

1. The literary characteristics of Philip's work can best be appreciated by reading the text as restored by Kohler: Philip of Novara, *Mémoires, 1218-1243* (Paris, 1913). In the fourteenth century, the story of Queen Eleanor and John of Morf and the death of John Viscount has the makings of a tale of courtly love. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 239-49, 251-8; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 420-2.


essentially to the Arabs and Byzantines, and the Cypriot nobility used, and learnt from, native Cypriot falconers. In the early thirteenth century, Gauvain of Chenichi was held in honour by the Emperor Frederick II because he 'savait mout d'oizeaus'. The late fifteenth century writer on falconry, Jean de Francières, used in his treatise two works on falconry written in Cyprus, one by the falconer of John, prince of Antioch, and the other by the falconer of one of the Lusignan kings, and so provides one of the few instances of Arab and Greek science being transmitted to the West through the Latin East.

The picture of the Cypriot nobility in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is that of a basically military class owing its dominant position in society to birth and privilege. It was a class that was conscious of its origins both in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and in the West, and of its own alien character, that was conservative but not immune to change, and that was homogeneous but aware of social divisions within itself.

1. For Frederick's interest in falconry, see T.C. Van Cleve, The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, Immutator Mundii (Oxford, 1972), pp. 313-16.

Chapter 2

THE LATIN SETTLEMENT OF CYPRUS

Guy of Lusignan purchased Cyprus and became its lord in April 1192.¹ His career as king of Jerusalem, and his struggle to maintain his position after the death of his wife in 1190 are well known. He had shown himself to be both brave and foolish, and, though early in 1192 the majority of the Palestinian lords obliged Richard of England, hitherto Guy's patron, to accept Conrad of Montferrat as king-designate, Guy was not without support.² He had enough followers for him to be regarded as an effective lord of an island which had just exhibited its capacity for rebellion, and sufficiently influential to raise a substantial loan as a down-payment to Richard.³

As lord of Cyprus, Guy never lost his ambition to recover what was left of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The murder of Conrad made little difference, as Conrad's successor, Henry of Champagne, had no intention of giving way to Guy. Richard supported Henry, and, according to one source, is said to have

---

1. After the rising against the Templars on the Saturday in Holy week (5 April, see Mas Latrè, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.7 note 3), but before the assassination of Conrad of Montferrat (28 April, see S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades (Cambridge 1951-4), iii, pp.64).

2. For Guy's career, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.106-20. See also Runciman, History of the Crusades, ii, pp.424-73, iii, pp.18-64 passim.

promised to give Henry Cyprus as Guy had defaulted in his payments; ¹ before his departure from the East in October 1192, Richard gave Henry his rights to the balance outstanding, though apparently none of it was paid. ² Even before Richard had departed, Guy was scheming with the Pisans to recover Tyre and then Acre; nothing was achieved, but the feelings of hostility between Henry and Guy were thereby increased. ³ After Richard's departure, Henry took action against the Pisans and seized Guy's brother Almery of Lusignan, the constable of Jerusalem, who was regarded as having been implicated in the plot. Thanks to the attitude of the Military Orders and his own vassals, Henry was obliged to release Almery almost immediately, and he left to join his brother in Cyprus. ⁴

Guy died after 18 August 1194, ⁵ and his brother Almery was elected to succeed him. ⁶ Almery's most important act was to arrange for the island to be created a kingdom with himself as the first king. The crown was obtained from the Emperor Henry VI who was at that time planning his crusade. The archbishops of Trani and Briandis brought Almery the royal regalia, apparently in April or May 1196, and he seems to have styled himself king from that time.

---

1. 'Eracles', ii, p.193 (ms. 'D').

2. The same sum, 60,000 besants, was outstanding when Henry and Almery came to an agreement which included cancelling the debt. 'Eracles', ii, pp.191, 209 (ms. 'A').

3. 'Eracles', ii, pp.194, 199 (ms. 'D').

4. 'Eracles', ii, pp.202-3 (ms. 'D'). For a garbled account of the same incident, see 'Eracles', ii, p.208 (ms. 'A').


The coronation was postponed until September 1197 as the emperor had intended to be present in person, although his death prevented this. ¹

Aimery's reason for wanting to be made king was said to have been fear of the designs of the Byzantine emperor. ² By acquiring a crown he would add to his prestige, and, while submitting to the suzerainty of the Western Empire, he would gain an ally in the West who was undoubtedly hostile to the Byzantines.

In retrospect it seems unlikely that the Angeli could have recovered the province which had been out of imperial control for about ten years at the time of Aimery's accession, but the fears were probably real enough at the time: the Byzantines still held Adalia and a number of other ports on the southern coast of Asia Minor and the exploits of a Greek pirate operating from one of these ports show how vulnerable Cyprus could be; ³ furthermore, there is no doubt that during the 1190's the Byzantine emperors were planning the recovery of Cyprus, even though no expedition was actually mounted. ⁴ Imperial suzerainty over Cyprus was important, for not only did it give the Western emperor the right to interfere in the island's affairs, but it also meant that there was no question of Cyprus being regarded as a dependency of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

---

1. See Mas Latrìe, Hist. de Chypre, i, pp.126-8; Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.48-9. Aimery was described as king of Cyprus by the pope in letters of December 1196 and January 1197. Mas Latrìe, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp. 601, 605.

2. 'Ericals', ii, p.209 (ms. 'A').

3. 'Ericals', ii, pp.205-7 (ms. 'D').

A reconciliation between Henry of Champagne and Aimery was achieved in 1197, made possible now that Guy of Lusignan, Conrad of Montferrat, and probably Ballian of Ibelin, a leading opponent of Guy, were dead.1 Aimery's three sons were to marry Henry's daughters, their dower taking the form of the cancellation of the debt owing on the purchase of Cyprus and the return to Aimery of his former Jerusalemite fief, the county of Jaffa.2 In a sense this agreement marks the end of the faction fighting which had been going on since the time of Baldwin IV. Henry seems to have conceded far more than Aimery in this agreement, and it is likely that his concessions were prompted by the approaching end of the five-year truce negotiated by Richard with the Muslims in September 1192;3 hostilities had already begun before he returned from Cyprus to Acre.4 Aimery had not taken seisin of Jaffa before the Muslims began to invest the town. A Cypriot garrison sent under the command of Raynald Barlais was ineffectual and Henry of Champagne's efforts to raise a

1. For the date of Ballian's death, see J.L. La Monte, 'John d'Ibelin, the old Lord of Beirut, 1177-1236', Byzantion, xii (1937), p.423.

2. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, i, pp.142-3; Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.57-8. Their children were apparently all young, and owing to the early deaths of two of Aimery's sons and one of Henry's daughters, the only marriage to take place was that of Hugh I and Alice of Champagne in 1208. Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.75.

3. Runciman, History of the Crusades, iii, p.73.

4. 'Eracles', ii, p.214 (ms. 'D').
relieving force were cut short by his own death; as a result Jaffa was taken. 1

With the decision to marry Henry's widow, Isabella, to Aimery, the history of Cyprus entered a new phase. 2 King in his own right of Cyprus and king consort of Jerusalem, Aimery never regarded the two kingdoms as united, and after his death in 1205 they passed to different heirs. There are few references to the island in the narrative sources of these years: apart from some naval activities, 4 the only recorded incident concerning Cyprus in this period is the claim to the island advanced by the son-in-law of the former emperor of Cyprus, Isaac Comnenus. 5

1. Ernoul, pp.305-7; 'Eracles', ii, pp.218-21 (ms. 'A'), pp.219-20 (ms. 'D'). The 'D' ms. called the Christian commander William Barlais, but this is unsupported. See 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.428. As the expiry of the truce and the death of Henry both date to September 1197 and the account shows that the reconciliation took place not long before this, the reconciliation must date to 1197 also.

2. For this marriage see Runciman, History of the Crusades, iii, pp.94-5.

3. The only document in which Aimery appears to be making a grant of Cypriot lands and rents and giving trading concessions in the High Court of Jerusalem is a fabrication. H.E. Mayer, Marseilles Levantehandel und ein akkonenisches Fälscheratelier des 13. Jahrhunderts (Tübingen, 1972), pp.187-8, see pp.43-9, 101-12.


5. Ernoul, pp.352-3; 'Eracles', ii, pp.256-7. The claimant has recently been identified as Thierry, bastard son of Count Philip of Flanders. He had come to the East with those participants in the Fourth Crusade who had not been diverted to Constantinople. Rüdt de Collenberg, 'L'empereur Isaac', pp.171-2.
Few of the knights who accompanied Guy to Cyprus immediately after his purchase of the island can be positively identified. The names of the leading Cypriot vassals in the first decade of Latin rule are known from the witness lists of the five surviving charters from that period. Only one (August 1194) was issued by Guy; Aimery issued two as lord of Cyprus (September 1195 and May 1196), one as king of Cyprus (Nov. 1197), and one as king of Jerusalem and Cyprus (March 1201). These charters provide the names of twenty knightly witnesses, including Aimery of Lusignan who witnessed his brother's charter in 1194. They indicate a considerable degree of continuity among the leading vassals at the Cypriot High Court in this period, and it is possible that most of these knights were among those who accompanied Guy to Cyprus in or soon after 1192. The witness lists show few changes after Aimery became king of Jerusalem - there is only one newcomer in the 1201 charter - and so it would seem probable that at least in the earlier part of Aimery's reign he was not rewarding his Jerusalemite supporters with fiefs in the island.

1. See table 3.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp.598-9; Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani MXCVMII-MCCCXCI, compiled R. Röhrich (Innsbruck, 1893-1904), no.723. (Röhrich wrongly described Aimery as king.)
4. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.30; Reg. Hier., no.729. That the privilege was issued by Aimery and not by Guy of Lusignan as indicated in the version as printed by Mas Latrie, see Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, 1, p.361 note 2.
5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp.606-7; Reg. Hier., no.737.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1194</th>
<th>1195 (Reg. 723)</th>
<th>1196 (Reg. 729)</th>
<th>1197 (Reg. 737)</th>
<th>1201 (Reg. 780)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almery of Lusignan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey of Toroa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Martin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almery of Rivet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier of Gibelet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Le Bel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odo of Mayre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of La Baume</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Bethsan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynard Barlais¹</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alelm Le Bel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Neuville</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Usserius</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Bethsan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynald of Soissons</td>
<td></td>
<td>(?) 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam of Antioch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Paphos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland of La Baume</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias of Robore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostain Aymar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Lay witnesses to privileges granted by Guy and Almery of Lusignan in Cyprus. (The numbers in columns refer to the sequence in the witness lists; a 'x' indicates that the man is mentioned in the document but not a witness.)


2. The 1196 document gives Walter 'de Berl' for Walter 'Le Bel'.


4. The 1195 document gives 'Alanus de le Bel' which I take to be an error for Alelm le Bel. See Reg. Hier., nos. 683, 690, 697, 729.


6. The 1196 document gives Raynald of 'Sespes' which could be a bad reading for Raynald of Soissons.

7. The 1201 document gives a 'Raynaldus de Balma' who could be identical with the Roland of La Baume of 1197. I prefer the name Roland - if indeed they are identical - for though less common than Raynald it was held by a later member of the same family. 'Gestes', p.865; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.269, 346, 366, 382.
With the exception of Aimery of Lusignan, little is known about the careers of these Cypriot vassals between 1192 and 1205. Renier of Gibelet was the envoy to Henry VI who negotiated the elevation of Cyprus to a kingdom. The distribution of his fiefs among his sons was discussed much later by Philip of Novara, who named him, together with Rostain Aymar, in his list of notable pleaders of the past. Raynaud Barlais's command at Jaffa in 1197 has already been mentioned. Baldwin and Philip of Bethsan were presumably among the 'oil de Bessan' who arranged the reconciliation between Aimery and Henry of Champagne. The only other Latin Cypriot mentioned in the accounts of these years is Raymond of Bone Done, a Cypriot naval commander in the mid-1190's; it is, however, not clear whether he was a vassal and he does not appear on the witness lists.

On the other hand, the earlier history of some of the vassals is known. Not surprisingly several were with Guy of Lusignan at the siege of Acre. Six, Aimery of Lusignan, Humphrey of Toron, Hugh Martin, Alelm and Walter Le Bel and Renier of Gibelet, witnessed charters issued by Guy during the siege or in

4. See above, pp.41-2.
5. 'Eracles', ii, p.213 (ms. 'D').
6. 'Eracles', ii, p.207 (ms. 'D'). He had commanded the ships which brought Richard on the last part of his journey to Acre in 1191. 'Eracles', ii, p.170 (ms. 'A'). It is not clear whether he had come from England or had come with Guy of Lusignan to Cyprus to meet Richard and was then put in charge of the ships to pilot them into anchorages with which he would have been familiar.
the period between the capture of Acre and his purchase of Cyprus.¹

Humphrey of Toron, though he only appears in one of these documents, is known from other sources to have been active as a supporter of Guy and had accompanied him when he met Richard in Cyprus in the summer of 1191.²

By January 1192 Hugh Martia was Guy's marshal, and Walter Le Bel was viscount of Acre.³

Two other witnesses to Guy's charters at Acre may well have gone to Cyprus in 1192 though direct evidence for this is lacking. 'Galganus de Cheneche', one of the most frequent subscribers in this series of documents, is likely to have been an ancestor of Gauvain of Chenichi, a leader of the pro-imperial party in Cyprus in the 1220's and early 1230's. Raymond Babin, a member of a family which had been in the Kingdom of Jerusalem since before the middle of the twelfth century,⁴ could equally have been the ancestor of the important Cypriot knightly family of that name. The Babins are first known in Cyprus in 1220,⁵ but as there are no references to them in any source between 1190 and 1220 it is possible that they had come to Cyprus with Guy in 1192.⁶

¹ See table 4.
² Hill, History of Cyprus, i, p.319; Runciman, History of the Crusades, iii, pp.44-5, 59-60.
³ Reg. Hier., nos. 698, 701.
⁴ Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.513.
⁵ Reg. Hier., no. 938.
⁶ Guy's older brother, Geoffrey, to whom he had intended that Cyprus should pass on his death ('Eacles', ii, p.203 (ms. 'D')) might have gone to Cyprus with him in 1192, but apparently he left the East not long after the end of the Third Crusade. There is no positive evidence that he had fiefs in Cyprus, though he is not known to have been in the West before 1196. S. Painter, The Lords of Lusignan in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', Speculum, xxxii (1957), pp.42, 44. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1189</th>
<th>1189</th>
<th>1190</th>
<th>1190</th>
<th>1190</th>
<th>1190</th>
<th>1191</th>
<th>1192</th>
<th>1192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
<td>(Reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey of Lusignan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimery of Lusignan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan of Belin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Tiberias</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Tiberias</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Le Tor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaganus of Chenich</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alein Le Bel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazellus of Tyre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Le Tor (jun.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joscelin of Edessa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier of Gibelet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelins of Luca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond of Nefin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad of Montferrat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey of Toron</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynal of Sidon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Babin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Martin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Le Bel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bourg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Cyprus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Chamberlain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Morosinus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Lay witnesses to privileges granted by Guy of Lusignan during and after the siege of Acre (1189-92). (The numbers in the columns refer to the sequence in the witness lists.)

1. Geoffrey Le Tor and Geoffrey Le Tor junior appear together only once; they are not otherwise differentiated and so there is no way of knowing which in fact witnessed. Except in the document where both appear I have treated every appearance of a Geoffrey Le Tor as if it is the elder Geoffrey, but this is simply for convenience. See below, p. 474.

In the document of April 1190 Geoffrey Le Tor is given as Geoffrey 'le Fort'.

2.
By no means all who witnessed Guy's grants at Acre were his supporters in his struggle with Conrad; in fact, Conrad of Montferrat himself and two of his leading supporters from 1190, Ballian of Ibelin and Raynald of Sidon, were, at different times, among the witnesses. None of the others can be linked for certain with Conrad's party, but several evidently chose to remain in Palestine and are found subscribing grants made by Henry of Champagne. These included not only Ballian of Ibelin and Raynald of Sidon, but also Hugh and William of Tiberias, Antelminus of Luca, Thomas Chamberlain, and possibly John Bourg. Baldwin of Cyprus and Philip Morosinus appear as vassals of Juliana of Caesarea in a document of 1197. Raymond of Neflin subsequently reappeared in the county of Tripoli, and John


2. Reg. Hier., nos. 707, 709 ....

3. Reg. Hier., nos. 707, 709 ....

4. Reg. Hier., nos. 707, 709 ....

5. Reg. Hier., no. 707. See 'Eracles', ii, p.194 (ms. 'D') where he is seen campaigning with Richard and Ballian of Ibelin after Conrad's murder.

6. Reg. Hier., nos. 707, 713 ....


Le Tor, the heir of the two Geoffreys, was a vassal in the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the early years of the thirteenth century. 1

It would therefore be wrong to see the survivors of Guy's party at the siege of Acre as being identical with the earliest Cypriot vassals, though some did accompany him to Cyprus. Other early settlers in the island originated, like the Lusignans, in Poitou and some could have been members of Guy or Aimer's household since their arrival in the East. Raynald Barlais was undoubtedly of Poltevin origins and probably was related to the family of the Lords of Montreuil-Bellay. 2 According to the 'Lignages', Hugh Martin was another Poltevin of Guy's affinity:

Hugh Martin came from overseas with King Guy. When King Guy bought Cyprus, he came with him to Cyprus, and brought his own two nephews, sons of his two sisters, with him; one was named Fulk of Yver and the other, Lawrence of Plessi. 3

Though 'Martin' could be no more than a patronymic, it is possible that Hugh was related to some of the many men with that surname known in Poitou in the twelfth century. 4 Laurence of Plessi, the ancestor of the Morf family, and Fulk Yver were likely to have been connected with people with the same surnames

1. See below, p.476.
2. 'Eracles', ii, p.219 (ms. 'D'). Montreuil-Bellay is on the borders of Poitou and Anjou. For its lords see for example, 'Cartae et chronica de obedientia Mairomno', ed. P. Marchegay and E. Mabille, Chroniques des églises d'Anjou, ii (Paris, 1869), pp.68, 72, 80-83; Cartulaires et chartes de l'abbaye de l'Abisle, ed. B. Ledain (Poitiers, 1895), pp. 22, 27, 88.
3. 'Lignages', p.472.
4. See for example, Cartulaires et chartes de l'abbaye de l'Abisle, pp.34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47.
also living in Poitou in the twelfth century. The 'Lignages' indicate that Massé of Gaurelle, the father of Adam of Antioch, was from Poitou and that he was related in some way to Guy. Perhaps too the William of Gaurelle who had owned property in Nicosia before 1205 was a member of this family.

But if the Barlaizes, Morfs and Antiochs were of Poitou origin, perhaps not long in the East before 1192, it is nevertheless true that a larger proportion of these early Cypriot settlers can be seen to have been established on the Syrian mainland before Saladin’s conquests. Only two, Aimery of Lusignan, constable of Jerusalem from 1179, and Humphrey of Toron, heir presumptive to Cultrejouardin, were great lords, and it should be noted that Humphrey’s landed inheritance was left in Muslim hands after the Third Crusade. In a list of military services due in the Kingdom of Jerusalem dating from the period immediately before 1187, Walter Le Bel is included among the knights of the lordship of Acre, and Raynauld of Soissons as a knight of Nablus; in 1183 Raynauld witnessed a grant made by Guy of Lusignan as count of Jaffa and


2. 'Lignages', p. 473. It is also possible that an otherwise unknown Guy Le Petit, founder of the Cypriot family of that name, was another Poitou who came with Guy. 'Lignages', p. 474. Care is always needed in using the 'Lignages' especially when referring to the twelfth century, and it is possible that their account of the origins of these families was fabricated with the intention of giving later members respectable ancestries.


4. John of Ibelin, p. 425. The list is given by John of Jaffa at the end of his law book. For a discussion of this source, see Small, Crusading Warfare, pp. 89–90.
Ascalon. 1 Odo of Mayre may be identical with 'Eude dou Merle', another knight of Nablus on this list, 2 but, equally, he could be the 'Odo de Mayre' or 'Maire' who appeared as a vassal of the prince of Antioch at various dates between 1177 and 1201. 3 Elias of Robore witnessed a grant made by Raymond of Tripoli in his capacity as lord of Tiberias at Nablus in 1179, and this would appear to indicate that he was a knight in the lordship of Tiberias. 4

Nine others of these early Cypriot knights could have been related to fief-holders on the mainland. Alelm Le Bel was Walter Le Bel's brother. 5 Renier of Gibelet is likely to have been descended from, or identical with, a Renier of Gibelet, son of Stephen, who appeared in documents of 1160 and 1161 as a vassal of the lord of Caesarea. 6 William and Roland of La Baume, who were brothers, could have been descended from a Raymond or Peter-Raymond of La Baume who was a witness to two documents in Tripoli in 1139. 7

---

and probably Baldwin of Bethsan were younger sons of Gremont, lord of Bethsan. Baldwin Usserius or Hostarius may have been related to a Renier Hostarius who is known to have held land in the lordship of Nablus during the reign of Guy of Lusignan as king of Jerusalem, and Baldwin of Neuville may have been descended from 'Guago de Novavilla' who witnessed a document of King Amaury in 1168. Adam of Antioch's mother had lived in Antioch.

This analysis is significant as it shows that several of the early settlers of Cyprus were dispossessed knights from Jerusalem. Besides Outrejouardin, Nablus, Bethsan and Tiberias were not re-occupied during the Third Crusade. The traditions concerning the Latin Settlement of Cyprus preserved in the East are in this way partly confirmed. According to these traditions, Guy, advised by Saladin to give away his newly gained resources in Cyprus, sent to Armenia and the other Christian states on the mainland offering fiefs and properties to any who would come. The knights and burgesses who had been dispossessed in the Muslim conquests came to Cyprus in large numbers, and Guy gave the knights and sergeants fiefs, provided for the widows and orphans of knightly families, and gave town properties to the burgesses. In this way 300 knights

1. Du Cange, *Les familles d'Outremer*, p.252. See 'Lignages', pp.463, 467. Jean Richard ('Le comte de Tripoli dans les chartes du fonds des Porcellet', *BEC*, cxxx (1972), p.352) has suggested that Philip was not Gremont's son, but his son-in-law, Philip Le Roux; there seems to be insufficient grounds for this theory.


4. 'Lignages', p.473.
and 200 sergeants were settled in Cyprus.¹

That Guy should have gone to Saladin for advice has a somewhat improbable air, though Saladin's attitude and response as recorded by the historians would fit in with his 'chivalrous' standards.² The policy Guy followed, however, was sound, for the more Latins who could be given a livelihood in Cyprus, the more men there would be with an interest in seeing to it that the Lusignan regime survived and prospered. It is not possible to distinguish those knights who accompanied Guy to Cyprus as members of his entourage from those who came to the island in the hope of being given fiefs following a general appeal for support. Probably the leading Cypriots, the sort of men who would witness the charters, had a special relationship with Guy, and we have seen that some at least were with him at Acre or had their origins in Poitou. Guy's adherents in 1192 who went with him to Cyprus would have been among the leading Cypriot vassals and doubtless were well rewarded, but they cannot have been strong numerically; hence the appeal for settlers described in the chronicles. According to one source, the knights who came following Guy's appeal were given fiefs worth four hundred white bezants annually.³ It is not inconceivable that Cypriot resources could provide for them, though even in a situation in which there would have been a number of landless knights in the East, it would be surprising if Guy could have found as

---

1. Ernou, pp.286-7; 'Eracles', ii, pp.188-9 (ms. 'C'), pp.188-90 (ms. 'D'), pp.187-9 (ms. 'G'). See 'Eracles', ii, pp.191-2 (ms. 'A').


3. 'Eracles', ii, p.192 (ms. 'A').
many as three hundred in the territories remaining to the Christians on the Syrian mainland. Guy is said to have given away so much that he only left himself the equivalent of twenty knights' fees. Some versions conclude their account of the settlement of Cyprus by describing how Almery, finding himself poor and the value of the lands given by Guy as fiefs worth twice what had been thought, summoned the knights and, appealing to their loyalty to himself, persuaded them to return part of their fiefs to him. The passage ends laconically: Almery '... que par force, que par amors ...' in this manner amassed an annual royal revenue of 300,000 besants by 1205.

By comparison with the occupation by the Crusaders and Venetians of the former Byzantine territories after the Fourth Crusade, the Latin settlement of Cyprus was easy. Between them Richard of England and the Templars seem to have broken any will on the part of the indigenous population to resist. This had two important consequences: so far as is known, the rulers of Cyprus were not compelled to reach agreements with the former Greek landowners by

1. Eroll, pp.287-8; 'Eracles', ii, pp.189-91 (mss. 'C', 'G').

2. 'Eracles', ii, p.190 (ms. 'G'). The other versions vary slightly in their phrasing.

3. 'Eracles', ii, p.190-91 (ms. 'G') is unique in giving the figure as 200,000 besants. For an alternative explanation of the increased income, see below, pp.291-2.

4. The Greek church resisted domination by the Latin hierarchy (see Hill, History of Cyprus, iii, chap. xvi), but there were no popular rebellions in the years immediately after 1192. The earliest reference to peasant disorders is in 1373. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 445.
which Greeks were assimilated into the feudal system, and military circumstances did not require them to enfeoff their followers with castles. 1

If we take the examples of the Venetian occupation of Crete and the Frankish occupation of the Morea, it is at once noticeable that the conquests were much more protracted. In the Morea it was several decades before the Byzantines were dislodged altogether, and even then the complete mastery of the peninsula was of short duration, and in Crete, though the conquest of the island was quicker, the Venetians had considerable trouble from insurrections and found that control of the strong points and coastal areas did not mean that the whole island was subdued. 2 In Crete, where support from the Venetian government meant that a more rigorous policy could be pursued, the authorities tried to effect the complete subjection of the Greek archontes, but gradually came to recognise the need for a measure of compromise with them. 3 In Frankish Greece, the former landowners were more readily admitted to the feudal hierarchy, 4 and in order to attract followers and to preserve the territory already gained, the princes allowed their barons castles, the right to build further castles, and rights of high justice within their fiefs. 5


3. Thiriet, Romanie vénitienne, pp. 128-33.


5. Bon, Morée franque, p. 87. In Crete the feudatories were apparently allowed fewer privileges. Thiriet, Romanie vénitienne, pp. 127-8.
On the other hand, there were a number of parallels with Cyprus:
in each case the ruling class was never assimilated fully into the existing
society and the rulers sought to preserve themselves and their acquisitions
by attracting settlers. Settlers came to Cyprus from the Syrian mainland,
to Crete from Venice, and to the Morea from other parts of Frankish Romania
and from those parts of France from which the leading barons themselves came.
In all three instances both knights and sergeants were enfeoffed: the official
figures for Crete being initially 132 knights and 48 sergeants,\(^1\) which can be
contrasted with the unofficial Cypriot figures of 300 and 200.\(^2\) In the Morea a
sergeant's fief was worth half that of a knight, whereas in Cyprus it was
apparently originally reckoned at three quarters the value of a knight's fief.\(^3\)

In all three places, the colonists brought with them their own customs
and institutions which were then superimposed on the existing ones. The Franks
in the Morea organised themselves as far as possible in the same sort of way
as they had in their French homelands, though a recent study has shown that
although the princes originated in Champagne, they did not abide by the
peculiarities of Champenois feudal custom.\(^4\) In Crete the administration was
consciously modelled on that of Venice, and the island's divisions were given
the names of the six quarters of the capital from which it was intended that

\(^1\) Thiriet, Romanie vénitienne, pp.126-7.

\(^2\) See above, pp.52-3.

\(^3\) Bon, Morée franque, p.89. 'Eracles', ii, p.192 (ms. 'A'). See above, p.5.

\(^4\) D. Jacoby, La féodalité en Grèce médiévale: Les 'Assises de Romanie',
their respective settlers would be drawn. In Cyprus, where the majority of the early settlers originated from the Kingdom of Jerusalem, Jerusalemite feudal practice was introduced, and the Cypriots were sufficiently aware of this for legal treatises written in Jerusalem during the thirteenth century to be regarded as guides to Cypriot practice.


2. See below, pp.254-5.
Chapter 3

THE RISE OF THE HOUSE OF IBELIN (1205-1233)

The most significant and the best documented episode in the history of Cyprus in the thirteenth century is the struggle known as the Ibelin-Longobard War. This was the first major crisis for the Cypriot nobility and it marked the culmination of the rise of the able and ambitious Ibelin family to a commanding position in the feudal society of the island. The political events of the minority of Henry I and the period of civil war in Cyprus have been the subject of several studies, but the origins and respective strength of the factions and the implications for the Cypriot nobility need further attention. Most historians have followed Philip of Novara in taking the death of Hugh I early in 1218 as the starting point of the struggle, but developments during Hugh's reign are important for an understanding of the period. Precisely why individuals supported one or the other party and why the factions should have become so deeply divided that civil war resulted can never be fully understood,


2. 'Gestes', p.670.
but some suggestions can be made. It would be wrong to see the struggle wholly in constitutional terms, for personal rivalries played a major part, and an examination of the origins and ties of the individuals concerned is revealing.

On King Aimery's death in 1205, Cyprus passed to his only surviving son, Hugh, then aged ten. This necessitated a regency, and the post of bailli was filled by Walter of Montbéliard, the husband of Hugh's sister Bourgogne and younger brother of Richard, lord of Montbéliard and Montfaucon in Upper Alsace. Though at that time he had not been long in the East, Walter at once embarked on an expansionist policy by attempting to conquer the important Anatolian port of Adalia, and, according to one source, the island of Rhodes. Possibly he was aiming to control the main trade routes in the eastern Mediterranean by establishing Cypriot rule in all major ports of call between Crete and Syria. In 1207 the Cypriots were expelled from Adalia by the Sultan of Iconium, and though that set-back seems to have marked the end of this policy for Cyprus, Walter may have made another attempt on Adalia using Jerusalemite resources in 1212.

1. The constitutional issues have recently been discussed. Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.161-6.
2. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.73-4.
3. L. de Mas Latrie, Trésor de chronologie, d'histoire et de géographie pour l'étude et l'emploi des documents du moyen âge (Paris, 1889), col. 1640.
4. Walter is not mentioned in crusading sources before 1205, but had evidently married before that date; according to Riley-Smith (Feudal Nobility, p.23), he had come to the East at the time of the Fourth Crusade.
It is possible that Walter had been acting in conjunction with the Templars who in 1206 obtained papal confirmation of the grant of Adalia to themselves,¹ and who were evidently on good terms with him.

In 1210 Hugh came of age and immediately brought about the disgrace of his brother-in-law. Walter was accused of extravagance, of keeping Hugh with insufficient funds and, by implication, of corruption. Rather than present his accounts for the period of his bailliage, he fled to the Templar fort at Gastria, and thence to Tripoli and Acre. In Acre he was well received by his cousin, John of Brienne, who had arrived in the East in September of that year and had immediately become king-consort of Jerusalem. From then until his death a few years later, Walter was active in raids on Muslim territory on John's behalf.² At the same time he succeeded in embarrassing Hugh by making charges against Hugh's choice as Archbishop of Nicosia to the pope,³ and by complaining to the pope about his own treatment:⁴ he alleged that he had been deprived of his estates, although Eschiva, his daughter and heiress, evidently acquired them, as we are later told that her first husband, Gerald of Montagu, held extensive lands in Cyprus on her behalf.⁵

That Walter should have fled in 1210 is evidence not so much for his

¹. Innocent III, ccxv, cols. 1019-20.
². See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, i, pp.179-81; Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.77-8.
⁴. Innocent III, ccxvi, col. 466.
⁵. 'Eracles', ii, p.376 (ms. 'A').
guilt as for the fact that he can have had little or no support in the High Court at that time; either by his personality or his policies he must have alienated the leading Cypriot nobles. Hugh, at the age of fifteen, may or may not have been able to formulate his own policies and, though there is no direct evidence that he was dominated by his advisers, it is unlikely that he would have been able to act without them. Nothing is known of the exact circumstances of the fall of Walter, though the witness lists of two privileges issued in September and November 1210 do tell us who Hugh's leading supporters were at that time.1 Both lists were headed by the constable, Walter of Caesarea, followed by the seneschal, Aimerie of Rivet, and the marshal, Raynal of Soissons; in fourth place on both occasions was Walter of Bethsan. Raynal and Aimerie had both been prominent in Cyprus since the 1190's2 and Walter of Caesarea was the brother-in-law of John and Philip of Ibelin.3 Though Walter of Caesarea and Walter of Bethsan are not known to have been in Cyprus any longer than Walter of Montbéliard, all four witnesses had been in the East much longer than he, and possibly there was a reaction against him for that reason.

With the majority of Hugh I a new period of bad relations between Cyprus and Jerusalem began. The ready acceptance of Walter of Montbéliard by his cousin, John of Brienne, may have marked its beginning.4 Early in 1213

2. See above, table 3.
3. La Monte, 'The Lords of Caesarea', p.155.
4. John was Walter's cousin and not his nephew as stated by the writer of 'Eracles' (i, p.316 (ms. 'A')). Mas Latrie, Trésor de chronologie, cols. 1576-7, 1640.
Innocent III rebuked Hugh for maltreating 'O.', a relative of John of Brienne and others of his vassals who had landed in Cyprus to escape some Muslims. It is tempting to identify 'O.' with Odo of Montbéliard, Walter's nephew, though of course there can be no certainty in this. As the preparations for the Fifth Crusade proceeded, Innocent became anxious that the Christians in the East should end their differences, and in 1215 or 1216 he wrote to both Hugh of Cyprus and Leo of Armenia telling them to make peace with John of Brienne and make ships available for the crusade. By the time the crusaders arrived (September and October 1217), Hugh and John were sufficiently reconciled for Hugh to bring to Acre a Cypriot force including several of his leading vassals and to join the fruitless expedition to Mount Thabor. Honorius III had intended the crusaders to assemble in Cyprus, and Hugh, by being involved in this way, perhaps found it impossible not to participate, though in the event it appears that the pope's plan was not followed. But Cypriot participation in the campaign of late 1217, led to disputes between John of Brienne on the one hand and Hugh and the Hungarian king on the other. At the end of the year Andrew of Hungary

1. Innocent III, ccxvi, cols. 736-7.

2. Regesta pontificum Romanorum inaeunte ab anno post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV, compiled by A. Potthast (Berlin, 1874-5), no. 5179, see no. 5178. The latter is undated, but belongs to the period 22 February 1215 - 16 July 1216.


5. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.82 and note 6; Runciman, History of the Crusades, iii, p.148.
decided to go home; whether Hugh intended to abandon the crusade at the same time is not clear, but he accompanied Andrew to Tripoli where on 10 January 1218 he died, aged twenty three. He was buried in the Hospitaller church in Tripoli.¹ 

The fall of Walter of Montbéliard marked not only the beginning of a period of bad relations with Jerusalem, but a complete change of Cypriot foreign policy. Throughout this period Bohemond IV, supported by the Templars, was engaged in a war with Leo of Armenia and his grand-nephew Raymond-Rupin, supported by the Hospitallers, over the succession to Antioch.² Whereas Walter appears to have been on good terms with both the Templars and Bohemond, on whose help he relied at the time of his escape from Cyprus,³ Hugh now turned to their opponents. It is clear that he favoured the Hospitallers since in 1210 he confirmed and extended their rights and possessions in Cyprus,⁴ in 1213 a Cypriot force was sent to join the projected Hospitaller expedition against Aleppo,⁵ and in 1218 it was to the Hospitallers that Hugh seems to have bequeathed his body. In 1210 Leo of Armenia married Hugh's sister Sibylla, and about the same time Raymond-Rupin married another sister, Helvis.⁶ The precise dates of these marriages are unknown, but it is unlikely that they were

¹ See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.82.
² See C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche (Paris, 1940), pp.596-635.
³ 'Eracles', ii, p.316 (ms. 'A').
⁴ Cartulaire général des Hospitallers, no. 1354.
⁵ Cahen, Syrie du Nord, p.626.
⁶ Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.76. Helvis is first mentioned as the wife of Raymond-Rupin in a document of September 1210. Reg. Hier., no. 845.
arranged by Walter of Montbéliard if indeed he was on good terms with Bohemond. Helvis had been married, or at least betrothed, to Odo of Dampierre, who may have been related to Walter. The marriage of yet another of Hugh's sisters to Bohemond IV at the end of 1217 or the beginning of 1218 may indicate that Hugh was attempting to establish good relations with both sides in the war, especially now that John of Brienne was married to Leo of Armenia's daughter.

Similarly Walter's aggressive policy against the Sultan of Iconium was halted. Hugh negotiated a commercial agreement guaranteeing the safety of Turks and Cypriots engaged in trade between Cyprus and the ports on the south coast of the Turkish mainland under the Sultan's control.

It was against this background of diplomatic re-alignment and poor relations between Cyprus and Jerusalem that the Ibelins first appeared and rose to prominence in Cyprus. Ballian of Ibelin had been a leading opponent of Guy of Lusignan, and consequently it can be taken as certain that there was no place for

---

1. Innocent III, ccxvi, cols. 466-7. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.76 note 2. Odo complained to the pope alleging that Helvis had been abducted. His complaint evidently coincided with Walter's complaint of dispossession (see above, p. 60 ) which suggests that they were acting together, and this in turn strengthens the idea that Walter had intended to marry Helvis to Odo whereas Hugh had married her to Raymond-Rupin. For the possible kinship of the Dampierre and Montbéliard families, 'Lignages', p.455.

2. See Runciman, History of the Crusades, iii, pp.134, 149, 165.

3. C. Cahen, 'Le commerce anatolien au début de XIIIe siècle', in Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen (Paris, 1951), pp.93-4. See also O. Turan, 'Orta Çağlarda Türkiye-Kibris Münasebetleri', Belleten, xxviii (1964), pp.215-16. (My thanks are due to Mr. R.C.W. Smith for drawing my attention to this article.)
any member of the Ibelin family in Cyprus before Guy's death. But with the
marriage of Aimery of Lusignan, whose first wife had been Balian's niece, to
Queen Isabella, the relations between the Lusignans and Ibelins changed. John
of Ibelin, Balian's elder son, became prominent in Jerusalem as constable and
then lord of Beirut, and on Aimery's death he was appointed bailli of Jerusalem. ¹
When, probably in 1208, King Hugh married Alice of Champagne in accordance
with the agreement made over ten years before by their fathers, ² Alice was
conducted to Cyprus by John of Ibelin and his brother Philip. ³ This is the first
definite mention of the Ibelins in connection with Cyprus and the marriage was of
importance for them in that they were closely related to both parties, being the
half-brothers of Alice's mother and first cousins of Hugh's mother. ⁴ It is
possible that John and Philip had received lands in Cyprus from Aimery, but
their chief interest at this period seems to have lain in Jerusalem. Philip
appears in documents from Jerusalem of 1206, 1207 and 1210, ⁵ and at the time
of John of Brienne's coronation was left to guard Acre; ⁶ John of Ibelin rounded
off his tenure of the bailliage by attending the coronation. ⁷ After that he seems

¹ La Monte, 'John d'Ibelin', pp.423-5. See also Riley-Smith, Feudal
Nobility, p.186.
² See above, p. 41.
³ 'Eracles', ii, pp.308-9 (ms. 'A'). See Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, i,
cols. 806-7; Innocent III, ccxv, cols. 829-30.
⁴ See table 5.
⁵ Reg. Hier., nos. 812, 823, 841a.
⁶ 'Eracles', ii, p.312 (ms. 'A').
⁷ 'Eracles', ii, p.311 (ms. 'A').
Table 5. The relationship of John and Philip of Ibelin to the royal families of Cyprus and Jerusalem.

1. Aimery of Lusignan married, after the death of Eschiva of Ibelin, Isabella of Jerusalem whose fourth husband he was. Hugh of Cyprus married Alice of Champagne.
to have withdrawn from Jerusalemite public life for he is never found among the witnesses to the surviving charters issued by John of Brienne; Philip appears in only one, in 1211. We can only guess at the reasons for their apparent disappearance from the forefront of Jerusalemite politics, but it is probable that they had quarrelled with John of Brienne. We have seen that relations between John of Brienne and Hugh of Cyprus were poor from 1210. In 1217 the Ibelin brothers re-appear in Cyprus, leading the witnesses to a charter issued by King Hugh. A short while later, when Hugh led the Cypriot contingent to Acre for the first stage of the Fifth Crusade, they were both members of it. Already Philip of Ibelin held the important fief of Peristerana in Morphou from the revenue of which he made a substantial gift to the cathedral of Nicosia in 1217. On Hugh's death, Alice, as regent for her infant son, deputed Philip to exercise her office for her. The career of Walter of Caesarea, the brother-in-law of John and Philip of Ibelin, was in some ways similar. He had been an active member of the High Court of Jerusalem in the time of Henry of Champagne and had witnessed grants made by Aimery of Lusignan as king of Jerusalem. Probably he received his

3. 'Eracles', ii, p.322 (ms. 'A').
5. See below, pp.69-72.
Cypriot fiefs from Aimery, for soon after the majority of Hugh I in 1216 he was constable of Cyprus and sufficiently senior to head the witness lists to the charters of that year; had he been a newcomer it is unlikely that he would have had that position. From 1216 he was regularly present at the Cypriot High Court, and, like the Ibelins, seems almost to have ceased attending that of Jerusalem. This could be seen as evidence of antipathy for John of Brienne. It has already been suggested that he may have had something to do with the fall of Walter of Montbéliard. Possibly he was on bad terms with another of John's followers, his own step-father, Aymar of Laroï; Caesarea was held by Walter's mother in her own right, and perhaps Aymar was excluding Walter from any part in his inheritance: certainly there is evidence that he was burdening the lordship with debt. Walter was probably aged about forty at the time of his mother's death (between 1213 and 1216), and he may have viewed Aymar with dislike and suspicion.

It would appear then that three of Hugh's leading vassals may have had their own quarrel with John of Brienne, and it is possible that they were partly responsible for keeping Hugh from drawing closer to John. Significantly these

2. Reg. Hier., nos. 896, 900, 903, 912, 938. See 'Eracles', ii, p.322 (ms.'A').
3. He witnesses only one of the surviving charters of John of Brienne. Reg. Hier. no. 892.
4. See above, p.61.
5. For Aymar see Reg. Hier., nos. 853, 857; 'Eracles', ii, pp.306, 311-12 (ms. 'A').
7. La Monte, 'The Lords of Caesarea', p.154.
three, John and Philip of Ibelin and Walter of Caesarea, were the nucleus of the Ibelin 'party' of the 1220's. Furthermore, Odo of Montbéillard and Ballian of Sidon, both of whom were supporters of John of Brienne, were later hesitant in giving John of Ibelin their full support in his struggle with Richard Filangieri, even though, like John, they opposed him.  

There are three versions of the arrangement by which Philip of Ibelin was appointed bailí of Cyprus in 1218. According to the unknown author of the relevant section of the compilation known as 'L'Estoire de Eracles', Alice, the queen-mother, received homage as bailí and then appointed Philip her lieutenant, enjoining the vassals to obey him until Henry I came of age. Philip of Novara agreed that Alice received homage as bailí, and stated that the vassals then urged her to appoint Philip as her lieutenant, as Hugh I had desired on his deathbed; Philip governed and Alice enjoyed the profits of the royal revenues. The third version, which has been often overlooked in the past, is contained in a papal letter of February 1226 in which it is stated that the recipients of the letter, the nobles, barons, knights and people of Cyprus, had chosen Philip to be bailí of the kingdom together with Alice until Henry should come of age or until Alice should make a suitable marriage. None of these sources can be regarded as

---

1. Both were related to John: Ballian of Sidon married his niece and Odo was the nephew of Walter of Montbéillard, John's cousin. See Mas Latrie, Trésor de chronologie, cols. 1576-7, 1640. For the relationship of Walter and Odo, see Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.458 note 2.

2. See for example 'Eracles', ii, p.394.

3. 'Eracles', ii, pp.360-61 (ms. 'A').

4. 'Gestes', p.670.

free from bias; Philip of Novara is well known for his prejudice, and even the papal letter is likely to have been based on ex parte information.

By about 1223 or 1224 Philip and Alice had quarrelled. 1 Alice, apparently unable to remove Philip on her own, left Cyprus and married Bohemond, the son of Bohemond IV. 2 According to Philip of Novara, the Cypriot vassals all feared that Bohemond was to be made bailli. 3 This was almost certainly Alice's original intention; in 1205 the bailliage had gone to the husband of the member of the royal family, Bourgogne, who was entitled to it, and so there was arguably a precedent for investing the bailli's husband with effective control, and, if the account of the 1218 agreement given in the papal letter is true, Philip would have no grounds for continuing in office. But quite apart from the Cypriot opposition, the pope found Bohemond unacceptable: the marriage was invalid in the sight of the church as Alice and Bohemond were related within

1. The reasons for the quarrel given by Hill (History of Cyprus, ii, p. 88) are based on a very late source, but are not inherently improbable.

2. 'Eracles', ii, p. 361 (ms. 'A'); 'Gestes', p. 673. The date of these events is questionable: Alice and Bohemond were certainly married by August 1225 (Honorious III, no. 5593) and most of the narrative sources give the date as 1224. 'Gestes', p. 673; 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p. 438 (ms. 'B'); 'Anales de Tierra Santa', ed. A. Sánchez Candeira, 'Las Cruzadas en la Historiografía española de la época. Traducción castellana de una redacción desconocida de los "Anales de Tierra Santa"', Hispania, xx (1960), p. 353; 'Chronique d'Amadl', p. 117. See 'Annales de Terre Sainte' (p. 437 (ms. 'A')) which gives the date as 1223 but is generally a year out at this period. For a further discussion of the problem of the chronology of the period see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p. 88 note 3.

3. 'Gestes', p. 673.
prohibited degrees, and, from November 1224, Bohemond's father was excommunicate. Faced with this opposition, Alice tried to appoint Aimer Barlais as her lieutenant. Philip, who according to one account had resigned, opposed the appointment on the grounds that he should hold the bailliage until Henry should come of age, and, supported by the vassals, thwarted the appointment and continued in office. It has recently been argued that the vassals were acting illegally in refusing Alice's nominee, and irrespective of whether Philip really did have a right to the lieutenancy by virtue of the arrangements of 1218, Aimer Barlais certainly felt aggrieved by his rejection. According to Philip of Novara, Aimer and Philip of Ibelin had already quarrelled over a jousting incident involving Aimer and one of Philip's vassals, and it is probable that Alice had deliberately chosen Aimer in an attempt to break the Ibelin ascendancy in Cyprus. In January and February 1226 the pope issued a

1. Honorius III, no. 5593, see nos. 6271-2; Gregory IX, no. 10. Alice and Bohemond were only just within the prohibited degrees being both descended from Baldwin II of Jerusalem at the fourth and fifth degrees:

```
  Baldwin II
    |  Alice
    |  Constance of Antioch
    |  Bohemond III
    |  Bohemond IV
  Amaury
    |  Bohemond V
  Alice of Champagne =
  Melissende of Jerusalem
    |  Isabella
    |  Baldwin II
```

4. Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, pp.192-3. It was probably significant that the appointment was not made in the High Court.
5. 'Gestes', pp. 672-3.
series of letters which were designed to bolster the Ibelin cause, though at
exactly which stage in these disputes they were written is not clear: the
archbishop of Nicosia was to publish Bohemond IV's excommunication; Henry
was put under papal protection and commended to Frederick II and others; the
Military Orders and the Cypriots were told to support Henry and Philip of Ibelin,
and Philip was told to exercise his office for the good of Henry and of the
kingdom. Whether these letters should be seen as support for the opposition
to Bohemond or as an endorsement of the Ibelins' refusal to accept Aimery
Barlais, they would evidently have helped the morale of the Ibelins and
encouraged them to think that they were not acting illegally by trying to stop
Alice removing Philip from the lieutenancy.

When Philip died, his brother John, who until that time had divided his
time between helping Philip and building up his lordship of Beirut, seems to have
taken control of the Cypriot government. By what authority he took over the
direction of affairs from his brother is not clear, but it is possible that to Alice
and to his enemies, at the time of Frédéric's arrival in the East, John was a


2. In the summer of 1228 according to 'Fracles', (ii, p.365 (ms. 'A')), 1227
according to 'Gestes' (p.676) and the 'Annales de Terre Sainte' (p.438, see
also 'Anales de Tierra Santa', p.364). In view of the fact that the Cypriots
were still in mourning for him at the time of Frederick II's arrival in the
East ('Gestes', p.677) in July 1228, perhaps 1228 is to be preferred.

3. 'Gestes', p.670, see pp.672-3, 675-6. John encouraged merchants to trade

4. He was regarded as being responsible by Frédéric. See below, p.83.
usurper, maintaining himself and his followers in opposition to Alice, Bohemond
and their lieutenant-designate, Almery Barlais.

The chief difficulty in understanding the events of the period 1205 - 1233
is that the detailed narrative sources favoured the Ibelin party and most of the
surviving documents concern them rather than their opponents. As a result,
the names of only a few of the anti-Ibelin party have been preserved. Apart
from the five leaders, Almery Barlais, Amaury of Bethsan, Hugh of Cibelet,
William of Rivet, and Gauvain of Chenichi, and six others including Philip
Chenard and Bertram and Hugh Porcelet who were listed as having been
dispossessed towards the end of the war,¹ the party is virtually unknown.²

There can be little doubt that personal animosity and jealousy of the
political ascendancy of the Ibelins were important factors in determining why
these men should have come together in opposition to them. Philip of Novara
explained the formation of the party as being the result of the kinship of Almery
Barlais and Amaury of Bethsan on the one hand, and William of Rivet and
Gauvain of Chenichi on the other, and of incidents involving Almery, Gauvain

1. 'Chronique d'Amadl', p.175. The others were Hugh 'Zaboc', Hugh of Marsa,
and Raynald of Chamberlains; also dispossessed were '... quelli de Creissi de
Thabor, quelli de Carpasso, quelli de la Messaria'.

2. The only others named were 'Denises', John of Beirut's seneschal, and Martin
Rousseau, both of whom were deserters from the Ibelin party ('Gestes', pp.
701, 720), and Humphrey of Monalgre ('Gestes', p.713); in addition, four
knights are named who were captured at Aghirda, but it is not clear whether
they were Cypriots or knights brought by Richard Filangieri ('Gestes', p.713).
Baldwin of Bellême, the only knight to refuse to accept Philip of Ibelia as
bailli when Alice tried to appoint Almery Barlais her lieutenant, should be
mentioned ('Eracles', ii, pp.361-2 (ms. 'A')). The names of about sixty
members of the Ibelin party are known.
and two knights who enjoyed Ibelin patronage; but the causes would seem to have gone deeper than that.

Aimery Barlais was the son of Raynald Barlais, the Poitevan companion of Guy of Lusignan in the 1190's; William of Rivet was probably the son of another of Guy's companions, Aimery of Rivet, seneschal of Cyprus; Gauvain was probably the son of yet another; Amaury of Bethsan was the son of Walter of Bethsan, prominent in Cyprus in the 1210's, and nephew of two other members of the family known to have been in the island in the 1190's. Of the five leaders only Hugh of Gibelet, a member of a cadet branch of the family of the Lords of Gibelet, whose father Bertrand is first known in Cyprus from a document of 1217, cannot be shown to have belonged to a family which had been on the island from the outset, and the fathers of three of them had been high in the counsels of the former rulers of Cyprus. It is therefore possible that they resented the Ibellas, who were perhaps new to Cyprus in the time of Hugh I, regarding them as *parvenus* who had displaced them as the leaders of Cypriot noble society.

Philip of Novara's statement concerning the kinship of Gauvain and William of Rivet is difficult to substantiate, though they can be shown to have

1. 'Gestes', pp.672-4.
2. 'Eracles', II, p.219 (ms. 'D'). See above, p.49.
4. See above, p.46.
been distantly connected by marriage. The relationship of Aimery Barrais and Amaury of Bethsan is more apparent: they were first cousins once removed. But the nexus of family relationships was more extensive than this. Gauvain was the uterine half-brother to another member of their group, Philip Chenard. Bertram Porcellet was Aimery Barrais's step-father and brother of Hugh Porcellet. The other leader of their party, Hugh of Gibelet was married to Maria, Hugh and Bertram's sister. Amaury of Bethsan was the son of yet another member of the Porcellet family. But the significance of family relationships should not be over-emphasised: Guy of Hivet, the nephew of William, was a page to prominent Ibelin leader, John of Caesarea, and died in what was said to have been an assassination attempt on John by the Teutonic knights; that branch of the family was evidently pro-Ibelin in its sympathies.

These family connections point to another factor which could help explain the political alignments: the links with the county of Tripoli. Hugh of Gibelet was the grandson of William II, lord of Gibelet; his father, besides being a


2. 'Lignages', p.463. See F. Chandon de Briailles, 'Lignages d'Outre-Mer, les seigneurs de Margat', Syria, xxv (1946-8), p.246. 'Renaud Barrais' in the last line of note 5 is a misprint for 'Aimery Barrais'.

3. 'Gestes', pp.694, 719.


5. 'Lignages', p.463.

member of the Cypriot High Court, had been a man of some consequence in Tripoli, and it was there that Hugh and his descendants were active after 1233. Bertram and Hugh Porcellet came from a well-established Tripolitania family, and, like Hugh of Gibelet, Bertram participated in affairs in the County. Bertram's step-son, Aimeric Bardais, was married to the heiress of the former Lord of Margat, and through her had the substantial rent paid by the Hospitallers from their revenues in Tripoli as payment for the castle and lordship. Several members of the anti-Ibelin party, therefore, had links with Tripoli and this perhaps explains in part why they should have chosen to support Alice and Bohemond. But it is not possible to connect Gauvain of Chenilehi or William of Rivet with Tripoli, nor did knights with origins in Tripoli necessarily side with them: a prominent supporter of John of Ibelin, William Viscount, is said to have been born there. The small number of the Ibelin's opponents who are known by name gives a false impression of the strength and importance of the anti-Ibelin party in Cypriot noble society. It has already been suggested that the leaders were heirs


5. Chandon de Briailles, 'Lignages d'Outre-Mer, les seigneurs de Margat', pp.244-6. See Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, p.68. Later in the thirteenth century the rent was paid in Acre. Chandon de Briailles, op.cit., p.248.

6. 'Gestes', p.706.
of men who had great influence in Cyprus before the arrival of the Ibelins.¹

An analysis of the witness lists to documents issued in the Cypriot High Court from 1216 to 1220, after which date no witnessed documents survive until 1229, is instructive.² Six members of the Ibelin party are included: John and Philip of Ibelin, Walter of Caesarea, Arnais of Gibelet, William Raymond and John Babin.³ Of these the first three invariably occupy leading positions in the witness lists when they appear, but the other members of the party only appear in 1220, by which time Philip of Ibelin had already been lieutenant for two years. Three other witnesses, Lawrence of Morf, Walter Le Bel and Peter Chappe, were probably related to supporters of the Ibelins during the civil war.⁴ In contrast, three of the later opponents of the Ibelins are named: Almery Barlais, Gauvain of Cheniché and William of Rivet, as well as Walter of Bethsan, Amaury's father, and Bertrand of Gibelet, Hugh's father.⁵ From his position in the witness lists, Walter of Bethsan was clearly a senior member of the High Court, and though generally the later anti-Ibelins are less prominent and less numerous in these lists, the fact that they witnessed at all indicates that they

1. See above, p. 74.
2. See table 6.
4. Lawrence of Morf was the father of John and Baldwin of Morf. 'Lignages', p. 472. See Reg. Hier., nos. 1037, 1049. Peter Chappe was probably related to Nicholas Chappe, and Walter Le Bel to Philip Le Bel. Reg. Hier., nos. 1037, 1049.
5. Also Almery of Rivet, probably William's father, and James, William's brother whose son Guy was in the service of John of Caesarea.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1210</th>
<th>1210</th>
<th>1217</th>
<th>1217</th>
<th>1218</th>
<th>1220</th>
<th>1220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Caesarea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almery of Rivet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynaud of Soissons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Bethsan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence of Morf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Paphos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinus of Bombel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Bel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Chappe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremont of Bethsan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of St. Bertin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Juvenis</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almery Barlais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand of Gibelet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Nores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Rivet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Isbeli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Isbeli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oste of Tiberias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaury, Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauval of Chealchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Rivet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnels of Gibelet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Babin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Lay witnesses to documents issued in the Cypriot High Court 1210 - 1220. (The numbers in the columns refer to the sequence in the witness lists; a 'x' indicates that the man is mentioned in the document but not as a witness.)
were not inconsiderable, and that, far from being hopelessly outnumbered among the leading Cypriot vassals, they constituted a significant minority.

This view is confirmed by a chance remark by Philip of Novara. Usually he conveyed the impression that Aimeri Barlais and his party were a small pressure group who for military strength depended on mercenaries and the Imperial forces from the West, but in his account of the events of 1231 he admitted that the anti-Ibelin party, which left John of Ibelin's expedition from Cyprus to the relief of Beirut, had numbered 80 knights.1 Exactly what proportion of the total active Cypriot knightly class this constituted is not clear but it was evidently substantial: shortly afterwards, when John of Ibelin tried to raise support in Acre for the relief of Beirut, he could only find 43 knights willing to join him, and at the battle of Aghirda the Ibelins had 233 mounted men.2 Assuming that Philip's figure of 80 knights is accurate - and it is possible that he was either mistaken or deliberately exaggerating - it is conceivable that the numerical strength of the anti-Ibelin party in Cyprus could have accounted for as much as one third of the nobility.3

1. 'Gestes', p.703.
2. 'Erales', ii, p.394; 'Gestes', p.712.
Philip of Novara, the apologist for the Iselin cause, argued that the
Iselins consistently served the interests of the young King Henry I. They
protected him from Bohemond of Antioch, his step-father, who as Philip hinted,
might have wanted to destroy Henry; had his marriage to Alice been fruitful;" they
protected him from Frederick, whose career showed him to be cruel and
unjust and who himself wanted to enjoy the profits of the minority;" and they
protected him from the 'foolishness and pride' of Aimery Barlais and his
associates, who, when they had power, 'pillaged and robbed the poor people of
Cyprus', and who after the battle of Nicosia took Henry 'by force' to the castle
of St. Hilarion and 'there held and guarded him as if in prison'." Philip and
John of Iselin and their sons are depicted as models of knightly excellence.
Philip '... mont i fist de bien et de hennor et de loyauté et de largesse...', and
John is frequently held up as a paragon of wisdom, moderation and
compassion. Though on occasion leading members of the party were criticised,
as for example Anseau of Brie for not organising the watch properly at Casal

---

1. 'Gestes', p.673.
2. 'Gestes', p.671. In his introduction (p. ccxxxiii), Kohler suggested that the
   passage was an interpolation, but I see no good reason for this.
3. 'Gestes', p.672.
4. 'Gestes', p.672.
5. 'Gestes', p.684.
6. 'Gestes', p.690.
8. For example, see 'Gestes', p.699.
Imbert, right, in Philip's view, was firmly on the Ibelin side, and those who opposed them could only have done so from perverse and irrational motives.

The tendency has been for historians, while recognising that Philip is biased, to be carried along too readily by his vivid narrative, and to accept his version of events naively. But we have seen that there were reasons for resentment against the Ibelins, that their opponents had greater support in Cyprus than Philip normally admitted, and that arguably the tenure of the bailiage by Philip of Ibelin after Alice's attempt to appoint Almery Farlais was illegal. When we come to consider the intervention of the Emperor Frederick II in Cyprus and the course of the civil war, Philip's picture is further called in question.

The political problems of the Empire in the twenty years following the death of Henry VI in 1197 meant that the imperial suzerainty over Cyprus, the price paid by Almery of Lusignan for his crown, could not be exercised. But by the early 1220's Frederick had sufficient authority in Europe to turn his attention to the East and to prepare to fulfill his crusading vow. His interest was enhanced by his marriage in 1225 to Isabella of Brienne, the queen of Jerusalem. So long as Henry was a minor, Frederick could claim the right to control the regency of Cyprus and have the profits from it. Though it was normal in the West for a lord to have rights of wardship, it was not normal in the East: a later jurist only allowed a lord this right if there was no parent or heir who could exercise it, and the regency arrangements of 1205 and 1218

1. 'Gestes', p.709.
had followed normal eastern practice in most respects. Frederick, however, was said to have told Alice of Champagne that she held the bailliage at his pleasure. ¹ He was angered by the fact that in 1225 the Ibelins had had Henry crowned, apparently on the grounds that as suzerain he should have been given prior notification, ² but it is not necessarily true that the Ibelins had intended to flout the Emperor’s rights, or to try to secure Henry’s position in the face of possible moves by Frederick to remove him; ³ more likely they wanted to avoid possible criticism nearer home if they delayed. ⁴

Frederick was probably pre-disposed to distrust the regime in Cyprus.

By about the time of Henry’s coronation he was in touch with the Ibelins’ opponents in the island, Gauvain of Chenichi, who left the island following an incident involving an attack on William of La Tour, a client of the Ibelins, took service with Frederick, and is found mentioned in documents issued by him and the Empress Isabella in January 1226. ⁵ William of Rivet was at the papal

---


2. 'Gestes', p.672. For the date see Hill, History of Cyprus, II, p.90 note 5.

3. The idea that Henry’s coronation was a political move directed against the emperor is commonly held. See for example Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, i, p.228; La Monte, 'John d’Ibelin', p.428; Hill, History of Cyprus, II, p.90.

4. Henry would have been aged eight in 1225. Hugh I’s age at the time of his coronation is not known, but, for comparison, Baldwin V of Jerusalem was about the same age at the time of his coronation; according to Kuczmarski (History of the Crusades, ii, pp.444, 446) he was not yet nine at the time of his death and he had been crowned over a year earlier. Henry’s contemporary, Henry III of England, was aged nine at the time of his coronation. F.M. Powicke, The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1962), p.1.

5. Reg. Hier., nos. 974-5; 'Gestes', p.674, see p.675.
court in 1227 and could well have been in contact with Frederick at that time; significantly he and his fellow ambassador seem to have persuaded the pope to relieve Archbishop Eustorgue of Nicosia, whose nephew died in 1229 fighting for the Ibelins,¹ of his responsibilities for inquiring into the alleged consanguinity of Alice of Champagne and Bohemond.² According to Philip of Novara, Aimeri Barlais pinned his hopes for a political recovery on Frederick, evidently expecting that he would end the Ibelin ascendancy, and so he and his associates did their utmost to turn him against the Ibelins.³

Aimeri was not to be disappointed. When Frederick arrived in Cyprus he treated John of Ibelin as the man in authority, and John seems to have been prepared to co-operate. He came to the emperor at Limassol, bringing the young king with him, and apparently recognised his suzerainty over the island;⁴ according to Philip of Novara he resisted the advice of his supporters to oppose Frederick,⁵ but it is impossible to know whether he genuinely believed that the emperor would not take action against him. Either he was confident in his position, or he thought that co-operation was the only hope, as Frederick was generally welcomed in the East,⁶ and if John and his supporters opposed him at

---

5. 'Gestes', p.677.
that time, they would have been isolated. But Frederick's demands on John were too great: he required him to hand over his fief of Beirut and account for the revenues of Cyprus. 1 On what grounds John's title to Beirut was questioned cannot be known, but its loss would have been a serious blow to John financially. As for the Cypriot revenues, John claimed that they had been given to Alice, but in view of the poor relations between Alice and the Belins, and the allegations of corruption against John in an Italian chronicle favourable to Frederick, 2 there may be grounds for suspecting the Belins of peculation.

Following these demands, and despite the fact that Frederick held two of his sons hostage, John, perhaps fearing for his life, fled and fortified the castle of St. Hilarion against the emperor. Frederick, joined by many of the leading vassals of Jerusalem and the prince of Antioch, as well as the Cypriot opponents of the Belins, came to an agreement with him. For various reasons Frederick had no time to waste, but won his point. Henry and the kingdom of Cyprus were to be in his control until Henry came of age, though it was agreed that Cypriot liegemen were to hold the castles. John was to accompany Frederick to Syria, presumably kept under surveillance, but apparently he refused to acknowledge the emperor's de jure right to the bailliage, claiming it as Alice's. 3

The Belin power in Cyprus was broken; John's show at rebellion ended any possibility of a durable understanding between him and Frederick.

Fortunately for John, the emperor's excommunication and his treaty with

1. 'Gestes', p.678.
3. 'Eraclis', ii, pp.368-9 (ms.'A'); 'Gestes', pp.680-82.
Al-Kamil turned many Syrian leaders, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the two largest Military Orders against him. By the time of Frederick's departure from the East, John's political standing in Jerusalem was high. 1

In Cyprus, Aimery Barlais and his friends seem not to have profited immediately from the removal of John of Ibelin. What arrangements were made for the government of Cyprus at the time of Frederick's departure is not known, but while in Syria he sent Count Stephen of Cotron with a force of Longobards to take charge of the island, including the castles, as baillis. 2 The emperor had therefore broken his agreement with John of Ibelin, by which the castles were to be held by Cypriot liege men. 3 In May 1229, as Frederick was leaving the East, he farmed the revenues of Cyprus for the remainder of Henry's minority to Aimery Barlais and his four associates. They were required to prevent John of Ibelin's return and to dispossess his supporters, but the Cypriot castles were to be held by Frederick's officers as security until the farm had been paid. 4 The five baillis were in a difficult position; to obtain effective control they had to find the money, but a rapacious policy would have made them unpopular.

Already the Ibelin party and their dependents were opposed to them, either


2. 'Gestes', pp.682-3. The date of Stephen's appointment is not known, but April 1229 as suggested by Dr. Riley-Smith (Feudal Nobility, p.166) is clearly too late, if the Ibelin supporters who went into exile following his appointment did so in the depth of winter. See 'Gestes', p.683.

3. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.166.

4. 'Gestes', p.684.
having been deprived of their fiefs or fearing dispossession, and John of Ibelin's position on the mainland was still intact. Probably fearing an attempt by the Ibelins to make a come-back now that Frederick was gone, they decided to raise the money and at the same time to try to keep and win as many supporters as possible. Philip of Novara described how they made a clumsy attempt to persuade him to join them, which suggests that he at least was not dispossessed at that time; how far they went in dispossessing the Ibelins is not known, but it is likely that Klaudhia, given in June 1223 to the Teutonic knights, Frederick's most dependable allies in the East, was part of their spoils; John of Mimars, said to be its former owner, later appeared among the Ibelin party. The instructions from the emperor to dispossess the Ibelins ran counter to the jurists' principle of no disinheritance without judgment, though it is possible to speculate that John of Ibelin, by his action at St. Hilarion the previous year, was guilty of apparent treason and so the penalty was justified; at this stage however, the parties were fighting not over legality but for survival. The emperor had obliged Aimery Barlais to destroy the Ibelin party in Cyprus completely. Perhaps this is what Aimery wanted, but possibly he had been originally prepared to see a situation in which the Ibelins, while not destroyed, were considerably reduced in power and influence. On the other hand, if the

---

1. 'Gestes', pp.684-6.

2. Tabulae ordinis Theutonici, ed. E. Strehlke (Berlin, 1869), p.56; Reg. Hier., no. 1049.

3. A jurist writing c. 1200 listed taking up arms against one's lord as a form of apparent treason which required no judgment of the High Court for disinheritance. 'Livre au Roi', p.616.
Ibellas were to recover anything in Cyprus at all, they had at least to
dislodge Frederick's baillis, and that in turn would mark the effective end of
the political careers of Almery Barlais and his colleagues.

The Ibella invasion of Cyprus followed little over a month after
Frederick's departure. The five baillis suffered defeat in battle before Nicosia,
and one by one the Ibellas secured the surrender of Kyrenia, Kantara and St.
Hilarion. The casualties included Walter of Caesarea and Cauvain of Chenichi.
St. Hilarion held out for ten months and all that time the Ibellas were
besieging the person of their king, though Philip of Novara tried to excuse this
by stating that he was treated as if in prison.\(^1\) John of Ibella had overthrown
the emperor's accredited representatives; all he now needed to do was remain
in control of Cyprus until May 1252 when Henry would come of age\(^2\) and
Frederick's claim to control Cyprus would lapse. Provided the Ibellas kept
the king in their power, on his coming of age they would cease to be rebels
against imperial authority and would take on the guise of royal counsellors.
They would not be completely secure, as Frederick still held rights over
Jerusalem, where John of Ibella and several of the others had fiefs. In the
meantime they were insecure in both Cyprus and Jerusalem, and this probably
explains why they tried to conciliate Almery Barlais and his remaining
supporters; according to Philip of Novara, the Ibellas took great pains to achieve
this, though in fact the former bitterness could not easily be concealed.\(^3\)

---

1. 'Eracles', II, pp.376-7 (ms. 'A'); 'Gestes', pp.688-93.
3. 'Gestes', pp.699-700. The heirs of Cauvain of Chenichi were allowed to
keep their fiefs though they themselves were exiled. 'Gestes', p.695.
From his point of view, Frederick's crusade had ended chaotically; between his crown wearing in Jerusalem and his departure from Acre he suffered several checks from the baronage and so in 1231 he sent his marshal, Richard Filangieri, to the East with a large force to reassert imperial authority. The commanders of Richard's advance party demanded in vain the expulsion of the Ibelins from Cyprus and then attempted to capture Beirut. The implications and consequences in Syria of this attack on John of Ibelin's most important possession need not be discussed. The imperial forces captured the town but not the castle, and, not unnaturally, John was anxious to organise its relief. He called on the Cypriot vassals as his 'freres et ... chers amis' to help him, and it would seem that Henry was made to accompany them as John was going to denude Cyprus of troops and so dared not risk the loss of control of the king's person. Almery Barlais and his party also participated in the expedition, either because John made them come or because they hoped to find a useful opportunity for wrecking it, and soon after the Cypriots set out for Syria at the beginning of 1232, they deserted. In Syria, John of Ibelin's forces failed to raise the siege of Beirut, though Richard Filangieri later lifted his blockade. In May the

1. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.170-73.
2. 'Eracles', ii, pp.386-8; 'Gestes', pp. 700-1; 'Breve chronicon de rebus siculis', p.904.
3. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.175-84 passim.
5. 'Eracles', ii, pp. 392-3; 'Gestes', pp.702-3.
6. 'Eracles', ii, pp.394-5; 'Gestes', pp.704-6, see p.707.
7. 'Eracles', ii, p.396; 'Gestes', p.708.
Ibelins were defeated at Casal Imbert, and immediately Richard Filangieri followed up this success by sending Aimery Barlais and his supporters to secure Cyprus. Those of the Ibelin party who were in the island took refuge in St. Hilarion, where they were besieged. But now that the siege of Beirut had ended and Richard Filangieri's attentions were directed to Cyprus, the danger to the Ibelins in Syria had diminished and John of Ibelin could lead his forces back to the island. The campaign that followed was not unlike that of 1229: the imperial army suffered defeat at Aghirda, north of Nicosia, and St. Hilarion was relieved; the surviving imperial supporters continued to hold Kyrenia, which fell in 1233 after a long siege.

The surrender of Kyrenia marked the end of the civil war in Cyprus. Frederick's claim to interfere directly in Cypriot affairs had ceased a year earlier when Henry came of age, and, as a consequence of political circumstances in the West, the emperor was unable to reassert imperial suzerainty. The Cypriots who had continued to oppose the Ibelins after Henry's majority were judged guilty of treason, as they had been in arms against the king, and they were dispossessed and exiled. Some, including Amaury of Bethsan and Philip Chenard, went to Apulia where the emperor took them into his service and richly rewarded them.

1. 'Eracles', ii, pp.396-8; 'Gestes', pp.708-10.
2. 'Eracles', ii, p.399; 'Gestes', p.710.
3. 'Eracles', ii, pp.399-402; 'Gestes', pp.710-21, 724.
In his account of the war, Philip of Novara provided a cleverly constructed apologia for the Ibelin party. Unfortunately, no similar case for their opponents has survived, but there can be no doubt that neither side had a monopoly of legality. It is impossible for us to judge whether the emperor had a better right to the bailiage; nor can we know whether the Ibelin administration before 1228 was unusually corrupt or be sure that John of Ibelin enjoyed the support of Alice of Champagne at the time of Frederick's arrival. The war was a struggle for power and survival. Considerations of legality during and after it were secondary; indeed, both parties were, at different times, in arms against the king.

There remains the question of why the Ibelins were successful in the civil war. Possibly the leaders enjoyed genuine popularity, and the sense of the need to win or be ruined could have acted as an extra spur. But military superiority was the key factor. The Ibelins won two pitched battles in Cyprus (Nicosia 1229, Aghirda 1232), and sustained two lengthy siege operations (St. Hilarion 1229-1230, Kyrenia 1232-1233). Whether the victories in battle resulted from superior numbers or superior generalship or both is uncertain. The defeat at Casal Imbert followed a surprise attack. At Nicosia clouds of dust proved a problem, but we are not told whether either side derived any advantage from them.\(^1\) At Aghirda the Longobards had the advantage of attacking downhill, but seem to have been poorly commanded.\(^2\)

---

1. 'Gestes', p.689.
2. 'Gestes', pp.715-16.
It was probably the sieges rather than the battles which placed the greater strain on the Ibelins' ability to organise their forces. At the siege of Kyrenia they had a useful ally in the Genoese, who were able to prevent supplies arriving by sea. The Genoese, opposed to imperial policies in Italy, were on good terms with the Ibelins. In June 1232, at the time of John of Ibelin's return to Cyprus following the battle at Casal Imbert, they had been given commercial privileges in Cyprus. In December of that year the Cypriots and Genoese formed a military alliance, and with the arrival of two Genoese fleets in Cypriot waters, probably at about that time, the naval blockade of Kyrenia was made effective.

Perhaps the most important reason for the Ibelins' military superiority


2. Mas Latrle, Hist. de Chypre, II, pp.56-8. The dating clause of the treaty reads: 'Actum in Nicosia, in palatio regis, millesimo ducentesimo tricesimo tercio, indictione sexta, die secunda Decembris post terciam.' Historians have hitherto accepted 1233 as the correct date, but the sixth indiction ran in Cyprus from 24 September 1232 to 23 September 1233, and consequently either the indiction or the year of grace is erroneous. (For the indiction in Cyprus, see the document of 29 September 1195 (Reg. Hier., no. 723) in which the fourteenth indiction is correctly given instead of the thirteenth which would have been correct for most of 1195.) I prefer to accept the indiction as correct, because in December 1232 the king of Cyprus was still besieging Kyrenia, whereas a year later the island enjoyed peace, and because the form of the document suggests that the king of Cyprus did not at that time control the whole of his kingdom: instead of the king or his plenipotentiary concluding the treaty witnessed by a few members of the High Court, the king, John of Ibelin, and about fifty knights entered into the agreement with the Genoese representatives as individuals, which indicates that the king was in a weak position at the time. It is likely that the treaty coincided with the arrival of the Genoese ships recorded by Philip of Novara. 'Gestes', p.719.

3. 'Gestes', p.719, see p.714.
was the fact that they had superior resources. In the kingdom of Jerusalem, John of Ibelin held the lordships of Beirut and Arsur as well as fiefs in Acre; his brother-in-law, Walter of Caesarea, held Caesarea, and his nephew John, later count of Jaffa, also had estates in Syria. We cannot estimate how many of the lesser knights such as Geoffrey Le Tor, who supported the Ibelins in Cyprus, had fiefs on the mainland. In Cyprus the Ibelin estates were probably extensive, though details of where they were have not survived. The revenues from these estates would have allowed them to hire mercenaries, including the foot soldiers who proved so important at Aghirda, or the mercenary knights, known to have fought in the same battle, and to have paid for transport and provisions. In May 1232, when the Ibelin fortunes had sunk low as a result of the battle of Casal Imbert, John of Caesarea and John, later count of Jaffa, sold estates in Syria to raise cash to pay for mercenaries.

Coupled with financial resources was control of patronage. Having great wealth meant that a lord could build up a dependent following of relatives, retinues, servants and others linked to himself less specifically. The Ibelins controlled not only their own sources of patronage, but, for most of the time

1. For John's fiefs at Acre, Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.517.
4. Philip of Ibelin's fief of Peristerona in Morphou is the only estate belonging to the family known at this period. Reg. Hier., no. 903.
5. 'Gestes', pp.715-16.
during and after the minority of Henry I, those of the Cypriot crown. In a minority the right to grant fiefs was restricted, but day to day administration would have allowed favours of various kinds to be given. The Ibelin leadership was basically a family affair consisting of the brothers, John and Philip of Ibelin, their brother-in-law, Walter of Caesarea, and their respective sons; Anseau of Brie, the only other Ibelin military commander, was also related, though less closely. Outside the family circle were the rear vassals and dependants.

Both Toringuel and William of La Tour, whose clashes with the Ibelins' opponents were said by Philip of Novara to have contributed to the divisions in Cyprus in the 1220's, were Ibelin dependants. Philip of Novara has provided us with a picture of the composition of an armed retinue of such dependants.

At the time of the battle of Aghirda, Ballian of Ibelin, John's eldest son, was excommunicate, and his father removed him from his command for that reason. Despite his excommunication and his father's action, five knights followed him into battle:

Of these five, one was Philip of Novara and another Raymond of Flase; these two were his vassals and held from him; Peter of Montolff was the third, a mercenary high in his favour, and the other two were Robert of Maumeni and Odo of La Ferté, whom he had brought up and made a knight.

2. 'Eracles', ii, pp.395-6; 'Gestes', pp.690, 691, 695, 708-9, 715.
3. Anseau was the grandson of John of Ibelin's father's half-sister; Anseau and John were thus first cousins once removed. 'Lignages', pp.448, 453, 470-71. See 'Gestes', p.673.
4. 'Gestes', pp.672, 674.
5. 'Gestes', p.715.
Presumably the other leaders would have had followings built up along similar lines comprising dependants who were not necessarily vassals.

In some cases the attachment of a particular family to the Ibelins had a long history. A good example of this is the Mimars family, which like the Brie family, was related to them.\(^1\) Hugh of Mimars, the earliest known member of the family in the East, flourished in the middle of the second half of the twelfth century and held a fief in the lordship of Nablus; from about 1177, he was thus a vassal of Ballian of Ibelin.\(^2\) After Hugh, the family disappears until the 1220's when Hugh's son Raynald appeared as a regular witness to John of Ibelin's charters issued at Beirut.\(^3\) Raynald evidently occupied an important position in that lordship as he invariably headed the witness lists in these documents, and on at least one occasion the clerk who acted as tutor to his children was responsible for drawing up the diploma.\(^4\) According to the 'Lignages', Raynald had six sons.\(^5\) Of these John is probably the John of Mimars who held the fief of Klavdia and is known to have supported John of Beirut in the civil war.\(^6\)

---

2. Reg. Hier., no. 597, see nos. 565, 567, and also nos. 477, 537, 539, 562, 602. In the 1180's his wife owed the service of four knights for her fiefs at Nablus. John of Ibelin, p.424.
5. 'Lignages', p.471. Hugh ('Hugue', 'Hue') is named twice.
6. See above, p.86.
Hugh, the eldest brother, held the fief of Asha ('Asquía') in Cyprus. Guy, the youngest brother, also made his career in the island, though, unusually for a member of a knightly family at this period, as a cleric: by 1246 he was a canon of Nicosia cathedral, and at the time of his death in 1253 was bishop of Paphos. This leaves Menassier, only known from the 'Lignages', Raymond, lord of 'Traissades', an unidentified fief which was not necessarily situated in Cyprus, and Ballian. Ballian followed his father in the service of the Ibelins in Beirut. In 1256 he was castellan of Beirut, and a few years later is mentioned as holding two castella in the lordship of Sidon.

After Henry's majority the Ibelin party could buy support by grants of fiefs, as in May 1232 when the Cypriots were about to return to Cyprus. Geoffrey Le Tor was given fiefs in the island, presumably as a reward for services rendered in the war, and perhaps Baldwin Bonvoisin, a Jerusalemite


2. Innocent IV, no. 2007; 'Eracles', ii, p.441 (see notes 3 and 4); 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.445. See 'Lignages', p.471. For the rarity of members of noble families entering the church, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.129 and note 52.


4. 'Lignages', pp.461, 471-2. Raymond and his children married members of knightly families established in Cyprus, and this would suggest that his fief was in the island.

5. Reg. Hier., no. 1250, see nos. 1307, 1308.


7. 'Gestes', p.712.

knights of Genoese extraction who was among John of Ibelin's supporters in 1232, received his fief of Kellia ('Quellies') for the same reason.

It is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory appreciation of the size of the military forces involved in the civil war. Various figures are given: for example, Philip of Novara had 150 men at arms in his attack on the anti-Ibelin forces at the battle of Nicosta; the Ibelin forces at the siege of St. Hilarion were said to have been organised in three shifts of 100 knights working one month on and two off; Richard Filangieri's total force was 600 knights, 100 mounted squires, 700 foot soldiers and 3,000 armed mariners; 80 knights deserted the Ibelin forces at the beginning of the 1232 campaign, and the Ibelin force which returned to Cyprus in May 1232 numbered 233 mounted men whereas their opponent's cavalry was estimated at 2,000. All that can be said is that the Ibelin resources were sufficient to provide an army to defeat the combined forces of their Cypriot opponents and the troops sent by the

1. 'Eracles', II, p.394.
2. 'Lignages', pp.451, 470. According to the 'Lignages' (p.470) Baldwin's father had married the daughter of the last Christian Lord of Sahyun. Possibly Baldwin held properties at Tyre, in which case his father and uncle had been settled in the East since the time of Conrad of Monferrat. Urkunden Venedig, II, p.386, see p.377. And see Reg. Hier., no.665.
3. 'Gestes', p.686, see p.689.
4. 'Gestes', p.692.
5. 'Gestes', p.700. 'Eracles' (II, pp.385-6) gives the figures as 300 knights and 200 crossbowmen and mounted sergeants.
6. 'Gestes', p.703.
7. 'Gestes', p.712. 400 knights were said to have been killed or captured at Aghirda. 'Breve chronicon de rebus siculis', p.904.
emperor. But the Ibelins did not find it easy to keep their army in the field.
In the winter of 1229-1230, the effectiveness of the siege of St. Hilarion was
impaired because too many of their men had gone home. At the same time
tithes went unpaid, and the siege of Kyrenia placed such a strain upon the
royal resources that the payment of money fiefs fell into arrears.

The surrender of Kyrenia marked the victory of John of Ibelin in Cyprus.
Richard Filangieri continued to hold Tyre, but the fighting had stopped, and
though until the capture of Tyre in 1243 the Ibelins were not fully secure in
Syria, in Cyprus they were unassailable.

The family's rise in Jerusalem had been protracted. Though the date
of their origin in Cyprus is unknown, by 1217 the Ibelins had emerged as the
most senior members of the High Court, superseding the families which had been
present in Cyprus from the time of Guy of Lusignan. Their success in the civil
war resulted from their resources and the strength of their following, which
certainly by 1229, and probably by the time of Alice's attempt to appoint Aimery
Barlais her lieutenant, was the strongest of its kind in the island. Their
resources on the mainland were important in that money and manpower could be
transferred when needed. Their rapid rise made enemies for them, and those

1. 'Gestes', pp.691-2.
2. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.631 (see pp.625-6), 633-6; 'A register
   of Santa Sophia', nos. 30-34, see also nos. 39, 40, 42.
enemies possessed a remarkable cohesion, but with their defeat and
disinheritance, the Ibelin ascendancy was complete. The victory meant that,
at least for a time, the Cypriot nobility consisted of the knights of the Ibelin
affinity, together with any who as individuals had managed to remain neutral.

But if the early years of the majority of Henry I marked the
culmination of the Ibelin ascendancy, it was the reign of Hugh I that had
witnessed its beginning. The origins of their rise lay in the closeness of the
blood-relationships between John and Phillip of Ibelin and both Hugh and his
queen, and perhaps in a common antipathy which they may have shared with
the king for John of Brienne. The political developments of the 1220's and in
particular the conflict with the emperor resulted in a civil war in which the
Ibellins were fighting as much to avert total destruction as to preserve and
increase their power.
Chapter 4

THE CYPRICHT NOBILITY 1233-1291

The Ibelin victory in the civil war inaugurated a period in which the family was extremely powerful. John of Ibelin died in 1236\(^1\) and his descendants, together with those of his brother, Philip, and his brother-in-law, Walter of Caesarea, continued to be the most influential members of the nobility. Of John's sons, four survived to have children of their own: two, Baldwin and Guy, and also Hugh who died without issue before April 1239,\(^2\) seem to have held estates exclusively in Cyprus. Balian, the eldest son, seems to have held estates in both Cyprus and Jerusalem,\(^3\) and John, lord of Arsur, perhaps only had fiefs on the mainland.\(^4\) Philip of Ibelin's heirs held fiefs in both kingdoms\(^5\) as did Walter of Caesarea's son, John. On John of Caesarea's death his estates were apparently divided among heiresses and as John L'Aleman's wife received the lordship of Caesarea, it seems probable that the descendants of

---

4. See below, p.453.
5. Their chief Jerusalemite estate from the 1240's was the county of Jaffa. For their Cypriotic estates in the thirteenth century, see above, p.6 note 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaM. 38</td>
<td>LaM. 39</td>
<td>Reg. 1054</td>
<td>Reg. 1055</td>
<td>Reg. 42</td>
<td>Reg. 1071</td>
<td>Reg. 1078</td>
<td>Reg. 45</td>
<td>Reg. 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, the 'Old Ld.'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Caesarea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Ibelin¹</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan of Ibelin²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Ibelin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Viscount</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnels of Gibelet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Morf</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Ibelin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Novara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy of Ibelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Antioch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. **Witnesses to Cypriot royal charter, 1233-1239.**

(Numbers in the columns relate to the order in which the witnesses appear. A 'x' indicates that the individual is mentioned in the document though not as a witness. LaM. = 'A register of Santa Sophia', ed. J.L. La Monte; Reg. = Reg. Hier.)

---

1. Later count of Jaffa.
2. From 1236 constable of Cyprus and lord of Beirut.
another son-in-law, Walter of Dampierre, enjoyed his Cypriot estates. The Ibelin family proliferated in Cyprus, and before the fourteenth century male heirs failed in only one branch, the descendants of Ballian of Beirut.

In the years immediately following the civil war John of Ibelin, his sons and nephews seem to have directed Cypriot affairs. In the witness lists of the surviving charters of the 1230's they predominate, joined only by vassals who are known to have supported them in the civil war. Precisely how far they controlled the crown is difficult to assess. Henry I does not appear to have possessed a forceful personality, and it is likely that the Ibelins were able to dominate him. Their domination is perhaps illustrated by an incident which occurred shortly after the end of the siege of Kyrenia. The financial strains of the siege had resulted in non-payment of money fiefs. William Raymond, a supporter of the Ibelin cause, wished to claim the deficit on his fief by conjuring his peers in accordance with the Assise sur la ligece; he was uncertain about procedure and John of Ibelin intervened to help him win his case.

1. According to the later recension of the 'Lignages', John had three daughters, Margaret, Lady of Caesarea, who married John L'Aleman, Alice who married Richard of Dampierre and died without issue, and Isabella who married Walter of Dampierre. Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4789, fol. ccixxxiii col. 2. (This manuscript corrects Beugnot's reading in 'Lignages', p.457.)

2. See table 7. The only exception was Henry of Antioch, the king's brother-in-law.


5. See Reg. Hier., nos. 1037, 1049, 1078 and also no. 929.

Whereas it is possible that John was solely concerned with justice, it is equally likely that he was intervening to vindicate the Assise at the expense of royal authority after its failure in Jerusalem in 1231\(^1\) by creating a precedent for its application in Cyprus. By the jurists' interpretation of the Assise, the king had no power to act against any vassal without judgement of the High Court, and, if this doctrine were clearly established in Cyprus, the chief beneficiaries would be the most powerful of the members of the High Court, the Ibelins.\(^2\)

John of Ibelin's sons consolidated their position as leaders of Cypriot noble society. Baldwin and Guy married respectively Alice of Bethsan and Philippa Barlais, the daughters of two of the leading opponents of the Ibelins during the civil war.\(^3\) It is possible that these marriages were the fruits of an attempt at reconciliation, but, especially if they took place after 1233, it is likely that the Ibelin brothers were hoping to gain their former opponents' properties. Admittedly we are told that they were forfeit,\(^4\) but perhaps Guy and Baldwin were permitted to redeem them from the crown on account of their wives' for their own benefit.\(^5\) John's sons also began what was to become a feature of the Cypriot political scene by acquiring the two most important of the Cypriot grand serjeanties. Baldwin was seneschal of Cyprus from before 1247 until his death in 1267; Balian and then Guy were constables of Cyprus under

---


2. For further discussion of the case, see below, p.347-8.

3. 'Lignages', p.449.

4. See above, p.89.

5. Jean Richard (Paire', p.83) evidently thought that Baldwin's descendants inherited some or all of the Bethsian estates.
Henry I. From then until almost the end of the century, the Ibelins monopolised these two offices, although they did not make them the hereditary property of any one branch of the family. King Hugh II and King Hugh III both married Ibelins, and so during this period the close relationship with the royal family was maintained.

After Henry I's reign Ibelin domination of the crown might have slackened somewhat; Ballian of Ibelin, son of John of Arsur, seems to have had a share in Plaisance of Antioch's bailiwick in the 1250's, but with the accession of Hugh III in 1267 a king who was inclined to be masterful had arrived. It was in his reign that the only clash in the thirteenth century between a member of the Ibelin family and the crown is known. In 1271 James of Ibelin, son of John count of Jaffa, acted as spokesman for the vassals who denied their obligation to serve the king in the feudal host outside Cyprus. Part of his argument was that Cypriot knights had frequently served outside Cyprus under members of the Ibelin family - he mentioned in particular John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, his son and grandson, and John, count of Jaffa - and so concludes that:

... the vassals of the kingdom of Cyprus have more frequently served the Ibelin family than my lord the king or his ancestors outside the kingdom; and if the precedent of their service is to enslave them, by that

1. See below, pp. 414-18, 420-22. All the known seneschals of Cyprus from the 1240's until the 1360's were members of the Ibelin family. The first non-Ibelin constable after 1236 appears for the first time in 1292.

2. See below, pp. 375-6.


4. 'Document relatif au service militaire', pp. 430-34.

argument the Ibelins can command them as much as my lord the king.¹

James's case was not sound,² and this passage is undoubtedly a piece of bravado calculated to disguise the fact, but his boast does illustrate the importance of his family. Hugh III is known to have attempted to reassert royal authority in Jerusalem,³ and it is likely that he also tried a policy of keeping his Cypriot vassals in control; this dispute is the only real evidence for his taking a strong line with them, and the eventual compromise indicates that he was essentially successful.⁴

It would be wrong to see the history of Cyprus in the thirteenth century as a struggle for power between the Lusignans and Ibelins. John of Ibelin may have used his position in the 1230's to control Henry I, but there is no evidence that after the early years of Henry's majority the Ibelins maintained themselves as 'Mayors of the Palace'. Rather they should be seen as the counsellors of the kings, their close relatives and their most influential vassals, enjoying trust and responsibility in the kingdom. They were magnates, outclassing the other noble families, but evidence for tension with the crown is slight. In the absence of contrary indications it would seem that mutual respect and cooperation was normal.

¹ 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.434.  
² See below, pp.268-76.  
³ See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.224-5.  
⁴ See below, pp.268. 277-8.
The role of the Ibelins in Cypriot politics in the thirteenth century can further be understood when considered in the context of another important family with Cypriot connections, the Briennes. Count Walter IV of Brienne was nephew of John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem. He spent the 1220's and early 1230's in the West and was probably absent during the struggles of 1228-1233. Like his uncle he had reason to oppose Frederick II, though in the 1230's he is found making grants in France to the imperial protectes, the Teutonic Knights. The precise date and circumstances of his arrival in the East are obscure, but in c. 1235 he married Henry I's sister Maria who, as the elder of his two sisters, was presumably at that time regarded as the heiress to Cyprus. At an unknown date he acquired Jaffa, though he never used the title of count and was probably never formally invested with the county. A likely explanation is


2. See 'Eacles', ii, p.359 (ms. 'A').

3. 'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne', nos. 163, 165, 170, see also no. 151.

4. 'Eacles', ii, p.403. The marriage took place in the same year as the joint expedition against Montferrat (Ba'rın). This was in 1236 according to some sources ('Gestes', p.724; 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.439 (ms. 'B')) but it was before the death of John of Ibelin and about the same time as Philip of Troyes and Henry of Nazareth's embassy to the pope in 1235-1236. 'Eacles', ii, p.406. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.204-7. The date 1233 usually given for this expedition has no authority.

that he received it during the 1230's from the Ibelin-dominated authorities in
Acre, who, on their own admission, would have lacked the right to grant it
as a fief. 1 From the late 1230's until his capture at La Forbie in 1244 he
was active in strengthening the Christian position in southern Palestine. 2
Generally he seems to have cooperated with the Ibelins, 3 but he is not known
to have intervened actively in Cypriot affairs.

After the capture of Walter, Jaffa was given to John of Ibelin, the
celebrated jurist. 4 Whether Walter's heirs had any claim on the county is not
known, but it could be more than mere coincidence that at about the same time
as John of Ibelin received Jaffa, Walter's eldest son, John, was given Henry I's
inheritance in Champagne. 5 But far from retiring to the West, the Briennes
embarked on a policy of using their close relationship to the Lusignanaas to
enhance their political standing in the East. There is slender evidence that they
aimed at the bailliage of Jerusalem as early as 1258, 6 but they were thwarted by
John of Jaffa and Plaisance of Antioch who installed as bailli the child, Hugh II

1. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.193 et passim.

2. 'Rothelin', pp.531, 539, 543-4, 564; Matthew Paris, iv, p.141.
   See John of Ibelin, p.109.

3. 'Fracles', p.403; Alberic of Trois Fontaines, 'Chronica', MGHs, xxiii,
   p.942.

4. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.215.


6. 'Rothelin', p.634. As it stands the passage makes no sense; I suspect
   that what was intended was something to the effect that the prince said that
   Hugh II should be heir in preference to the children of Walter of Brienne.
of Cyprus. Curiously, Henry I's other sister and her husband granted John of Brienne their lands in Champagne at about that time. During the 1260's, Hugh of Brienne, John's brother and heir, fought unsuccessfully for the bailliage of Jerusalem and the throne of Cyprus. In 1261, on the death of Plaisance, he let his claim to the Cypriot bailliage go by default, and the first real test came in 1264 when he disputed the bailliage of Jerusalem with his cousin Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan. There is no need to describe the pleading in detail. Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan won on the grounds that he was older than his cousin, though Hugh of Brienne's mother had been the elder sister. The legal proceedings were not merely a formality, for Hugh of Brienne had some telling arguments and was able to destroy some of his cousin's points. The reasons for Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan's victory were partly legal and partly circumstantial. Legally, although the representative of the junior line, he had a good precedent in the dispute between the two Eschivas of Tiberias for the principality of Galilee. But it was probably the political circumstances which told against Hugh of Brienne. Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan may have seemed preferable for

1. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.216-17. As 1st cousins of Hugh II, the Briennes were in the same degree of relationship to Conradin for whom the bailliage was supposed to be held. Unlike Hugh II their rights came to them through their mother.


3. See 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité au trône et à la régence', RHC. Lois, II, p.408.

4. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.218-20.

5. Codex Vaticanus latinus 4769, fo. celliv col. 2 - fo. cellili col. 1, fo. celliliv col. 2 - fo. cclvi col. 1. These passages where the case is debated are omitted from the printed edition of chapters 7 and 8 of 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité' (pp.409-12, but see pp.406-7, 408).
military and financial reasons,¹ and it is possible that Hugh of Briene's
ambitions clashed with those of the Cypriot feudatories, in particular John of
Jaffa, who may have feared for the loss of his county. There is no positive
evidence for this and little can be assumed from the grants of 1247 and 1258,
but it is nonetheless possible that the interests of the Belins and the family of
the Princes of Antioch may have coalesced in face of the need to exclude Hugh
of Brienne from power. On Hugh II's death in 1267, Hugh of Brienne made a
bid for the throne of Cyprus,² but apparently he had no chance as his cousin
had already been accepted as Hugh's heir. He then took service with Charles
of Anjou, Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan's most formidable enemy in Europe, but
apart from threatening invasion in 1275, he was not able to press his claim,
and in 1289 was trying to sell his rights to the King of Aragon.³ The fact that
he is not known in the East after the 1260's suggests that he had no support
there, and there is no indication that the disputed crown of Cyprus was used to
embarrass Hugh III. Peter Dubois, writing in the early fourteenth century seems
to have accepted the Briene claim to Cyprus,⁴ but there are no further
references to it after that date. The family continued to hold fiefs in Cyprus

---
¹ See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.220.
² 'Gestes', p.769.
³ E. Lourie, 'An offer of the suzerainty and escheat of Cyprus to Alphonso III
   of Aragon by Hugh de Brienne in 1239', EHR, lxxxiv (1969).
⁴ Peter Dubois, 'Opinio eujusdam suadentis regi Francie ut regnum
   Jerosolimitanum et Cipri acquireret pro aliero filiorum suorum, ac de
   invasione regni Egipti', ed. C.-V. Langlois in Peter Dubois,
until the mid-fourteenth century, but as absentees.¹

Hugh of Brianne was virtually the only man in the thirteenth century to challenge the right of a king of Cyprus to rule.² Most families were content to maintain their position in noble society. It has been seen that the Ibelins virtually monopolised the offices of seneschal and constable from 1233 until 1300. Three families, Le Tor, Antioch, and Montolif, who between them occupied the offices of marshal and chamberlain in the same period are typical of a class of prosperous vassals, who, though they could not be described as magnates, were active in Cypriot politics.

The Le Tor family had in the twelfth century been vassals of the kings of Jerusalem, holding an important fief in the lordship of Count Joscelin. In the thirteenth century they produced two outstanding figures, Geoffrey Le Tor, jurist, diplomat and chamberlain of Cyprus who held fiefs in Cyprus given him by Henry I for services to the Ibelin cause in the civil war, and his son John who played an important role in Cypriot affairs from the 1250's until his death at an advanced age between 1319 and 1326.³ The Antioch family was among the earliest to settle in Cyprus and originated from Poitou.⁴ John of Antioch, the son of Adam the marshal of Cyprus, served the Ibelins in the civil war and later

---


2. For the claim of Thierry of Flanders, see above, p.42.


4. See above, p.50.
held his father's former office. ¹ Walter, the youngest of John's three sons was later chamberlain. ² The early history of the Montolif family in Cyprus is less clear: the family was established in the county of Tripoli before the mid-twelfth century, and flourished there until the late thirteenth.³ Apart from Peter of Montolif, a mercenary knight in the Ibelin service in 1232,⁴ Simon of Montolif, the marshal of Cyprus who died at Acre in 1291 is the first known member of the family on the island.⁵ Perhaps the family, which from the early fourteenth century had numerous members in Cyprus, owed its establishment in the island to Hugh III, and came with him from Tripoli. The Le Tors and Antiochs married into houses of similar standing, ⁶ such as the Soissons family, one of the first to settle on the island and one which in the early years of the thirteenth century produced a marshal of Cyprus,⁷ and the Viscount family which was of Tripolitanian origin and was perhaps a branch of the family of the hereditary viscounts of Tripoli.⁸ In the fourteenth century the Montolifs became one of the most distinguished families, while the Le Tors died out and the Antiochs never completely recovered from the consequences of

1. See below, pp.425, 426.
2. 'Lignages', p.473. See below, p.431.
4. 'Gestes', p.715.
5. See below, pp.426-7.
7. See below, pp.425-6.

8. See above, p.76. For the hereditary viscounts of Tripoli, see J. Richard, Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (Paris, 1945), p.81.
their support of Amaury of Tyre in the political crisis of 1306-1310.

These families and others such as the Morf, Mimar, Babia and Nores families formed what might be termed the middle rank of the nobility. Above them were a handful of great families, the Belins, Dampierres and Briennes, and the members of the royal family such as Henry of Antioch and the younger sons of Hugh III. Below them were the poorer feudal and mercenary knights whose financial situation and family connections were insufficient to allow them to distinguish themselves.

From 1243 when Alice of Champagne was accepted as bailli of Jerusalem, the Cypriot royal family had an interest in the mainland kingdom. In 1269 after the Hohenstaufen dynasty had died out, Hugh III of Cyprus mounted the throne of Jerusalem, and, though ousted from 1276 until 1286, the Lusignans henceforth took the title of king of Jerusalem. Cypriot knights had already served on crusades and participated in other military expeditions in Syria, but with suzerainty came military responsibility, and the Cypriot rulers brought their island vassals to fight on the mainland on several occasions. In the 1260's Cypriot military involvement in Jerusalem was frequent and the dispute of 1271 was in part a reaction to this. But this dispute should not be seen as an indication that the Cypriot feudatories had no concern for Syria. Many families had fiefs in both kingdoms and would have had a vested interest in the survival of Jerusalem. As the extent of the kingdom diminished during the second half

---

1. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.210-27.

2. See below, p.267.
of the thirteenth century, these families would have come to depend increasingly on their Cypriot estates, though with the Barlais family the opposite occurred: deprived of their Cypriot fiefs, they had to rely on their mainland revenues.¹

The clearest example of a house which gradually came to depend on its Cypriot fiefs is the Ibelin family. By 1250 the family's resources were divided with two branches, those of Baldwin the seneschal of Cyprus and Guy the constable of Cyprus, being based solely in Cyprus, and the other three with mainland estates, apparently supplemented by Cypriot fiefs.² Of the lordships held by the Ibelins in Jerusalem, Arsur was alienated to the Hospitaliers in 1261 for a perpetual rent and lost to the Mamlukes in 1265;³ Jaffa was lost in 1268,⁴ and Beirut remained in Christian hands until 1291.⁵ Though the lords of Arsur and the counts of Jaffa almost certainly held fiefs at Acre, there is no evidence that either of these branches of the Ibelin family was resident in the kingdom of Jerusalem or took an active part in Jerusalemite politics after the death of Balian of Arsur in 1277.⁶ In the early fourteenth century members of all five branches were living in Cyprus.

---

2. See above, p. 99.
3. Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, pp. 133-4. Any financial obligations to the lords of Arsur on the part of the Hospitaliers were terminated in 1269.
6. 'Eracles', ii, p. 478.
The fate of the descendants of John of Caesarea was slightly different. It appears that his Jerusalemite estates passed to the Aleman family and his Cypriot estates to the Dampierres. 1 Caesarea was lost in 1265, and the Alemans seem to have died out towards the end of the century. 2 They are not known to have had Cypriot estates, but presumably any they held would have passed to the Dampierres on the extinction of the line. Similar examples featuring lesser families can be found: the senior line of the Bethsan family appears to have been based in Cyprus while in the mid-thirteenth century a cadet branch was present in Acre, subsequently reappearing in Cyprus after 1291; 3 the Mimars family had members in both kingdoms in the mid-thirteenth century, 4 and so did the St. Bertin family. Walter of St. Bertin, who appears as a vassal of John of Jaffa in Cyprus in 1247, and as a liege man in the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1251, is known to have been involved in legal disputes over fiefs in both kingdoms. 5

No clear pattern emerges from these examples. In some cases an individual held fiefs in both kingdoms; in others different branches of the same

---

1. See above, pp.99, 100.
2. La Monte, 'The Lords of Caesarea', pp.159-60.
4. See above, p.94-5.
5. Reg. Hier., no. 1149; Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.539-40; 'Abrégé du Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois', RHC Lois, II, p.246. It is possible that more than one individual with this name is referred to. A Walter of St. Bertin appears as a vassal of Hugh I in 1210. Reg. Hier., no. 846. For Amaury of St. Bertin, a vassal of the lords of Tyre and Caesarea (between 1253 and 1269), see Reg. Hier., nos. 1210, 1233, 1238, 1286, 1366. For Thomas of St. Bertin, a holder of a mainland fief in the 1270's, see 'Eracles', II, p.474.
family held fiefs in one or the other; most families held fiefs in Jerusalem before obtaining Cypriot interests. How numerous the knightly class was in Cyprus before 1291 cannot be known, but whereas the number of knights that could be supported by the resources of the kingdom of Jerusalem almost certainly fell sharply after c. 1260, it can be assumed that in Cyprus the numbers remained more constant. The importance of the pressure on the Jerusalemite knights to leave Syria is impossible to assess, but it is likely that there was a preference for fiefs in the comparative security of Cyprus. In the late thirteenth century some families left Syria for Apulia, but whether this was after the collapse of Angevin power in Acre, or after 1291 is uncertain. It is even less clear how many feudal knights there were in Acre in 1291 with no resources in Cyprus or elsewhere to fall back on, or whether those Jerusalemite knights with fiefs in Cyprus regarded them as insurance against the time when they would lose their mainland fiefs or as sources of income to be spent in the defence of their mainland fiefs.

1. 'Lignages', pp.464, 469.
2. See below, pp.276-7.
Chapter 5

THE NOBILITY IN THE REIGN OF HENRY II (1285-1324)

It is not easy to evaluate the effect of the fall of Acre and the other Syrian ports on the Cypriot feudatories: for those with no fiefs on the mainland it would presumably have made no material difference, whereas for those who did hold fiefs in Syria it would have meant a reduction in income, though also a reduction in liabilities. Grandclaude's view that the Jerusalemite magnates were ruined in 1291 and their consequent reliance on royal generosity tilted the balance in Cyprus in favour of greater royal authority is without foundation. It has already been seen that many of the leading families in Jerusalem acquired fiefs in Cyprus during the thirteenth century; by 1291 with the exception of Tyre and Beirut and apparently Haifa and Scanderoon the great feudal lordships had disappeared. The survivors of the Jerusalemite nobility with no resources in Cyprus did suffer, though according to the writer of the 'Gestes des Calprois' the knights and sergeants who took refuge in the island were hired as


2. Acre was royal domain; Sidon, Athlit and Tortosa were held by the Templars; the lord of Gibelet seems to have retained his lordship for a few years after 1291. See Ruachman, History of the Crusades, iii, p.407.
mercenaries. It is to be assumed that those feudatories who chose to remain in Cyprus, especially those who already had fiefs or family connections there, were assimilated without difficulty. Even so, as late as 1310 Thomas of Piquigny was described as a 'miles Accoensis'.

It is even more difficult to assess the mood of the nobility after 1291. Initially there were fears that the Mamlukes would invade Cyprus, and after this scare had passed there were what appear to have been rather half-hearted counter-attacks. But whether the nobility believed that the reoccupation of Syria was feasible or desirable is open to doubt, and there is little evidence for spontaneous enthusiasm for a forward policy against the Mamlukes. The idea of the kingdom of Jerusalem, however, had its attractions: the kings of Cyprus retained the title of king of Jerusalem; titular Jerusalemite lordships were maintained, and it was said that the women in Cyprus were accustomed to wear black in mourning for the loss of Acre. But however much talk there was of crusades, no Cypriot army made a convincing attempt to establish a bridgehead in Syria and there was never any suggestion that such an undertaking was possible unaided.

1. 'Gestes', p.818.
2. 'Processus Cypricus', p.162. Probably this appellation was used here as a deliberate anachronism as Thomas was apparently testifying that he had seen the Templars fighting at the fall of Acre. In the account of the events of 1308, James of Flory was described as a 'chevalier d'Acre'. 'Gestes', p.885.
5. See above, pp.16-23.
The fall of Acre had a profound effect on Cypriot commerce; with the embargo on direct trade with the Mamlukes, western merchants could not legally trade in Syrian or Egyptian ports, and almost immediately the pattern grew up of local traders shipping their wares from Syria to Famagusta which thus became the chief entrepôt in the eastern Mediterranean.  

Directly after the fall of Acre Henry II was encouraging traders from Barcelona and Pisa to come to Cyprus by granting privileges, and the register of a Genoese notary working in Famagusta in 1300 shows that by then it was a thriving international port. The royal revenues from trade would have increase dramatically, and consequently the crown's capacity for providing money fiefs for the feudatories. But the increased wealth from trade excited the greed of the trading republics, Genoa especially, and they, rather than the Mamlukes, were from the 1290's Cyprus's chief enemies.

It was not the fall of Acre but the crisis of 1306-1310 which forms the focal point of Henry's reign. On 26 April 1306 Amaury of Lusignan, lord of Tyre, brother of Henry II and heir apparent, supported by the majority of the leading Cypriot vassals, declared the king unfit to rule and assumed control of

1. See above, pp. xii-xiii.


3. 'Actes passés à Famagouste', passim.
the kingdom, taking the title of governor (gubernator). 1 Amaury had had composed a list of complaints to justify his action, 2 and the theme of the document which was read to the king on that day by Hugh of Bello, a grandson of John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, and a senior member of the family at the time, 3 was that

... les besognes dou réaume n'ont pas esté ni ne soat pas gouvernées coment besoing seroit ... 4

The document is an important statement of the causes of the coup, and provides a commentary on the history of Cyprus during the previous fifteen years.

The first accusation against Henry was that nothing had been done about the Genoese threat to Cyprus, and the advice of the vassals had been ignored. 5 In the 1230's the Genoese had helped Henry I and the Bellois, 6 but in the late thirteenth century relations became strained. In the 1290's Henry was conciliatory, rescinding an agreement made in 1288 which restricted their rights in Cyprus 7 and accepting responsibility for damage to Genoese property in Cyprus.

3. 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442; 'Gestes', p.858. He was a son of Baldwin the seneschal. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rapoletes, table XI (1).
4. 'Texte officiel', p.635.
5. 'Texte officiel', p.535.
6. See above, p.91.
7. Liber furiun reipublicae Genuenses (Turin, 1854-7), ii, cols. 275-6. The government in Genoa refused to ratify the treaty of 1288 with the result that Henry '... postea Ianuenses male tenuit et minus honoravit ...'. Annull Genovesi di Caffaro e de'suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXIII, ed. L.T. Belgrano and C. Imperiale di Sant'Angelo (Rome, 1890-1929), v, p.91.
resulting from the Genoese war with Venice. As Genoese demands and piratical activities increased, it appears that the king attempted to resist. The exact course of events is confused, but more than once Henry threatened to restrict the freedom of Genoese citizens in the island. This was no solution as Cyprus needed Genoese merchants to keep trade flowing, and by restricting them the king would have been indirectly encouraging them to turn to piracy. The charge that Henry had done nothing to solve the problem was not altogether true. In 1303 Genoese corsairs were captured and hanged, and at the beginning of 1306 the Genoese were expelled and then allowed to remain provided they took an oath of good behaviour. But by April a crisis had been reached: the Genoese withdrew their citizens from Cyprus in preparation for war and the king ordered the expulsion of the Genoese and the seizure of their merchandise. Although he tried to pin the blame for the crisis on Amaury, Henry was held responsible by the feudatories, and concern at these developments, singled out by the principal contemporary chroniclers as the chief reason for the coup, was undoubtedly an important factor in Amaury's seizure of power. The king was then accused of doing nothing about the threatened Egyptian invasion, even though warned by his own mother of their preparations. Though

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 239.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 255-6. The situation was sufficiently serious for the pope to intervene. Clement V, nos. 752-3.
7. 'Texte officiel', p. 535.
there seems to be no other evidence for a war scare in 1306, there is no doubt during the previous 15 years that Henry had done little to strike at the Mamlukes. Attempts at collaboration with the Mongols, intended to coincide with their expeditions of 1300 when Damascus was captured, or 1303 when they were defeated at Marj al-Suffar, were ineffectual. Though the Cypriot campaigns of 1299-1303 were the only attempts by Latin Christians to intervene in Syria at this period, exaggerated accounts of the successes of Christian armies in the first two decades of the fourteenth century circulated in the West. Henry was later accused of failing to allow supplies to be sent to Amaury of Tyre's expedition to Ruad. It is probably significant that all the Cypriot knights who acted as emissaries or commanders in these campaigns and who are known to have participated in the events of 1306-1310 - Bertram Fassian, Baldwin of Piquigny, Raymond Viscount, John of Antioch and John of

1. D.P. Little (An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qal'lan (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp.141-2) gives no indication that the Arab sources for A.H.705 (1305-6) contain references to the Mamlukes planning action against Cyprus. I thank Mr. R.G. Irwin for drawing my attention to this point.


3. For examples, see John of St. Victor, 'Memoriale historiarum', RHE, xxi, p.646; Flores historiarum, ed. H.R. Luard (London, 1890), iii, pp.335, 341-2.


5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.236, see p.341.


Cibelet — supported Amaury of Tyre.

Henry was further accused of doing nothing to help Armenia, then under strong pressure from the Mamlukes of doing nothing about potentially hostile shipping and of diplomatic failures which had turned former friends into enemies. He had failed to arrange for the import of foodstuffs in time of famine; towns and castles were insufficiently garrisoned and supplied, and delays in the courts of up to twenty years meant that justice was denied.

The document, as read by Hugh of Ibelin, was nevertheless respectful in tone. The king was reminded of the fact that the knights had for the previous seventeen years willingly allowed their fiefs to be taxed, and was assured that his interests and the interests of his kingdom were uppermost in the minds of his vassals. For the good of his kingdom and his own good, in view of his

1. 'Gestes', p.850. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.237, see pp.261, 269, 341.
3. It was not specified which powers Henry had alienated, though from papal letters of July 1306 it appears that he had refused to allow the Hospitallers to use Cyprus as a naval base. Cartulaire général des Hospitallers, nos. 4727-8.
4. For a royal ordinance of 1296 to fix grain prices, see J. Richard, 'L'ordonnance de décembre 1296'. There are no references to a failure of the harvests in Cyprus in the period immediately before 1306, though a drought is recorded in Syria in 1305. al-Maqrizi, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l'Egypte, ed. and translated M. Quatremère (Paris, 1837-48), II, part 2, p.249.
6. 'Texte officiel', pp.534-5.
illness, he was requested to hand over power to his brother. Though it is not possible to substantiate some of the charges brought against Henry, we are given a picture of an ill and inactive king who had been incapable of providing strong government at a time when it was needed. This lack of good government was undoubtedly an important reason for the widespread support given Amaury in 1306, but the narrative sources provide an alternative explanation: Henry had relied on the counsel of his maternal uncle, Philip of Ibelin the seneschal of Cyprus, to the exclusion of all his other vassals, and this denial of their rightful role as royal advisers rankled.

Although almost all the historians of the period were hostile to Amaury, he emerges as an abler and perhaps more attractive figure than his brother. What is known of his career before 1306 seems to indicate that he was vigorous and capable. He led the Cypriot contingent to the defence of Tripoli and was then appointed by his brother to be his bailli in Acre '... il quale si portava ben et saviamemente'. By 1296 he had been made lord of Tyre and constable of...

---

1. He is said to have been an epileptic. See Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, pp.187, 227.
2. 'Texte officiel', pp.536-7.
5. 'Gestes', pp.803-4; *Annali Genovesi*, v, p.94.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.218. See 'Gestes', p.804. It was probably because he was bailli in Acre that the pope wrote letters to him in October 1296. Nicholas IV, nos. 4387, 4392, 4400. See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 220-21.
Jerusalem, and he was prominent in the military campaigns of 1299-1303.

He also has the rare distinction for a Cypriot of having a philosophical treatise dedicated to him, though whether this indicates that he was an educated man and patron of the arts is questionable.

During the four years of his rule he seems to have attempted to correct those evils which he had accused his brother of ignoring. He worked for peace with the Genoese, and by 1308 had won the support of their representative in Cyprus so that he led a demonstration against the king '... per el bon viso che II mostrò el signor de Sur ...'. About the same time as this incident occurred, Amaury concluded a peace treaty with the authorities in Genoa. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it appears that in the period after Amaury's assumption of power the hostilities ceased, but early in 1310 there was an affray in Famagusta in which some Genoese were killed. Henceforth the Genoese worked for the restoration of the king.

Amaury's policy towards the Mamlukes was bound up with his relations


5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 280.

6. Clement V, no. 9256.

with the papacy. It is probable that he was frustrated by the paucity of the military activities before 1306 and genuinely hoped to recover the former Christian lands in Syria. From letters to the pope and the king of Aragon written in 1308, it appears that Amaury was seeking aid against the Mamlukes, and in his letter to the pope he referred to the threat of invasion. According to al-Maqrizi, however, the chief Mamluke military activity in 1308 was directed against the Yemen, though the same author noted the refortification of the castle of Mont Pelerin at Tripoli in that year. But even if there were no plans for invading Cyprus, it does not follow that the Cypriots did not fear invasion especially as after 1303 the Mongols were less of a danger to the Mamlukes: in April 1308, at the king's request, the pope granted indulgences for those helping to fortify Famagusta.

It is possible that Amaury's appeal to the West was prompted by a desire for papal recognition and support rather than by fear of Muslim invasion. From the beginning of his pontificate, Clement V had been planning a crusade in

---

1. Mas Latrîe, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp.680-81, see p.679; Vitae paparum Avenioensium hoc est historia pontificum Romanoarum qui in Gallia sederunt ab anno Christi MCCCV usque anum MCCCXCIV, ed. S. Baluze, new edition by G. Mollat (Paris, 1914-27), iii, pp.84-6. Neither letter is fully dated but the Aragonese letter was written on 25 April, and from references in it to a shipwreck which occurred in December 1307 (see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.227), April 1308 is the probable date, though 1309 or 1310 are possible. The text of the letter to the pope is contained in a papal letter of 20 August 1308 and contains a reference to Hayton of Gorhigos's return to Cyprus in May of that year (see 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.278-80); the letter therefore dates to between May and early August 1308.

2. al-Maqrizi, ii, part 2, pp.278-281.

3. Clement V, no. 2736.
consultation with the Military Orders, and Amaury probably suspected that a crusading army might depose him en passant, either to restore Henry or to establish a new dynasty in Cyprus. In the treaty of Caltabellotta in 1302 the possibility of an Aragonese prince receiving the Cypriot crown was mooted and Peter Dubois, Philip IV of France's crusading publicist, was suggesting the accession of one of Philip's younger sons to the throne of Jerusalem and Cyprus. From the outset Amaury feared papal intervention in Cyprus against him. At the time of his settlement with Henry in May 1306, Amaury and Henry, almost certainly on Amaury's insistence, agreed not to send emissaries or letters to the pope to complain about each other's actions. Whether Henry broke the agreement, or whether rumour of Amaury's coup reached the pope and Henry was suspected of being responsible is not clear, but early in 1307 Amaury sent Hayton, the former lord of Gorhigos who was now a canon at Bellapais, to represent his interests at the papal court. Hayton remained there for approximately a year, returning in May 1308. Meanwhile Amaury sent two other embassies to the pope, the first of which ended in shipwreck (December 1307), and the second of which, led by two knights, John of Brie and John

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.254.
Lombard, was at the papal court by the end of February 1308. Hayton's mission was allegedly to deatiguate the king and obtain papal confirmation of Amaury's post of governor for life. Either he or John of Brie and John Lombard brought to the papal court documents relating to Amaury's seizure of power as evidence for the justice of his actions. These included the speech read by Hugh of Ibelin described above, and an instrument of May 1306 by which Henry agreed to the legal and financial arrangements for Amaury's rule. It appears that the ambassadors translated them into Latin and concocted a third document based largely on Hugh of Ibelin's speech for the purpose of convincing the pope. This third document emphasised Amaury's enthusiasm for military action against the Mamlukes and Henry's indifference, and there is no doubt that Amaury's ambassadors hoped thereby to win papal support, knowing that the pope was anxious to launch a crusade and that preparations were already in progress. Amaury's case, evidently buttressed by these documents, and Henry's, conveyed by unknown emissaries, were laid before the pope before 23 January 1308 on which date Clement commissioned two clerics to investigate. But, though

1. Clement V, nos. 2469, 2471, see also 2470, 2472, 2484; 'Gestes', p.871. See Kohler's Introduction to 'Flor des Estoires', pp.xlii-xlili.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.280.
4. All these documents survive in the Vatican archives. See above, pp.27-8.
6. Clement V, no. 3543.
Hayton, as a prominent member of the pro-Latin party in Armenia, was well received, and though he offered 10,000 gold florins and perhaps more for papal recognition, he returned to Cyprus having failed in his mission.  

By the time of Hayton's return, Amaury was faced with considerable opposition in Cyprus; many knights were imprisoned and others in exile. Consequently papal support was all the more vital. Hayton brought with him instructions from the papal court ordering the arrest of the Templars in Cyprus, and Amaury was sufficiently anxious not to offend the pope that he complied, even though the Order had hitherto consistently supported him. In August 1308 the crusade was formally announced, planned for the following spring. The expedition was postponed, but by the summer of 1309 it appeared to be about to start. By the end of July Amaury appears to have been under the impression that its arrival was imminent, and summoned a full feudal levy. Presumably his intention was to co-operate with the crusade as far as possible, thereby hoping to secure papal approval, and at the same time he would have the Cypriots organised in case the crusading army should attempt to remove him by force.

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.280.
3. See below, pp.139-43.
6. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.248, 260-61, 266, see also, pp.360, 392.
8. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.300-301.
His other device was to renew his efforts to put pressure on Henry to appoint him governor for life, but repeated attempts throughout August and September at persuasion, removal of Henry's companions, virtual imprisonment and the confiscation of the royal treasury failed to have their desired effect. The crusade came to nothing, but Amaury still felt insecure and early in 1310 sent Henry into exile. In March 1310 Raymond of Pisa, the papal nuncio, arrived in Cyprus with the task of reconciling the king and his brother. Amaury still feared a crusading fleet, and apparently thinking that Raymond had arrived ahead of it, reportedly set about strengthening the defences of Famagusta. Raymond persuaded Henry to accept an agreement by which his brother would be governor for life, but Amaury postponed the conclusion of the agreement in the hope that he could obtain still better terms. At that juncture he was murdered.

Amaury's attitude to the recovery of Syria cannot be fully determined. In 1306 he posed as the champion of those who wanted a forward policy against

2. See Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, p.225.
4. 7 March (the Saturday before Quadragesima) according to Raymond himself (Perrat, 'Un diplomate gascon', p.66); 4 March according to the 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p.326). He has been given this mission in January 1308. Clement V, no. 3543.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.326-7. A small Hospitaller fleet, all that could be saved from the abortive crusade, was active in the Aegean at this time. See Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, p.225. Perhaps Amaury feared that it was destined for Cyprus.
7. On the day of his murder his widow thought that he had fled through fear of the coming crusade. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.332.
the Mamlukes and his earlier record suggests that this was genuine. From 1308, when it became apparent that the pope was not predisposed to support him, his enthusiasm seems to have cooled through fear that papal opposition, supported by a crusading army, would terminate his career. This fear was understandable, for as late as 1310 when the papal nuncio was negotiating for him to be made governor for life, that same nuncio was still prepared to consider using excommunication and interdict as means of coercing him to allow the restoration of the king.  

In the same way that any study of the Ibelin-Longobard war has to rely heavily on Philip of Novara's account, so the study of the political events of 1306-1310 must rely on one source, the 'Chronique d'Amadi'. The author of the original of this source which survives only in an Italian translation, was favourable to the king, but he did not allow himself to denigrate the opposition excessively and his comparatively moderate tone and his reasonable accuracy in describing events which can be checked from independent sources indicate that he can be trusted up to a point. The version of the events that he gives shows that Amaury, with some justification and with considerable support, seized power in 1306; from then until his murder in 1310 unfavourable events and declining popularity undermined his position; after his murder Cypriot noble society polarised, some trying to establish his younger brother Aimery as


2. For the relationship of this source to other narrative sources, see the Introduction to 'Gestes', pp. ccli-cclviii; Leontios Makhairas, II, pp.8-11.
governor, and the others working for the restoration of the king; the king returned from exile, and Almery's party collapsed.

Behind the reasons for Amaury's loss of support was the fact that Henry refused to accept his suspension from the exercise of kingly office. In April 1306, at the time of Amaury's coup he defended himself against the usurpation, but, out-numbered and out-maneuvered, was forced to come to terms. According to the writer of the 'Chronique d'Amadi' he recovered from his illness early in 1307, and from then proceeded to build up his party in Cyprus. Despite various set-backs and intensive pressure, especially in August and September 1309, he refused to give up, and it was only when in exile in Armenia that this will to resist seems to have wavered and he was prepared to appoint Amaury governor for life. Had Henry submitted to his brother, it is unlikely that the opposition to the governor's rule would have reached the proportions it did. But Amaury and his leading supporters could not allow Henry to recover power, even if cured and capable of ruling, for they knew he would be vindictive.

Compared with the king's, Amaury's party in 1306 was powerful. Of the

1. 'Gestes', p.862; Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 50, 53; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.249.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.254.
4. See below, pp.132, 139-41.
5. See above, p.128.
major nobility only the queen-mother, her brother, Philip of Ibelin the
seneschal, and John Dampierre, the king's first cousin, supported Henry.
His mother and uncle, children of Guy the constable, tried to oppose Amaury
at the time of the coup and Philip and John only took the oath to Amaury under
duress.¹ Between April 1306 and June 1310, the date of his murder, over
fifty knights are mentioned by name as followers of Amaury. Thirty of these
are mentioned in the sources for 1306.² Amaury was supported by his brother,
Aimery the constable of Cyprus, and by representatives of virtually all the
branches of the Ibelin family. These included Rupen of Montfort, the
descendant through his mother of Balian of Beirut, Hugh, the son of Baldwin
the seneschal, and Hugh's nephews, Baldwin, Balian, prince of Galilee, and
Philip known as Philip 'the Younger',³ and John, grandson of John of Arsour.
No member of the family of the counts of Jaffa was of age in 1306, but Philip
of Jaffa later joined Amaury's party.⁴ The only branch of the Ibelin family
which contained supporters of Henry was that of the descendants of Guy the
constable. But of the members of this branch, Guy's grandson, also named Guy,
supported Amaury, while Amaury himself and his brother Aimery were Guy's

¹ 'Gestes', pp.857-8; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 42, 45-7; 'Chronique
d'Amadi', pp.242-8, 252.
² See 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, pp.442-3; Diplomatarium Veneto-
Levantium, i, p.42; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 59 (see J.L. La Monte
and N. Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem and
Cyprus', Medievalia et Humanistica, vi (1950), pp.72-3); 'Chronique d'Amadi',
³ Philip the Younger's brother John also supported Amaury, but he is not
mentioned in the connection with the events of 1306.
⁴ See below, pp.466-7.
descendants through their mother.¹ In 1306 Amaury is also known to have had the active support of a number of lesser knights, including members of the Antloch, Bethsan, Brie, For, Gibelet, Montgisard, Montolif, Morf, Piauligny, Le Tor and Viscount families,² and he also enjoyed the support of the Templars and the bishop of Limassol.³

Substantial though Amaury's following was, the nobility were not unanimously behind him. Though all the knights took the oath to support him, some were less willing than others.⁴ In the agreement of May 1306 by which Henry seems to have accepted Amaury's governorship for the time being, Amaury evidently felt sufficiently secure to allow the king his personal freedom and a sizable pension. He was also allowed a household retinue of twelve feudal and twelve mercenary knights and a supporting force of turcopoles, mounted sergeants and servants.⁵ The narrative sources seem to indicate that the knights were hand-picked by the king. Without exception the named fief-holding knights subsequently appear participating in attempts at a royal restoration, and so it is likely that in 1306 Henry was able to choose men on whom he knew he could rely. The list included his two most prominent supporters, Philip of Ibelin and John Dampierre, two others who were later exiled by Amaury, Aimery of Mimars and Hugh Bedula,⁶ and three of the leading royalist knights

¹. See table 8.
2. See table 9 column 1.
⁴. 'Chronique d'Amadil', pp.248, 250, 252. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para.60.
⁵. Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 56-8; 'Chronique d'Amadil', pp.251-2.
Table 8. A simplified genealogical table to illustrate the relationship of the principal members of the Lusignan and Ibelin families involved in the events of 1306 - 1310.

Note: People alive in 1306 underlined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1306</th>
<th>1307 - 5 June 1310</th>
<th>6 June 1310 - 1311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Acrolissa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Aguilliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Aguillers</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Antioch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Antioch</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Antioch (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond of Antioch</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas of Antioch</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montolif of Aretia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novello of Argent (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Artuffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Atumi</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L'Ayze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Babin</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of La Baume (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond of La Baume</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland of La Baume</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Beduin</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Beirut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Belforte (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Belforte (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Benefei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aygue of Bethsan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Bethsan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of Blanchguarde (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Bonifacio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimery of Brandis (Brindisi?) (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anseau of Brie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan of Brie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard of Brie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy of Brie (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Brie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Brie, lord of Paradhisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Brie, son of Bohemond1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Brie, lord of Pistaki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas of Brie (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odo Le Bufle (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Le Bufle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam of Caffran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip of Caffran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cao (Capo?, d'Istria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carpass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cascas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1307 - 5 June 1310</td>
<td>6 June 1310 - 1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Chappe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Chevides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam of Cochili</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballian of La Corona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of La Corona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of La Corte</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Costa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Costa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Costa (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy of Cressy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemond of Crel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniæ Dacif (m)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dampierre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram of De</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of De</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohard of Estran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram Fassan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fassan Fassan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Fignon (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Finicote (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Place</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Floury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of Floury (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Floury (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of For</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond of For</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Gibelet (of Besmedin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gibelet (son of Henry)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gibelet ('Arneb')</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gibelet (of Avgoru)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter of Gibelet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Gibelet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Gibelet (m)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Gibein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Heremite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anseau of Ibelin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Ibelin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballian of Ibelin 'Malgarni'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballian of Ibelin, prince of Galilee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1307 - 5 June 1310</td>
<td>6 June 1310 - 1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy of Ibelin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Ibelin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Ibelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Ibelin, lord of Arsura</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Ibelin (brother of Philip)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Ibelin (the Younger)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Ibelin, count of Jaffa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Ibelin, the seneschal</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas of Ibelin (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Isaac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Le Jaune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Laleman (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Lanfranc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lanfranc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Litant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lombard (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Longueval (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of La Lucchese (m)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimer of Lusignan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan Machle (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Mainboeuf (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Mainboeuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mainboeuf (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mainboeuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Mainboeuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Malevlier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Marmenif (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimer of Mimars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Mimars (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan of Mimars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Mimars (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Mimars, lord of Asha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Mimars (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Mirabel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard of Monreal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballan of Montagu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupen of Montfort</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballen of Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynald of Montgisard (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Montolif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1307 - 5 June 1310</td>
<td>6 June 1310 - 1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Montolif</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Montolif</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Montolif (brother of Bp.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon of Montolif (son of Thomas)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Morf, lord of 'Stambole'</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence of Morf</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis of Nores</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Novara</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip of Novara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of L'Oliva (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Passoreal</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Passoreal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustorgue Pedout (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Peristerona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh of Peristerona's sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Le Petit</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier Le Petit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Piquigny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas of Piquigny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Pisano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Platiau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Plessia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Pormentan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of La Potamie (Potamia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Potier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Retin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauvain of La Roche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter of Rolant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Rosca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemond Rosia or Rossel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ruclan or Rosel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of St. Bertin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey of Scandellion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter of Scandellion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemond Sias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynald of Soissons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1307 - 5 June 1310</td>
<td>6 June 1310 - 1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Tiberias</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Le Tor</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of La Torre</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas of Valmetton</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph of Villiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Villiers, son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph of Villiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Viscount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. A list of knights who are known by name who participated in the events of 1306 - 1310.

Key:  
- x - supporter of Amaury of Tyre  
- o - supporter of King Henry  
- () - not altogether clear which party they are supporting at the time  
- (m) - mercenary knight  
- (s) - squire

Note:
1. It is not always clear from the sources whether the son of Bohemond or the Lord of Paradisi is the John of Brie mentioned.
in Famagusta in 1310, Anseau of Brie, Raynaud of Soissons and John Babia.  

None of the twelve feudal knights were among the thirty known to have supported Amaury positively in 1306, and all were involved in the pro-royal movements of 1308. It could be argued that by allowing the king to have this retinue, Amaury was being over-confident in view of the evident hostility to his regime of some at least of its leading members, but it is likely that in 1306 Amaury was inclined to be generous to the king, knowing that if he were too harsh he would provoke a reaction.

Henry lived at the village of Strovolos, two miles south of Nicosia, for the rest of 1306. At an unknown date, apparently early in 1307, there was an obscure episode which appears to mark a significant change in Amaury's policy. Amaury suspected Henry of plotting with knights favourable to him and so sent a body of armed men to arrest him. Henry was warned and, avoiding Amaury's forces, came to Nicosia. Amaury placed his brother's residence under guard and Henry was virtually besieged until the bishop of Famagusta smoothed things over by persuading the brothers to wait until they heard whether the pope would sanction Amaury's rule. It is not certain whether Amaury's suspicions were well-founded, but the episode does at least show that he felt insecure. Though he was prepared to arrest the king in the comparative secrecy of Strovolos, he seems not to have been prepared to arrest him in Nicosia, and this suggests that he feared opinion there.

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.362.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.264.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 61; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252-4.
On the other hand, Henry seems to have been henceforth under closer surveillance and is not known to have left Nicosia until his exile.\(^1\) The incident provides the earliest evidence for Amaury feeling insecure. Probably his measures failed to bolster his position, since the king was not fully in his control, and yet his treatment of him would not have won over those who were loyal, especially as Henry was now said to be cured of his illness.

The only attempt by the king to win back power by using his supporters in Cyprus occurred in 1308. In January a group of knights from the Paphos area rebelled against Amaury. Simultaneously the king and his followers in Nicosia put the royal residence in a state of defence, though the chronicler does not indicate whether the Paphos rebellion took place with Henry's knowledge or approval. Amaury besieged the king, assisted by the Templars and by the Genoese.\(^2\) The royalists were out-numbered and surrendered without a fight.\(^3\)

The 'Chronique d'Amadi' lists 24 feudal and 15 mercenary knights who were with the king. All were imprisoned except Philip of Ibelin and John Dampliere, who were exiled to Alaminos and Karpasia respectively, and 4 feudal knights and 10 mercenaries whom the king was allowed to keep.\(^4\) Meanwhile the Paphos knights, said to number 40, had failed to rally support at Limassol, and on learning of the situation in Nicosia dispersed. 12 were later imprisoned.\(^5\)

---

1. Possibly Henry's retinue was reduced at this point to the 7 knights mentioned by the author of the 'Gestes' (p.865). The list includes two men who were not members of the retinue of 1306.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.263-4. See 'Gestes', p.866. Two of the mercenary knights were Amaury's agents. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.264-5.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.265-6.
The royalists evidently had considerable support, but militarily were no match for Amaury. It appears that most of the knights who were imprisoned remained in custody until early 1310, and consequently the king had no second chance. Probably the Paphos group had acted prematurely and the royalists submitted rather than risk their lives in what would have been a hopeless conflict.

The king's position was further weakened when Amaury followed up his success by making him appoint him governor for life, but Henry agreed only under duress and in consequence the Franciscans, who from about this time emerge as supporters of the king, refused to affix their seals to the document confirming the appointment.

Soon after this, Amaury's position was impaired by the loss of two of his leading followers, Rupen of Montfort and Baldwin of Ibelin. It was reported that Rupen and members of his household were plotting to capture Amaury and restore the king. Rupen denied the reports and was confined to his mother's estate of Laphthos. Baldwin was suspected of conveying Amaury's secret plans to Henry and confined to his estate at Korakou. The account of these events as given by the 'Chronique d'Amadi' does not say that the charges were justified.

1. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.325. Ballian of Montagu and William of Villiers were at liberty earlier. Ballian was a member of the queen's household, and William was of the household of Eschiva of Ibelin, Lady of Beirut. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.296-7, 300, 316.

2. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.298, 323, also p.251.

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.266.

4. The date given by the 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p.267) of the end of June ('uscir del mese di zugno...') is impossible as Baldwin was exiled in April (pp.275-6). Perhaps 'zener' (January) should be understood for 'zugno'.

and it leaves the impression that Rupen and Baldwin were disgraced without cause. Subsequently they supported the king, but it appears that their defection was due to Amaury's willingness to believe stories of plots - evidence for his feeling of insecurity - rather than Henry's ability to detach his adherents. It was said that Baldwin was denounced by his cousin, John of Ibelin, the brother of Philip the Younger, and by Simon of Montolif, later to be Amaury's murderer, both of whom bore him a grudge. 1 Rupen, as heir to the Cypriot inheritance of the lords of Beirut, and Baldwin, as representative of the senior branch of the descendants of Baldwin and seneschal, 2 were powerful men, and they were the first major losses suffered by Amaury's party that are recorded. 3 Amaury strengthened his position by arresting knights who were sympathetic to the king, 4 and then in April 1308 had Philip of Ibelin, the seneschal, and Baldwin of Ibelin sent into exile to Armenia. 5 Meanwhile John Dampierre died, having been beaten up following an attempt to communicate with the king. 6

Amaury had been faced with the opposition of a substantial section of the

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.329.

2. See above, p.167 and table 8.

3. The only previous defector to Henry's party who is known was Balian Machic, a mercenary knight. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.259, 264.

4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.269. Most were probably held until 1310, but in 1308 Walter of Floury was an exile in Rhodes and Hugh of Mimars was in Henry's service. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.297, 300, 310.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.272-7.

Cyriot feudal class. Almost 70 knights are named in the lists of those involved in the royalist moves of 1308, but Amaury was able to contain them without difficulty. His policy of repression was successful in that there was no more open opposition to his regime on the part of the feudatories, but the extent of the royalist party in 1308 is probably symptomatic of widespread disaffection. There is, however, no evidence for any grounds for opposition to his regime other than that it was 'illegal'. Loyalty to the crown and to the person of the king, especially now that he was physically fit, entailed opposition to the usurper, and the belief that Amaury was a usurper would have been increased when it became apparent that the pope was not prepared to recognise him. Amaury, unpopular in Cyprus and threatened by the pope and a forthcoming crusade, was driven to act against his own supporters, the Templars. Though Cyprus remained quiet for the rest of 1308 and throughout 1309, Amaury's difficulties increased. The harvests failed; two of his leading supporters died: Guy of Ibelin in September 1308 and John of Arsur in August 1309; Rupen of Montfort, who had been allowed to accompany his mother on her unsuccessful expedition to Athens to claim the duchy, chose to remain in exile in Rhodes, and in April 1309 Amaury was more or less openly rebuked from the pulpit by two Franciscans.

1. See table 9 column 2. Almost all the known royalist knights in 1307 - 1310 were involved in the attempted restoration of 1308. More pro-royal knights than anti-royal knights are known by name in this period, but they were nevertheless probably a minority.

2. See above, p.127.


4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.293, 300.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.297, see pp.294-8.
for his treatment of Henry. From the middle of 1309, by which time Amaury believed the crusade to be on its way, he intensified his repression, and increased his pressure on the king. In June a group of knights who had been arrested for supporting Henry in 1308 were exiled to Armenia, and more were exiled in September. As the crusade gave Amaury cause for fear, so it gave Henry cause for hope and he now resisted all attempts to make him submit.

By October 1309 Amaury had decided on a complete change of plan. In that month he sent his wife to arrange with her brother, King Oshin of Armenia, to accept Henry as a prisoner in exile, and at the beginning of February 1310 Henry was escorted to Cilicia. Immediately the king was out of Cyprus, Amaury released the royalist knights who were held in custody in the island, threatening them with confiscation of their fiefs if they tried to act against his interests. This was a skilful move, for, by releasing the prisoners, Amaury was able to make a conciliatory gesture, and by placing the king in custody in Armenia he had removed the greatest threat to himself. It would be difficult for any royalist movement to be taken seriously, for even if the royalists were to gain control of Cyprus, the king would still be inaccessible to them, and if a crusade were to come with the intention of restoring Henry, it would have to contend with both the Christian states in the eastern Mediterranean. Also it

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.298.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.299. See 'Gestes', p.871.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.313.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.325.
would be hard for the royalists in Cyprus to contact the king. Exiling the king might not be popular, but it would secure Amaury's position.

It is probable that Amaury would have preferred to rule with the consent and support of the king and vassals, but the history of the years 1306 - 1310 shows a progressive movement towards repression. He may have been popular at the outset, but gradually loyalty to the king and Henry's stubborn refusal to submit sapped his authority and obliged him to become increasingly autocratic. Every setback and every unpopular move tended to rally support to the king, and though he could pose as the saviour of the kingdom in 1306, he seems to have become increasingly regarded as a usurper. Traditional loyalty to the king was Amaury's chief problem, and his failures and difficulties only reminded people of that loyalty.

Amaury was murdered on 5 June 1310, and King Henry returned to Cyprus on 27 August. This reversal of royal fortunes was brought about largely by the initiative taken by the royal knights in Cyprus. It seems that after the king's exile the most hopeful course of action for the royalists was to rescue the king from Armenia and take him to safety in Rhodes. In May 1310 it was rumoured that the Genoese and Hospitallers were plotting to do just that. By that time Rhodes was becoming a recognised refuge for royalist knights: in February two royalist knights, John L'Ayse and James of Montolif, had fled from Cyprus to join Rupen of Montfort and others there. Whether there was any

---

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.325, see pp. 265, 297. Thirteen royalist knights returned to Cyprus from Rhodes in June 1310. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.334.
truth in the rumour is not clear, but the Genoese had ceased to be friendly to Amaury’s regime by that date,¹ and the Hospitallers had evidently moved from their position of neutrality to support the king.²

The author of the ‘Chronique d’Amadi’, followed by Florio Bustron, gave a detailed account of the murder of Amaury by Simon of Montolif, one of his household knights. Simon’s motives were not discussed, but the writers were careful to avoid the suggestion that he committed the murder at the instigation of the royalists;³ far from joining the royalist knights he completely disappeared, and the sources hint that the royalists had no prior knowledge of the murder and decided to seize Famagusta only after the news of Amaury’s death reached them and even then out of considerations of self-preservation and not as part of a predetermined plot.⁴ It seems to be implied that Simon was acting independently and murdered Amaury for reasons of his own.

But it is likely that the original chronicler of these events was deliberately distorting the record to avoid accusing the knights, who at the time of writing would have been the leaders of Cypriot feudal society, of political assassination. There are various indications that Amaury’s death was planned. The chronicler was well-informed about events in 1309 and 1310; in particular, he gave a detailed narrative of the incidents of August and September 1309, of the deportation of the king early in 1310,⁵ and of the events of June to

¹. See above, p.123.
². See Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, pp.210-12.
⁴. ‘Chronique d’Amadi’, pp.333-4; Florio Bustron, p.199.
September 1310. But for the period from February to June 1310, the narrative is less detailed: the activities of Raymond of Filis are described, but not the riot involving the Genoese, nor the rumoured plot to take Henry to Rhodes, nor the opening of the trial of the Templars in Cyprus. It is therefore clear that the writer was omitting much that was of interest, and it is possible that he also suppressed the record of an assassination plot. It has been noted that in the account of the murder Simon cut off Amaury's hand and took it away with him, and suggested that he did this to prove that he had done the deed. This argues against the idea of Simon's independence and for the possibility that he was acting at the instigation of others.

Two writers of the late fourteenth century stated categorically that Amaury was murdered by knights loyal to King Henry. Little credence need be given to John Dardel whose account is clearly ill-informed and distorted, but Philip of Mézières's assertion in two separate works that the murderer acted by arrangement with the other royalist knights cannot be discounted so easily.

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.329-38.
5. Philip of Mézières, Le Songe du Vieux Pelerin, ii, pp.227-8; 'Épistre lamentable et consolatible sur le fait de la desconfiture laetimable du noble et vaillant roy de Hongrie par les Turcs devant la ville de Nicopoli", ed. J.M.B.C. Kervyn de Lettenhove in Jean Froissart, Œuvres (Brussels, 1887-77), xvi, p.485. According to Philip, the murderer was the uncle of a knight known to King John II of France - a detail which suggests he may have been well-informed.
It is likely, but not certain, that Amaury was killed at the instigation of the supporters of the king. Possibly a clue to those behind the murder is to be found in the transcript of the preliminary trial of the Templars in Cyprus.\(^1\) The hearing opened on 1 May and ended on 5 June, the day of Amaury's murder, and so it is probable that it was cut short by that occurrence. It fell into three parts: 1 - 4 May, the interrogation of 21 lay and clerical witnesses; throughout the rest of May, the examination of the Templars held in the island, and 1 - 5 June, the interrogation of a further 35 lay and clerical witnesses. Cut of the 56 witnesses, 24 were knights, the others being churchmen, merchants and burgesses. 16 knights testified at the beginning of May and 8 at the beginning of June. The first to testify in May were Philip of Ibelin, the seneschal, and Baldwin of Ibelin, both of whom had been in exile in Armenia and who were presumably brought over specifically for the trial.\(^2\) Among the others were Rupen of Montfort, who was in exile in Rhodes and, according to the chronicler, did not return to Cyprus until 23 June,\(^3\) and James of Montolff who was presumably the knight who had fled to Rhodes earlier that year.\(^4\) There is no doubt that the hearing took place in Nicosia at the dates stated, and so it can only be assumed that these feudatories

---

1. 'Processus Cypricus', pp.147-400.

2. 'Processus Cypricus', pp.152-3. See above, p.142. They were in Armenia in April 1310 (Perrat, 'Un diplomate giscou', p.69; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.328) and again by 9 June ('Chronique d'Amadi', p.338).


had been brought to Cyprus under safe-conducts. As the Templars had been opposed to the king, it was presumably thought by the clergy instructed to conduct the proceedings that pro-royal knights knight be more ready to provide evidence to secure their condemnation than might Amaury's supporters. In the event the royalist knights were just as prepared to exonerate them as the anti-royalists. Of the 16 knights who testified in May, 2, James of Plany and Raymond of Benthio, are otherwise unknown, and 2, Peter Isaac and Ballan of Montgaisard, were supporters of Amaury. Both seem to have been comparatively minor figures, but it is perhaps significant that they had been appointed to the posts of bailli of the royal castelli and bailli of the royal court immediately after Henry had gone into exile. The other twelve, including the four brought to Cyprus from exile, were all supporters of the king. Of the eight apparently at liberty at the time of the trial, four, Anseau of Brie, John Babin, Raynald of Soissons and Simon of Aguilhiers, had been members of the royal retinue in 1306, and these four, together with Robert and Raynald of Montgisard had been imprisoned for their role in the events of 1308. Anseau of Brie stated in his testimony that he had first heard of the charges against the Templars when imprisoned in Buffavento. Aygue of Bethsan, Anseau of Brie, John Babin, 

1. 'Processus Cyprius', pp.155-6, 157-8. From his testimony it would appear that Raymond had been in Amaury's service in 1308.


4. 'Processus Cyprius', pp.159-60; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.264, 269.

5. 'Processus Cyprius', p.154.
Raynald of Soissons and Robert of Montgisard were all prominent among the royalist knights in Famagusta after June 1316. Finally Thomas of Pauilgni was at that period apparently in the service of Rupen of Montfort and his mother. On the other hand, of the eight knights who testified in June, it is not known which side four supported, but three, John Lombard, Henry of Gibelet and Philip of Ibelin the Younger, were noted supporters of Amaury. The eighth was Simon of Montolif who was perhaps Amaury's murderer, but more probably his name-sake, a supporter of Amaury who had been bailli of Paphos in 1308. Not only does it look as if the royalist and anti-royalist knights were being kept apart, but it is clear that the leading royalists, including the three most powerful of the exiles, were together in Nicosia one month before Amaury's death. If the assassination was a royalist plot, perhaps

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.362.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.267, 296. He was later bailli of the secréte, see below, pp.323-7.
5. 'Processus Cyricus', pp.385-6. He is described as a knight of Nicosia and Paphos which suggests he was more likely to have been the bailli. It is possible that the two were identical, though the 'Chronique d'Amadi' (pp.265, 329) apparently distinguishes them, describing one as the brother of the bishop and the other as the son of Thomas. For Peter of Montolif, bishop of Paphos in 1302, see Boulfice VIII, Registre, ed. G. Digard, M. Faucon, A. Thomas and R. Fawtier (Paris, 1884-1939), no. 4554.
it was planned at that time. Admittedly the trial of the Templars provides only circumstantial evidence, but when taken together with the possible deliberate omissions on the part of the chronicler - a writer who could have wanted to distort the truth about the circumstances of the murder - and the assertions of Philip of Mézières, as well as Simon's action in cutting the hand off Amaury's dead body, a plot is not implausible.

Whether or not the royalists had engineered the murder of Amaury, they immediately took advantage of his death. Amaury's leading supporters, led by his brother Almery, the constable, and Ballan, prince of Galilee, at once proclaimed Almery governor.¹ Many of the royalist knights were together in Famagusta at the time of the murder. According to the writer of the 'Chronique d'Amadi', they had been posted there by Amaury as part of his panic measures at the time of the arrival of Raymond of Fils,² though if they had anticipated his murder, it is possible that they had deliberately congregated there. Amaury's castellan had instructions to keep the news of the murder from them for as long as possible, presumably so that Almery would have a chance to consolidate his position. But the day after the murder the royalists, supported by the Italian communes,³ declared openly for the king, and the

¹ 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.333.
² 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.333. See above, p.128.
castellan was powerless to resist them.¹ Later that day, when messengers came from Nicosia requiring the knights to take the oath to Amaury, the royalists refused and took the castellan and some other knights who were opposed to the king into custody.² They sent letters to rally other royalist sympathisers, and, when news of the events in Famagusta reached Paphos and Limassol, the knights in those places also declared for the king.³ At Kyrenia the garrison refused to accept either Amaury's castellan or his successor appointed by Amaury and swore to support Henry.⁴

For over a month there was stalemate, with neither side prepared to initiate a full-scale civil war. Amaury held Nicosia, and the royalists Famagusta and the other towns.⁵ The knights based in Famagusta were led by Aymgou of Bethsan, a supporter of Amaury in 1306 whose activities from then until 1310 are unrecorded.⁶ The other leaders of this group, John Babin, Anseau of Brie, John of La Corona, Peter of Gibelet, Martin Le Jaune, Robert of Montgisard, Bartholomew of Montolif, John Le Petit, and Raynald of Soissons, had all emerged as royalists by 1308.⁷ Towards the end of June they were joined by

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.333-5.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.343-4.
5. Curiously there is no reference as to who held the castles of St. Hilarion, Buffavento and Kantara at any stage during this period.
6. See below, p.203. For his relationship with Walter of Bethsan, an anti-royalist, see p.451 note 6.
Rupen of Montfort and other exiles who had been in Rhodes. On 6 June the royalist knights, the Venetians, Pisans and Genoese, and apparently the non-noble population of Famagusta swore to uphold the royal rights. Famagusta was placed in a state of defence and the royal banner flown. Aygue of Bithia was elected 'captain of the army and lieutenant of the king throughout Cyprus', although his title - 'Capitaneus regal Cypri', 'Capitanus baronum, fidellium militum et communitatam regal Cypri' - did not receive formal royal sanction until 12 August. Until then Aygue was claiming to act on the king's behalf, but he derived his authority solely from the conjuratio of knights, burgesses and Italians of 6 June. This conjuratio had one simple aim: the restoration of Henry and the defeat of his opponents. Though it is clear from the narrative that the knights were the most potent force within this conjuratio, it is significant that they did not attempt to act alone.

The Hospitaliers worked in close collaboration with the knights at Famagusta. Guy Severac, the grand commander, participated in the first, unsuccessful, attempt to negotiate the release of Henry, and on 26 June and 27 July the king's messengers were sent to Antioch.

---

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.354.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.335-6: '... capitanio loro sopra ditto exercito, et locotenente del re per tutto el regno de Cypro ...' (p.336).
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.374.
26 July substantial Hospitaller forces arrived in Cyprus to reinforce the royalists. ¹ On the same day that Amaury was murdered, Guy Severac had brought letters to Cyprus announcing that Henry was appointing the master of the Hospital his lieutenant in the Island and calling on his vassals to support him. The origins of this move are obscure. It is not known whether Henry had any foreknowledge of a political crisis in Cyprus, but it is unlikely that the intention was to publish the letters immediately, especially as the master was apparently not in Cyprus at that time.² Probably they were for use in the event of a political upheaval, and they suggest that the king was relying on the Hospitallers rather than on his own vassals to take the initiative. After the anti-royalists had withdrawn to Kormakiti, these letters were used apparently in an attempt to give a semblance of legality to Aygue of Bethsan’s assumption of control in Nicosia. Albert L’Aleman, the Hospitaller commander of Cyprus deputising for the master, and Aygue were declared to be governing jointly on the king’s behalf.³ Probably the strong Hospitaller military presence meant that an arrangement of this kind was sensible, and it is interesting that there is no hint of any tension between the Hospitallers and the royalist knights during this period.

Besides Aygue of Bethsan’s followers and the Hospitallers, the queenmother with her household was anxious for Henry’s return. She stayed throughout this period at Nicosia and evidently had considerable influence, ⁴ but she did not

---

¹ 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.354, 370-71.
² 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.336.
⁴ For example, the garrison at Kyrenia initially stated that they would hold the castle at her command. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.344.
always agree with the other royal supporters. Like the Famagusta royalists she worked for a restoration of Henry on the basis of exchanging him for Isabella, Amaury's widow and sister of the king of Armenia, and her children, and undoubtedly she was largely responsible for persuading her to comply with this scheme. But her attitude to Aimer's party differed from that of the royalist knights. Aygue of Bethsan apparently hoped to eliminate his opponents by arresting as many as possible. The queen-mother, however, seems to have wanted a general reconciliation. From the outset she was seen as a moderating influence: it was to her that the anti-royalists arrested in Famagusta appealed when they wanted help to avoid being taken to Rhodes. On 13 June she succeeded in getting Aimer and his remaining followers to swear to support the crown. This had the immediate effect of saving them from the royalists, but after the failure of the second mission to Armenia (20-27 June), and the efforts of some of the anti-royalists to smuggle Isabella to Armenia, the queen-mother again feared a royalist attack, and in particular feared for the safety of her youngest son, Aimer. A military clash was averted when Isabella agreed to help work for the exchange of herself for Henry. Though Aimer and his party had sworn to support the king, the royalists evidently doubted their

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.341.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.353-5.
sincerity and decided to put them to the test by making a formal feudal summons in the name of the king ordering them to come to Famagusta on pain of loss of fiefs. At the request of Aimery and Balian of Galilee, the queen-mother countermanded this summons; it was repeated and again she cancelled it. The royalists then prepared a strong force to attack, and again the queen-mother ordered them to desist. The royalists then summoned their opponents again, this time ordering the majority to come to Famagusta, but telling the leaders to go to separate rural centres in different parts of the island. The queen-mother told them that she could do no more to protect them and after a final attempt to assure the Famagusta royalists that they were working for the restoration of the king had been rejected, Aimery and his party withdrew to Kormakiti, a village near the north coast, about 24 miles north west of Nicosia. ¹

The queen-mother's attitude to the anti-royalist knights can partly be explained by the fact that they regarded her rather than Ayygue of Bethsan as exercising authority in Cyprus; they saw her as competent to abrogate the summonses, and in the letter to the Famagusta royalists shortly before they withdrew to Kormakiti, they spoke of obeying the queen until the king's return.² She clearly hoped to save the remnants of Amaury's party from the vengeance of the king and the Famagusta royalists, and it is significant that two knights, Adam of Caffran and Raymond of For, who were apparently members of her entourage at this period, had been supporters of Amaury as recently as 1309.³

---

1. 'Chronique d'Amadî', pp.360-65.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadî', p.362.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadî', p.348, see p.305.
The knights at Famagusta provided the necessary military force to gain control of Cyprus, and force Aimery to give up his pretensions to be governor, but they were not the only group working for the restoration. Though they realised the need for a tougher policy than that favoured by the queen-mother, they made little direct contribution to the negotiations for Henry's release which were conducted by the papal legate, whom they did not trust, and the nuncio, Raymond of Plis.  

Within a few days of Amaury's murder it was clear to Aimery and his party that they had failed to gain recognition and that they were out-numbered and unpopular. Neither attempts to temporize nor a military demonstration had the effect of weakening the resolve of the royalists in Famagusta. The royalists' control of the ports gave them the initiative, and Aimery was forced to give way. According to the 'Chronique d'Amadi' Aimery's followers had considered offering the royalists' wives and fiefs to their servants, but were sensible enough to see that such a device would only discredit them. Aimery found that only about 40 knights supported him and decided to promise to help restore the king. In return for this undertaking, the queen-mother undertook to do her best to get them pardoned, but it is not recorded that they made any positive contribution to obtaining Henry's release, and it is likely that they hoped that the longer the

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.341-3.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.343.
negotiations continued, the more chance there would be of recovering the initiative. They apparently tried to smuggle Isabella of Tyre to Armenia, thereby removing the royalists' bargaining counter for Henry. 1 When this failed they tried to secure their safety by taking crusading vows. The oaths were administered by the papal legate, and apparently they hoped that their bodies and fiefs would be immune from reprisals until these vows were fulfilled. 2 Their immediate fear was not the possible vindictiveness of the king but the threatening attitude of the royalist knights. The royalists were trying to arrest them and seemed prepared to use force. Their decision to abandon Nicosia and withdraw to Kormakiti suggests that they were insecure there and lacked popular support. About 40 knights with a total of 226 mounted men and 400 infantry went to Kormakiti. 3 Of the leaders, only Henry of Gibelet seems to have tried to save himself by obeying the royalists and hoping for clemency, and he was murdered. 4 Probably the others feared the same fate.

Though the royalists then took over Nicosia, it was feared that the force at Kormakiti would try to attack them there. 5 In August two men confessed under torture to being party to plans by Aimer's men to burn down Nicosia and

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.353-4.

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.355. For the use of the crusading vow to avoid punishment or keep disputed gains in England after the battle of Evesham, see Beebe, Edward I and the Crusades, pp.93-100.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.365.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.382-3, see pp.361, 366.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.366-70.
induce the king of Armenia to kill Henry. ¹ The royalists blockaded the coast near Kormakiti to prevent them escaping to Armenia or contacting the Armenians for help. ² They were content to contain them and made no attempt to attack.

After the king's return on 27 August, he formally summoned the knights at Kormakiti to come to Famagusta, but they refused. ³ Instead the leaders tried to arrange shipping to escape to Armenia, but the plans went wrong, and by this time their rank and file supporters, finding themselves deserted by their commanders, had surrendered. ⁴ The leaders became isolated fugitives. Ballan of Galilee, Philip of Jaffa, Hugh of Ibelin and Walter of Bethsan surrendered and placed themselves at the king's mercy. ⁵ Aimery of Lusignan and Philip of Ibelin the Younger went into hiding, but were discovered. ⁶

For Philip of Mézlières, writing towards the end of the fourteenth century, the political crisis of 1306 - 1310 was a dispute between Amaury, lord of Tyre, and 'aucuns fauux barons', and the king supported by the 'commun de la chevalerie de Chippre'. ⁷ In many respects the struggle was indeed between the magnates on the one hand and the king with some of the ordinary knights on the other.

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.371.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.365-6.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.380-82.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.384-6.
Probably it would be wrong to make too sharp a distinction between the noble who could build up an affinity of relatives, vassals, mercenaries and other clients, and the independent knight owing no allegiance except to the king and having no personal retinue of any consequence, but there can be no doubt that most of the powerful vassals did support Amaury.

We have seen that the majority of the descendants of the 'Old Lord' of Beirut and his nephews joined Amaury in 1306. From the narrative description of the years 1306-1310, it would appear that most of these men had armed retinues, though their size and importance cannot be assessed. Unfortunately it is rare for the sources to identify an individual as a companion or mercenary of a particular lord, but, besides Amaury, evidently Almery of Lusignan, Ballan, prince of Galilee, Baldwin of Ibelin, and Philip of Ibelin the Younger employed armed men; Ralf and William of Villiers and Thomas of Piquigny were apparently members of the retinue of Rupen of Montfort and his mother. It is noteworthy that in 1310 the royalists in Famagusta made particular reference to the 'servitio' of several of their leading opponents when trying to split them by summoning them to various different places in Cyprus. The possession of an

---

1. See above, p.131.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadil', p.294.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadil', p.329.
7. 'Chronique d'Amadil', pp.267, 296.
8. 'Chronique d'Amadil', p.361.
armed retinue would partly explain why Amaury needed to give the royalist magnates, Philip of Ibelin, John Dampierre, Rupen of Montfort and Baldwin of Ibelin, special treatment in 1308,¹ and similarly why, though only 40 knights went to Kormakiti, they had such a large armed force with them.²

Amaury and his leading supporters probably had a considerable army at their command, but their seizure of power also required that Henry should, to a large extent, be isolated. In other words they had to detach a substantial proportion of the knights who depended directly on royal patronage from the king. In 1306, probably because of Henry’s low reputation at that time, they met no tangible opposition and received the positive support of a number of knightly families. It is not normally possible to know whether an individual knight supported Amaury because the magnate who was his patron did or because he chose to on his own initiative, but among the families which supported Amaury were several which had been important in the thirteenth century. For example, the Antioch family consistently supported Amaury and then Aimery;³ they had settled in the island in the last decade of the twelfth century and in the thirteenth had provided two marshals and one chamberlain of Cyprus.⁴

Raymond Viscount, the only member of his family known to have participated

---

1. See above, pp. 140-42.
2. See above, p. 158.
in the events of this period, and Philip and Baldwin of Novara were also members of Amaury's party. Both families had been in Cyprus since the early part of the thirteenth century, but though Philip of Novara, the jurist and presumed ancestor of Philip and Baldwin, had been a member of the following of Ballian, lord of Beirut, there is no indication that his descendants were connected with Ballian's descendant, Rupen of Montfort, and certainly they did not change sides when he did. The Mainboeuf family, all but one of whom supported Amaury, probably had not been settled so long in Cyprus, but by the mid-thirteenth century had been established in Palestine. It is probably reasonable to see Amaury's party as consisting of the majority of the more powerful magnates with their retinues and members of some of the lesser Cypriot noble families of which these examples are representative.

By contrast Henry had fewer great men in his party, but many members of established knightly families. There is no obvious single explanation of why one family should support Henry and another of similar standing, Amaury.

1. 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.42.


3. A William Viscount, lord of Nisou, is known in 1221. Reg. Hér., no. 942. Raymond Viscount also held Nisou and so was evidently a descendant. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.285.

4. 'Gestes', p.715.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.275, 328, 352, 355, 359, 368, 390, 392. For John Mainboeuf, a mercenary knight imprisoned by Amaury in 1308, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.289.

Several of the families which supported the king can be seen to be little different from the examples of families which opposed him. The Aguilliers, 1 Babin, 2 La Baume, 3 Bedula, 4 Chappe, 5 Chevides, 6 Nores, 7 St. Bertin, 8 and Soissons 9 families had all been established in Cyprus before the middle of the thirteenth century, and in some cases before 1200. In the mid-thirteenth century members of the Aguillier and St. Bertin families had been vassals of John of Jaffa in Cyprus, and a member of the Babin family a vassal of John II of Beirut in Beirut, but evidently, as in the case of the Beirut-Novara connection, these relationships had ceased by 1306. 10 Two other noble families who supported the crown seem not to have settled in Cyprus until the late

1. Apparently of Tripolitanian origin, they were in Cyprus by 1247. Reg. Hier., nos. 788, 1149. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 264.


thirteenth century: the Le Jaune family probably originated from Antioch-Tripoli and were perhaps introduced into Cyprus by Hugh III; the earliest reference to a member of the family in Cyprus is in 1285, but as late as 1323 Peter Le Jaune was described as a knight of Tripoli. The Floury family were prominent in Jerusalem in the thirteenth century and perhaps did not come to Cyprus until after the fall of Acre. Besides these examples there were a number of families which appear at first sight to have been divided in their allegiance, but in those instances, where it is possible to reconstruct the genealogy, for example, the Brie, Morf, and Le Petit families, it appears that separate branches

1. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.264, 362, see also p.258.
3. 'Gestes', p.792.
7. For James of Floury, knight of Acre, see above, p.118 note 2.
8. For the family tree, see Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, pp.523-30. Of the royalists, Anseau, Gerard and Guy were probably the sons of Baldwin of Brie, and John, lord of Pistaki, the son of Philip, Baldwin's brother. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 264, 269, 362, 367, 375. Of Amaury's supporters, Hugh was probably the uncle of Aimery and the others, John son of Bohemond and John of Paradhisi their cousins and Ballian the son of John of Paradhisi. See 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.42; 'Gestes', p.871; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.250, 261, 268, 305, 315, 333-5, 340, 359, 392-3.
9. For the family tree, see Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, pp.565-7. Lawrence, the anti-royalist, was probably the son of Adam (p.566), and the royalist Baldwin, lord of 'Stambole', the son of Geoffrey (p.567) in which case they were second cousins. See 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.443; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.265, 269, 305.
10. For the family tree, see Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.580. John, a royalist knight, is probably the nephew of the anti-royalist, Renier. See 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.443; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.263, 264, 311, 337.
were united in their allegiance to one or other party, and there are no definite
examples of brothers or fathers and sons supporting different sides. Thus of
the Gibelet family, only the Besmedia branch supported Amaury; of the Mimars
family, Hugh of Mimars, lord of Asha, supported Amaury while all the members
of the other branches who are known to have participated supported the king.2
No picture can be obtained of the family alignments of important houses such as
the Montoliffs or Montgisards as our knowledge of their genealogies are too
fragmentary. The Ibelin family, as is known from the 'Lignages', almost all
supported Amaury, but there was a group of knights with that name, Anseau,
James and Thomas of Ibelin and Ballian of Ibelin 'Malguarnite' who supported the
crown.3 Whether these men were related to the descendants of the lords of
Ibelin or whether they were a completely separate family which took their name
from that town is not known.4

1. See Rey, 'Les seigneurs de Giblet', pp. 413-15. (Rey confused John son of
Henry of Besmedin with his name sake.) The royalist knights with this family
name were either members of other branches of the Embriaci family or
descendants of Renier of Gibelet. See above, p. 51.

2. See above, pp. 94-5; 'Lignages', pp. 471-2. For Hugh of Asha, see 'Chronique
d'Amadi', p. 305; for the royalist members of the family, see pp. 252, 264,
269, 299, 300, 310, 323, 336, 373, 390. (On p. 390 Aimery of Mimars is
wrongly called Henry.)


4. Possibly they were members of an illegitimate branch of the Ibelin family,
or were members of the Gibelet family and their name had been corrupted
in the transmission of the text. An anti-royalist knight, Simon 'de Gibelet'
is mentioned in 1310. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 391. In the corresponding
passage of his chronicle, Florio Bustro (p. 243) calls him Simon 'd'Iblin'.
That the Gibelet and Ibelin families were separate is clear from charters of
the 1220's. Reg., Hier., nos. 950, 957, 963.
Though these examples show that many noble families and many individual members of noble families declared themselves in favour of the crown, by 1308 the royalist knights evidently had insufficient power to overthrow Amaury's regime.¹ Perhaps this can be accounted for partly by the fact that Amaury controlled the royal revenues and so had the capacity to pay for mercenaries on a large scale, and partly because few of the royalists could provide much military support other than their own personal service. In 1308 when the knights of Paphos tried to rally those at Limassol to restore the king, the Limassol knights refused to join them on the grounds that they had with them no 'baroni del seguito del re';² they realised that the ordinary knights could do nothing against the combined retinues of the lord of Tyre and the other magnates.

It might be assumed that the eventual royalist victory would be due in part to extensive defections from Amaury's party, but the sources do not support such a view. In 1306 all the feudatories swore an oath to Amaury, though with varying degrees of enthusiasm,³ but only 10 who are known from the surviving sources to have given him positive support are later seen giving support to the royalists. The most important defectors, Baldwin of Ibelin and Rupen of Montfort, seem to have been expelled from Amaury's party after false accusations against them, rather than won over by the king.⁴ Apart from these, only three others are known to have emerged as royalists before Amaury's murder: Thomas of

---

¹ See above, pp.140-41.
² 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.265.
³ See above, p.132.
⁴ See above, pp.141-2.
Piquigny, a member of Rupen of Montfort's retinue, 1 James of Montolif, who fled from Cyprus early in 1310, 2 and Ballian Machie, a mercenary knight who joined the king at the time of the attempted restoration of 1308. 3 The most perplexing of the defectors to the royalists is Aygus of Bethsan. A supporter of Amaury in 1306, he neither supported the king in 1308, nor appears in these years as a member of Amaury's party; then in 1310 he re-appears in the narratives as leader of the royalists. 4 Similarly John of Montolif, who subscribed to the address to Henry of 26 April 1306, was in the service of Henry immediately after his return from exile. 5 Three knights who remained faithful to Amaury at least until late 1309, John Le Tor, Raymond of For and Adam of Caffran, 6 were among those who were working for Henry's return after June 1310. None of them was closely connected with the Famagusta royalists, but they seem to have worked with the queen-mother. 7 John seems to have been the most active, 8 and it is likely that he and Adam were older than most of the


knights. ¹

With the exception of Rupen of Montfort, Aygue of Bethsan and John Le Tor, few prominent royalists in Cyprus before the king's return can be shown to have had any close connections with Amaury. Aimeric's knights at Kormakiti numbered about 40, and so many former supporters of Amaury must have declined to support him without working closely with the royalists, in the same way that in 1306 many knights took the oath to Amaury without really welcoming his coup. For vassals not too involved in party politics it would have been fairly easy to make themselves acceptable to either party; for example, John of Plessia subscribed to the address of 1306 and is not otherwise known except as a security for Philip of Jaffa late in 1310;² evidently, though he is not known for any contribution to the restoration, he was persona grata with the king. For the greater vassals, neutrality would have been more difficult, but many of the ordinary knights probably played only minor parts and apparently only those who actively opposed the king after Amaury's murder actually suffered.³ Though approximately 170 knights are mentioned by name as participating in the events of 1306-1310,⁴ there are at least five families, Antiaume, Gaurelle, Malembec, Neuville and Veray, established in the East by the end of the thirteenth century and present in Cyprus later in the fourteenth,

1. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.369. John's name first appears on a witness list in 1287. See below, p.478. Adam had been bailli of Tyre in 1291. 'Gestes', p.818.


See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.465.

James of Ibelin, pp.496-9.
which do not feature in the sources for this period.¹ How many knights played no role sufficient to deserve notice but simply accepted, and were accepted by, the changing regimes cannot be known.

Amaury's fears of reprisals against his party should the king recover power were fully justified, but the reprisals seem to have been limited to those who impeded the restoration and did not include those who had followed Amaury until his death and then remained passive. The most important group to be punished was the knights who had been at Kormakiti. Immediately on his return Henry summoned them to come to him and they refused.² They were thus in arms against the king and arguably guilty of apparent treason. According to the jurists they were liable to trial by wager of battle,³ but instead of trying to deny their guilt they surrendered and asked for mercy.⁴ Henry was, up to a point, merciful. He evidently did not have the court pass judgement on them since no formal judgement was pronounced until 1325, after the accession of Hugh IV.⁵ This meant that their fiefs were not confiscated and their heirs not disinherited until that date. For a traitor defeated in wager of battle, the sentence, assuming that he had not been killed in the battle itself, was death by hanging;⁶

². 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.380. See above, p.159.
⁵. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.403.
presumably the same sentence could be inflicted on anyone who admitted his
guilt, but Henry was content to hold the Kormakiti knights in custody. About
35 are listed as having been sent to Kyrenia for their part in the resistance
at Kormakiti; of these, 5 minor offenders were soon released, and 10 others
banished. Besides those imprisoned, 8 turcopoles and 50 foot soldiers who
had been in the force with them were also exiled. In 1315 the leading
opponents of the king, Ballan of Galilee, Philip of Jaffa, Hugh of Ibelin, Philip
of Ibelin the Younger, John of Ibelin, his brother, and Walter of Bethsan, were
placed in the dungeons at Kyrenia and apparently starved to death. Aimeri of
Lusignan died at about the same time, probably in Buffavento. Presumably the
other knights who remained in Kyrenia and who survived were released in 1324
in the general amnesty at the time of Hugh IV’s accession. But as the
judgement of 1325 shows, Hugh was only prepared to allow them their personal
liberty; their fiefs were forfeit. Apart from the Kormakiti knights, the only
individuals who were held in prison were those taken into custody by the royalists
at Famagusta shortly after Amaury’s murder. John of Brie, the castellan of

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.386-91.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.391, 392.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.388.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.397-8.
5. He was dead by 10 April 1316. Mâs Latrîe, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.703.
   See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.383.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.401.
7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.403. Hugh IV evidently tried to heal at least one
   of the rifts caused by the 1306-1310 crisis by promoting the marriage of
   Aygue of Bethsan’s son to Hugh of Ibelin’s daughter. John XXII, Lettres
   communes, no. 23432.
Famagusta, and five others were arrested and, except for John himself, were sent to Rhodes. 1 John was at liberty in 1311, 2 but whether the others remained in exile is not stated. 3 Another opponent of the king was executed, 4 and Giles Malinboeuf, held in prison by Aygue of Bethsan, certainly remained locked up after the king's restoration. 5

Henry's reasons for avoiding public trial and execution are unknown, but probably he feared for the safety of the remaining hostages in Armenia if he acted too savagely at once, and it is likely that his mother and the papal representatives in Cyprus counselled moderation. Possibly he had not originally intended to be so severe, but in 1311, after the uncovering of a plot by a group of Amaury's former supporters to capture the king and his closest associates, release the knights held in Kyreala, and govern Cyprus nominally on behalf of Hugh, Amaury's eldest son, 6 he would probably have felt too insecure to allow his former enemies their liberty. But it is more likely that he was determined to keep his opponents confined, and that his imprisonment in 1313 of the three sisters of Ballian prince of Galilee was ordered partly from a continuing desire for revenge on those who had opposed and humiliated him. 7

---

2. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 392.
3. A Humphrey of Scandellon appears as a witness to a document of 1330. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p. 164. Whether he was the Humphrey of Scandellon sent to Rhodes is unknown.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 371.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 359, 390.
7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 399-400.
Several of the problems of the earlier part of his reign reappeared during the fourteen years covered by the period from Henry's restoration until his death. Relations with the Genoese and with Armenia were poor, and, though he sent a well-reasoned memorandum to the pope on the subject of the recovery of Syria, Henry was in evident fear of the Mamlukes. 1 Philip of Belin, the seneschal, on whose advice the king had relied before 1306 2 and of whom Raymond of Pits wrote that he had not for nothing been said to be 'rancoris et scandalis auctor', 3 was again prominent. 4

Not surprisingly, the royalist knights were rewarded with titles and responsibilities. By 1315 Robert of Montgisard was turcopolier and James of Floury bailli of the secréte, 5 and James was replaced by Thomas of Pinуглay before 1318. 6 Under Hugh IV, Bartholomew of Montoliff was chamberlain of Cyprus, John Babin, marshal of Jerusalem 7 and Hugh Beduin, admiral. 8

Hugh Beduin, John of Gibelet and Bartholomew of Montoliff were employed as

2. See above, p. 122.
4. For his activities after 1310, see below, p. 416.
5. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), pp. 63-4. See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 399.
7. See below, pp. 431, 441.
8. See below, p. 320.
ambassadors to the Aragonese courts at different dates before 1324,¹ and in
1318-1319 John Le Tor and Simon of Aguilliers were ambassadors at the papal
court.² Some of the leading royalists, including Rupen of Montfort and Baldwin
of Ibelin, died soon after the restoration,³ but others, for example Anselm of
Brie, Aimery of Mirmars and John of Montoliff apparently remained prominent in
the service of Henry and then Hugh IV for upwards of twenty years after 1310.⁴

Some knights gained and some lost over the crisis, but an assessment of
its effect on the nobility as a whole is not easy to make. Perhaps there were
fewer great vassals as a result, and consequently the gap between the power and
wealth of the king and that of his greater feudatories became wider, but it is
difficult to sustain this idea. The Dampierre and Montfort families came through
unscathed, and their members continued to hold high office until their male lines
failed, the Montforts in 1326 and the Dampierres probably in the third quarter
of the fourteenth century.⁵ The Ibelin family, considering how many of its
members had supported Amaury in 1306, was relatively unaffected. The most
heavily punished branch were the descendants of Baldwin the seneschal; Ballian

---

¹ Mas Latrle, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp.700-701; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.395, 399. For other activities of these knights before Henry's death, see
Mas Latrle, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.705; 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.63; Acta Ioannis XXII (1317-1334), ed. A.L. T'utu (Città del

² John XXII, Lettres communes, nos. 7966, 7967, 7971, 7972, 8332, 9947, 9948.

³ Both died in 1313. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.395. Aygue of Bethsan probably
died in the early 1310's. See below, p.431.

⁴ Mas Latrle, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.141, 158, 164, 178, iii, p.725;
'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.63. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.402.

⁵ See below, pp. 423, 437-8, 460-61.
The last known member of the Dampierre family is a Philip of Dampierre,
recorded in 1367. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 200.
of Galilee, Philip the Younger, John and Hugh all died in Tyre, but Baldwin of Ibelin, the representative of the senior line of the family joined the royalists. The only other Ibelin to suffer imprisonment and death at the hands of the royalists was Philip of Jaffa, and in this case it is clear that his brother restored the family to favour. After the death of John of Arsur, his heirs played no part in the dispute and then apparently continued to enjoy royal patronage. Guy of Ibelin, the only descendant of Guy the constable to support Amaury, seems not to have left any male descendants after his death, and the other members of that branch of the family supported Henry throughout. Thus of the four branches of the family to bear the name Ibelin in the early fourteenth century, only two were penalised, and in neither case did the branch come to an end as a result. After 1310 Ibelins held high office as seneschals of Cyprus and Jerusalem, and Hugh IV, like Hugh II and Hugh III married a member of the family. During the fourteenth century every branch of the Ibelin family died out in the male line, and their lessening role during the

1. See above, pp. 141-2.
2. See below, p. 467.
3. See below, pp. 454-5.
4. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, table XI (I).
   For James of Ibelin, constable of Jerusalem, see below, p. 439.
   According to Rüdt de Collenberg (Rupenides, table VII (C)) James I's first wife was an Ibelin.
7. For the end of the Ibelin counts of Jaffa and lords of Arsur, see below, pp. 466, 468-9. The last recorded member of the family is a Nicholas of Ibelin (filiation unknown), taken into exile by the Genoese in 1374. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542.
century was due more to this dynastic accident than to any discredit that may have fallen on them as a result of the 1306-1310 crisis. As for the lesser families, there were undoubtedly some changes of fortune following the crisis, but of the well-established families who opposed the king, only the Mainboeufs seem to have disappeared completely in 1310; others such as the Antioch family continued to live in Cyprus, but seem not to have enjoyed their former prominence. On the other hand, the families that seem to have benefited, such as the Babin, Mimars, Montolif, Morf and Nores families, were all established in Cyprus long before 1306, and it is not possible to point to any house which came from complete obscurity to occupy a high position as a result of the actions of its members during this period.

The importance of the events of 1306-1310 for the Cypriot nobility does not lie in the effect it had on them, but in what it reveals about them. The crisis shows that the knights were politically articulate and responsible. They wanted good government and they had a high regard for legality. In 1306 the king was ill and incompetent, so they took steps to make good this deficiency. By 1308 the king was fit and Amaury's regime was showing signs of not fulfilling its earlier promise, so the feeling grew that he was unnecessary and the king should resume his authority. In 1310 the knights helped secure a return to royal, and unquestionably legal, government, and in the meantime showed themselves capable of setting up a provisional government headed by one of their

1. Stephan of Lusignan's idea (Description, fo. 83v) that the Belin family was the same as the Zimblet family which was living in Cyprus in the sixteenth century is erroneous. He evidently confused Belin with Gibelet (see fo. 92v).

2. For the Antioch family in the thirteenth century, see above, pp. 109-10.
own number. Of course this is an over-simplification; not all knights thought alike; some had personal reasons for wanting or not wanting a change of regime in 1306 or in 1310, and others were members of the retinue of a particular lord and this could lead to a conflict of loyalties. Undoubtedly individual actions were motivated by self-interest as much as by a desire for the common good. Ultimately power rested on military force, and of that the ordinary feudatories had no monopoly. Mercenaries, paid for out of the revenues of the royal estates and those of the magnates, and the forces of the Military Orders were also of importance. But military force was used sparingly: though feeling ran high, there were no pitched battles and no sieges. In fact there is no record of any bloodshed before Amaury's murder, and in the period up to the end of 1310 only three Cypriots are known to have suffered violent death. Perhaps this is an indication that the parties knew their own capacity and weakness. The knights accepted the responsibility of sharing in the direction of affairs and seem generally to have acted wisely; whether the king's actions deserve similar praise is less certain.

1. Amaury of Lusignan, Balian Etart, and Henry of Gibelet. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.330, 371, 382-3. Some Genoese had been killed early in 1310, but this probably had only indirect bearing on the political crisis. See above, p.123.
The fourteenth century saw marked changes of fortune for Cyprus and the Cypriot nobility. Though no statistics survive, the Black Death struck Cyprus with considerable force. How far the knightly class would have been directly affected is not known, but a reduction in population would almost certainly have resulted in a loss of revenue for those with fiefs in land. The plague returned in 1363 and in 1392-1393. The fourteenth century also witnessed the extraordinary expansionist achievement of Peter I (1359-1369), in which the vassals played an important role, and the Genoese war of 1373-1374, in which Cyprus was defeated, Famagusta lost and many of the knights taken captive to Genoa. The loss of Famagusta, and the collapse of the town's commercial prosperity only added to the economic difficulties caused by plague and the expensive expeditions of Peter I. Military glory, defeat and economic


2. Leontios Makairas, Ι, paras. 66, 135.

3. Leontios Makairas, Ι, paras. 622-4. It is likely that an ordonnance issued by James I in 1396, which seems to be designed to control the mobility of unfree peasants, was an attempt to curb the economic effects of the plague. Bodleian Library: Ms. Selden Supra 69 (Selden's ms. no.3457), fo. xiiiV - fo. xivV.

4. See above, pp.xiii-xiv.
From the time of the Ibelin-Longobard war, Cypriot noble society had been dominated by the descendants of John of Beirut, his brother, Philip of Ibelin, and his brother-in-law, Walter of Caesarea. This domination survived the political crises of Henry II's reign, but by about 1375 every branch of the Ibelin, Montfort and Dampierre families seems to have died out in the male line, and so far as is known the only family other than the Lusignans which could have benefited from marrying heiresses to these families was the Brunswick family. Duke Henry of Brunswick-Grubenhagen married a daughter of Philip of Ibelin, the seneschal of Cyprus, and their younger son, Philip, who unlike his father chose to settle in Cyprus, married a daughter of Odo of Dampierre and then Alice of Ibelin, Hugh IV's widow. What distinguished these families from the rest of the nobility apart from wealth - and there is no way of knowing their precise incomes - was the fact that they were related to the Lusignans. Hugh II, Hugh III and Hugh IV all married Ibellins; Peter I's first wife was the Montfort heiress; James I married Helvis, the daughter of Philip of Brunswick.

1. See above, pp.174-5.
2. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, tables IIIa(iH3), VIII(BK)(MF), XI(I).
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.404.
4. For Philip of Brunswick, see below, pp.438-9.
5. See below, p.461.
6. See Leontios Makhairas, II, pp.88-9. According to Rüdt de Collenberg (Rupenides, table VII(C)), James had previously been married to an Ibelin. It is not clear whether Helvis was Philip's heiress, or whether the lord of Brunswick, admiral of Cyprus, whose tomb dated 1414 existed in the nineteenth century was Philip's son, as is suggested by Rüdt de Collenberg (op. cit., table VIII(BK)(ME)). L. de Mas Latrie, L'Île de Chypre, sa situations présente et ses souvenirs du moyen-âge (Paris, 1879), p.382.
Guy of Lusignan, son of Hugh III, married an Isabella;¹ Isabella, sister of
Hugh IV married Odo of Dampierre,² and Margaret, one of Hugh IV's daughters,
marriced Walter of Dampierre.³ Another family was added to the list of those
related to the royal family when in 1360 John of Morf, the marshal of Cyprus,
betrothed his daughter to Hugh of Lusignan, prince of Galilee.⁴ John also had
ambitions to marry another of his daughters to Peter II.⁵ It is probably
significant that John was the first man not a member of the royal family for whom
a titular Jerusalemite lordship was revived: in 1365 he was made count of
Edessa.⁶ There is no doubt that considerable prestige was attached to being
a member of a family related to the royal house and even of being connected
with one such family. In 1373 John of Morf is said to have won Raymond Babia
over to his idea of collaborating with the Genoese and installing Hugh of Galilee
on the throne by offering to marry one of his own daughters to Raymond's son,
thereby bringing his house close to the royal family.⁷

Though many branches of the higher nobility of Cyprus became extinct
during the fourteenth century, the number of wealthy magnates was probably not

---
¹ See below, p.459.
² See below, p.437.
³ Clement VI, Lettres closes, patentes et curiales intéressant les pays autres
que la France, ed. E. Déprez and G. Mollat (Paris, 1960-1961), nos. 1409,
1461.
⁴ Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 108. The actual date of the marriage is not
clear. Leontios Makhairas seemingly contradicts himself, indicating first
that it had taken place by 1368 (l, para. 214, see para. 349), and then that
it still had not taken place in 1373 (para. 412).
⁵ Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 349.
⁶ See above, p.20.
much diminished. The careers of Philip of Brunswick and John of Morf show that replacements could come either as foreign nobles who settled in Cyprus and somehow won favour, or as Cypriot knights who by a combination of wealth, service and opportunism could better themselves. Even so, the higher nobility became increasingly the province of the members of the Lusignan family.

Hugh III was the first king of Cyprus to have more than one son to survive him, and Hugh IV (1324-1359) and James I (1382-1398) both had large families. It was necessary to provide apanages for the younger sons and nephews. In 1306 Henry II secured a fief rent of 10,000 besants assigned against the revenues of Kouklia and Akhella for his nephew, Hugh, later Hugh IV. Amaury of Tyre's apanage included Aradhippou, and his son Hugh was to receive all his father's lands and Khrysokhou as well. Hugh's prolonged absences in Armenia, coupled with Henry II's probable disfavour to favour the son of his former opponent, led to these estates being taken over by the crown, and though Hugh IV and Peter I seem to have been prepared to make concessions, Hugh's descendants never succeeded in recovering their patrimony. In 1366 Hugh, prince of Galilee,

1. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, table VII(C).
2. 'Texte officiel', p.598.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 345. Aradhippou was later a royal residence. See Mas Latrice, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.141, 219. Amaury also acquired 'Stambolu' during his rule. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.348. Mas Latrice (op. cit., ii, p.112 note 2) suggested that this was Stromboli near Paphos. Amaury's widow held Trikomo. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.361.
5. John Dardel, pp.24-6, 37-41. See also Benedict XII, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, no. 820. See below, pp.215-17.
received fiefs worth 50,000 basants annually as compensation for giving up his claim to the throne,¹ and it is likely that this included the valuable castel of Lefkara which he is known to have held a few years later.² John prince of Antioch, Peter I's younger brother, owned estates including Kolota, Pelendria, Alaminos and part of Lophos.³ Normally a king would have to provide for his relatives from the royal domain,⁴ but James I provided for the illegitimate son of the prince of Antioch out of the estates held by his legitimate half-brother.⁵ Apanages could be given to the husbands of female members of the royal family. In 1340, Ferrand of Majorca, the husband of Ischiva, daughter of Hugh IV, was promised a substantial allowance in addition to his wife's marriage settlement, though this particular grant was immediately revoked.⁶

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 108, see paras. 129, 131.
2. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 80, see p. 66.
3. 'A register of Santa Sophia', no. 126; Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp. 80, 81, 88, 89, 90; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 419.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 620. Presumably these estates had been inherited from the prince. Included among them was Lophos, but also Aylos Reginos and Polemidhia held in 1367 by Bermond of La Voule. See Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 80 (Polemidhia was shared by John of La Ferté; see p. 81).
5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp. 183-4, see p. 196. Besides his wife's marriage settlement, Ferrand had a fief of 30,000 basants annually, presumably inherited from his mother.
The structure of Cypriot society meant that it was virtually impossible for an inhabitant of Cyprus who was not already a member of a knightly family to become a knight.\(^1\) We have seen that the Frankish ruling class from the time of the original settlement was largely drawn from the nobility of the other Christian states in the Latin East, but from the early years of Latin rule some knightly settlers in the island were immigrants from western Europe with no previous period of residence on the Syrian mainland. Probably the most famous western settler in Cyprus in the thirteenth century was the Lombard Philip of Novara, whose writings show him to have identified himself completely with the interests of the Cypriot nobility.\(^2\) After 1291 any recruits to the nobility had to come from outside the Latin East, and the presence of western knights in Cyprus is an important factor for understanding the stresses of the second half of the fourteenth century.

There are scattered references to foreign knights in Cypriot service before the accession of Peter I. A few, such as Ferrand of Majorca\(^3\) or Philip of Brunswick, played important roles; others such as Lanfranc Carmala or Humphrey of Marin, Genoese knights in the service of Amaury of Tyre,\(^4\) were evidently minor figures. The presence of other knights in Cyprus with Italian-sounding

---

1. See above, pp.11-12.


4. 'Chronique d'Amadí', pp.321, 340-41, 381.
names, such as Nicholas Bonifacio, 1 Alamery of Brindisi, 2 John Cao (?Capo) d'Istria, 3 John Lombard, 4 Stephen Pisano, 5 or Gremont of Luca, 6 might seem to indicate that many of the new immigrants came from Italy. Particularly noteworthy in view of the poor relations between Cyprus and Genoa are the Genoese immigrants. Hugh IV is known to have given a fief to a Thomas of 'Illiones', 7 and to have been under pressure to make one of his own Cypriot vassals provide a fief for another Genoese. 8 Other members of the Carmain family appear in Cyprus during the fourteenth century: Simon was apparently twice an ambassador to the West, 9 and John and his son, Ralf, who are both described as Genoese, were in the service of Peter I. 10 There had

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.348.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.264, 392.
4. Two men of this name are known: one in the 1310's (Clement V, no.2469; 'Processus Cyprius', pp.387-8; 'Gestes', p.871; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.323, 392-3), the other in the 1340's (Leontios Makhairas, i, paras.79-82).
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.264.
7. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 1004-7.
10. Annales ecclesiastici, ed. C. Baronius and O. Raynalduis, new edition by A. Thienner (Bar-le-Duc/Paris, 1864-83), 1360 para. 13; Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.85; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 102, 119, 133, 135, 138, 190, 351, 363. Ralf is last known in 1374. See Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.95. Dawkins's view that the family were White Genoese is improbable in view of the insistance in the sources that they were Genoese, and the fact that Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 375) does not mention them among the leading White Genoese families in Cyprus. See also Benedict XI, Registre, ed. C. Grandjean (Paris, 1883-1905), no. 1035.
been Genoese knights in Cyprus since at least as early as the mid-thirteenth century, and their presence in the island proves that, despite the political tension, individual Genoese who wished to make a career for themselves there could find employment and be given fiefs and responsibilities.

An important group of foreigners who are found in Cyprus in the fourteenth century, and who could rise high in the royal service were lawyers. The kings needed men trained in civil law as legal advisers, especially in matters of international diplomacy. It was rare for Cypriots to go to Europe for training in the law schools, though examples are known, including Bartholomew of Coches, 'publicus apostolica auctoritate notarius' (1310, 1315), and Philip Chappe, 'utriusque juris professor' (1319). The majority of legal experts seem to have come from the West. The earliest of these men whose career can be traced was Giustino del Giustini, a native of Città di Castello, who first appears as a secretary to Henry II in 1309. In 1311, when he was given Venetian citizenship, he was described as residing at the royal court, and from then until after 1342 'Justinus de Justinis, jurispritus, consiliarius regis' frequently appears as a

1. Innocent IV, no. 5560.
2. Similarly Genoese clergy could receive benefices. For evidence that they were not always absentees, see above, p. xiii note 2.
3. 'Nouvelles preuves', BFC, xxxiv (1873), p.64; Perrat, 'Un diplomate gascon', p.76.
4. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 9950, see no. 2642.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.310.
7. I libri commemoriali, i, p.111, no. 489.
knight and servant of Henry II and Hugh IV. In the 1360's and 1370's the Lombard knight, Giacomo di San Michele, 'in legibus doctor', played a similar role in the royal service. Yet another knight, professionally trained in the West, was Uomobuono (Cmmebon) of Mantua, royal physician and chancellor in the early part of Peter I's reign. Several other lawyers or physicians from Italy were in royal service during the fourteenth century. Like the two Cypriot lawyers mentioned above, a few such as Antonio da Bergamo (d. 1393) were clerics; others, such as Matteo del Pasqualli, Domenico Rodolfi of Bologna, or Guido da Bagnolo of Reggio, were laymen. The importance of these men,

1. "Nouvelles preuves", DFC, xxxiv (1873), p.64. For other references, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.141-2, 150, 158, 162, 164, 167, 179, 202, iii, p.705; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, pp.210, 214; I libri commemoriali, ii, p.69, no. 393.

2. For his origin, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.479. For his legal qualifications, see Philip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, p.169; Biblioteca bib-­

3. For other dates, see Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 3652. For other references, see Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 2073, 3616; Acta Gregorii P.P.XI (1370-1378), ed. A.L. Tinut (Rome, 1906), p.363; Leonifios Makhairas, i, paras. 147, 333-5, 500, 515, 524.


whether nobles, non-nobles or clerics, lay in the fact that they could provide
the king with the legal expertise necessary for administration and diplomacy,
thereby acquiring considerable responsibilities in the royal service, to the
potential detriment of the Cypriot feudatories. Philip of Mézières, the famous
crusading propagandist and man of letters, should be included among these
western civil servants, even though his formal education consisted only of what
he could learn in the cathedral school of Amiens. 1 He was a knight who became
chancellor of Cyprus in the early 1360's and a close associate of Peter I. 2

It was the reign of Peter I which witnessed the largest number of
foreigners in Cyprus. The king's first visit to the West (1362-1365) was
primarily to raise support for his projected crusade, but even before he set out
there were evidently many westerners in his service. At the beginning of his
reign, Philip of Brunswick was appointed constable of Jerusalem, Peter Malocello,
a Genoese, chamberlain of Cyprus, and Uomobuono of Mantua, chancellor. 3
The Genoese John Carmain was an envoy to the pope in 1359-1360, and captain
of Adalia from 1362 until his death in 1363. 4 We also hear of Florentines in

1. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp.23-9. Iorga has demonstrated that,
contrary to the belief of earlier historians, he was not trained as a lawyer.

2. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, p.109. He was chancellor by March 1363.
Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.249. For evidence that he was regarded
as a knight, see 'Nouvelles preuves', BFC, xxxiv (1873), p.76, also p.75 note;
Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantiunm, II, p.139.


4. Leontios Makhairas, t, paras. 102, 129, 132-3, 135. See Annales
ecclesiastici, 1360, paras. 13-14.
the king's service, 1 Genoese naval captains working on his behalf, 2 and an English knight, Robert of Λούζα, made captain of Corhigos. 3 In 1360 John of Verona was recruiting mercenaries in northern Italy for service in Cyprus, 4 and among the participants in the expedition to Adalia of 1361 were the lord of Πασέτ and the son of the count of Savoy. 5 But it should not be supposed that the beginning of Peter's reign necessarily coincided with a sudden upsurge in the employment of foreigners, especially as the sources for the previous reign are particularly meagre and probably do not reflect the extent to which foreigners were involved in Cypriot affairs. A knightly adventurer from France is recorded in the 1350's, who returned home to tell of his exploits before the king of Cyprus (Hugh IV); 6 probably he was not the only man to seek renown in the East at that time, and the lord of 'Pasit' and the son of the count of Savoy were his counterparts a few years later.

Many westerners accompanied Peter I on his expedition to Alexandria, and others came East once news of its capture reached the West. It is likely that many of those who went to Alexandria returned home immediately afterwards. 7

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 110.
2. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 103, see also paras. 139-41.
5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 119. The phrase 'the Seigneur of Pasit who was in Cyprus' suggests that he was a visitor - presumably from the West.
Unfortunately comparatively few men recruited in the West who joined Peter's 1365 campaign can be identified, and, of those who came East in 1365, only John of Rochefort, Perceval of Cologne, Bermond of La Voule, Guy Le Baveaux and his two sons, Martel of Basqueville, John of Reims, the Venetian, Peter of Grimani, and the Byzantine Greek convert to Latin Christianity, John Lascaris Calapheros can be shown to have been still in Cypriot service in 1367. Despite the rumours of peace which deterred many, other westerners came to Cyprus, spurred on by the news of the sack of

1. The list of crusaders in 1365 given by Atiya (Crusade in the Later Middle Ages, pp. 517-19) is misleading as it includes those who served on the expeditions in 1367 as well.

2. William of Machaut, pp. 143, 147, 156, 157; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 167.

3. William of Machaut, pp. 60, 61, 72, 75, 84-5, 85, 207, 234. For his later history see Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, p. 278 note 6. His family originated from Cologne (Gers) and not the Rhineland city of the same name.

4. William of Machaut, pp. 72-3, 75, 111-14, 144-5, 158, 163, 164, 168, 207; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 187, 190, 200.

5. William of Machaut, pp. 74, 139, 140, 147, 148, 151, 153, 178, 193.


7. William of Machaut, p. 180, see also pp. 142, 179.

8. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 167, 190.


10. See Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 175, 183.
Alexandria and by the renewed preaching of the crusade. During 1367 there were evidently a large number of foreign knights in Peter's armies which went to the relief of Gomigdo and raided various ports on the Syrian coast.

Whereas it is possible that many of these knights were adventurers who served at their own expense, or, at the most, received ex gratia payments from the king, it is clear that some at least acquired fiefs in Cyprus; Bermond of La Voulte held Polemidia and Aylous Regiatus in the diocese of Limassol in 1367, and John Lascaris Calopheros held 'Serle' and married Maria of Mimars, widow of John of Soissons. Other westerners who received fiefs from Peter I included the French knight, Geoffrey of Ligier Luc, and probably George of Leone, described in 1372 as resident in Rhodes, and the Genoese Ottobono of Cathania who in the early 1370's was captain of Smyrna.

1. For papal bulls ordering the crusade to be published dated October 1366, see Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 2416, 2418. See also Chronique des Quatres Premiers Valois, p.185.


3. William of Machaut, p.111. Florimond of Lesparre served for six months at his own expense and for four months at the king's. William of Machaut, p.228.


5. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp.84, 91. See Jacoby, 'Jean Lascaris Calophéros', pp.191-2. It is not known whether John held 'Serle' in his own right or by right of his wife.


7. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 897-8.

8. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 1540, 2290.
In the aftermath of the murder of Peter I there was a reaction against these foreign sief-holders, and this, together with the cessation of hostilities with the Mamlukes in 1370, led to a falling off of the number of westerners in Cypriot service. Two French knights, Gallo of Dampierre and Pelisson of La Pelissonnière, supported the Cypriots in the war with Genoa (1373-1374); Fulk of Archiac who had served at the relief of Gorhigos in 1367 was in Cyprus in 1374; Gantolet of Abzac, the nephew of Raymond of La Pradècle, archbishop of Nicosia in the 1360's and early 1370's, participated in the sack of Alexandria and later in one of Peter II's attempts to recover Famagusta. But generally, the number of foreigners in Cyprus declined after 1369 and especially after the Genoese war: only three knights who were definitely of foreign origin, William of Charny, George Monomachos, and John Lascaris Calapheros, are listed as


3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 400. It is unlikely that Gallo of Dampierre is identical with the similarly-named man mentioned in the account of 1369 (para. 110) who is there said to be a Florentine.

4. Liber juris, ii, col. 814; William of Machaut, pp.140, 157. Whether he had stayed in the East or returned to France in the intervening period is not clear.

5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.460-64. For Raymond of La Pradècle see Mas Latrie, 'Histoire des archevêques', pp.272-4. Eubel (hierarchia catholica, i, p.365) dates his appointment to 1361 and that of his successor to 1376. Raymond was still archbishop in 1374. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2674.


7. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.460-64.
being in Cyprus after 1374,¹ and of these John Lascaris was soon to leave Cyprus and devote his attention to the Morea.² Ogier, lord of Anglure, referred to a French knight at the court of James I;³ otherwise the silence of the sources would seem to suggest that few foreigners entered Cypriot service in the closing decades of the fourteenth century.

But the kings of Cyprus were not alone in attracting foreigners into their service; Cypriot knights also served other masters. Early in the fourteenth century Peter Le Jaune assisted the Hospitallers in their capture of Rhodes and was rewarded with an annuity from their estates at Kolossi.⁴ John of Morf received a fief from King John II of France in 1362,⁵ and John of Ibelin, the seneschal of Jerusalem, served Edward III of England during the mid-1360’s.⁶

The reign of Peter I is chiefly noted for the king’s military activities against the Turks and Mamlukes. Hugh IV had placed the towns of southern Asia Minor under tribute,⁷ and participated in the various leagues against the

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 563. For William of Charny, see paras. 310 (and note 4), 342, 352. For George Monomachos, who like John Lascaris was a convert from eastern orthodoxy, see paras. 362, 446. From John Lascaris’s will it appears that they were related. Demetrius Cydones, Correspondance, ed. R.-J. Loenertz (Città del Vaticano, 1956–60), i, p. 190, see p.192.

2. See Jacoby, 'Jean Lascaris Calophéros', pp.197–204 passim.

3. Ogier of Anglure, Le Saint voyage, p.82.

4. 'Chronique d'Amadis', p.258. See John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 17252, see also no. 60648.

5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.741.


Turks, but it was his son who employed the full resources of Cyprus in an attempt to reassert Christian power in the eastern Mediterranean. In 1361 (1360 o.s.) he took control of Gorhigos from the weakened Armenian authorities; in the same year he captured Adalia, and followed this in 1362 by a raid on Myra. Throughout the early 1360's we read of efforts to clear the seas of Turkish and Christian pirates and other Turkish shipping. In 1365 came the capture and sack of Alexandria. In 1366 military activities were limited to a raid on the Turkish coast, but 1367 witnessed what was evidently the most sustained effort in any one year: first there was a major raiding expedition which though dispersed by bad weather attacked Tripoli; there then followed an expedition to relieve Gorhigos which was being besieged by the Turks; a third major expedition was needed to put down a mutiny at Adalia.

1. For references, see above, p. xv note 3.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 103, 137-45, 150-52.
6. The main Christian accounts are by William of Machaut (pp.52-110) and Leontios Makhairas (i, paras. 162-73). See also Philip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, pp.125-41. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp.278-304; Atiya, Crusade in the Later Middle Ages, pp.345-78; Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.329-34.
7. William of Machaut, pp.120-22; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 180.
9. William of Machaut, pp. 135-72; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 194-5.
10. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 199-201.
towards the end of the year the king led a raid on Tripoli and the other ports of northern Syria as far as Ayas; independently of the king, but apparently with his approval, there was an attack on Sidon, and at an unknown point during 1367 there was an attack on Jaffa to which the king and prince of Antioch brought assistance. In 1368 campaigning all but ceased; there were raids on Alexandria and Damietta by Genoese operating from Cyprus, and a minor raid by the Cypriots on the Syrian coast. Peter is said to have returned to Cyprus from Rome in 1368 with plans for attacking the Mamlukes in Cilicia, but his death at the beginning of 1369 put an end to such schemes. Hostilities did not cease completely, however, and in 1369 the prince of Antioch sent an expedition which attempted to raid the coastal towns from Beirut northwards as far as Cilicia and which then raided Alexandria. Peace was finally agreed in 1370.

Peter could not have acted without the support of the Cypriot feudatories, and it is clear from the narrative accounts that they participated in all his


2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 213.


4. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 219, 222.

5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 220.


8. See above, p. 190.
campaigns. Though the terms under which they served are not known,¹ it is possible to gain an impression of their importance relative to that of the western adventurers who were particularly prominent during the second half of the reign. Leontios Makhairas listed 37 lay knights who joined Peter’s expedition to Adalia in 1361.² 32 of these were undoubtedly members of long-established Cypriot houses, among those represented being the Antioch, Brie, Ibelin, Montolif, Morf and Solissons families,³ and 3 of the others, Philip of Brunswick, Peter Malocello and John Carmaï, had evidently been accepted as members of the Cypriot nobility. Philip was related by marriage to the royal family, Peter was chamberlain of Cyprus and John, though described elsewhere as a Genoese, could have been descended from men bearing the same family name in Cyprus earlier in the century and had already been entrusted with an important diplomatic mission by the king.⁴ This leaves only two, the lord of 'Pasit' and the son of the count of Savoy, who could be classed as foreign adventurers, though it should be noted that Peter was aided by at least two galleys provided by the Hospitallers and two provided by the Genoese podestà in Cyprus, and is likely to have employed some of the mercenaries recruited in Italy the previous year.⁵

¹ See above, p.9.
² Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 119.
³ Two knights are included in this total whose origins are questionable: Peter of Casin (called by Dawkins 'Cassal'), otherwise 'Cansy' or 'Causinus' (Documents Chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.82; Liber lurium, ii, col. 811) was perhaps a descendant of Bartholomew of 'Canele' mentioned in a document of 1232. Mas Latrë, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.57. John of La Ferté was perhaps a descendant of Odo of La Ferté. See Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.81 note 10. Peter and John both held fiefs in the Limassol diocese.
⁴ See above, pp.178, 183, 186.
⁵ See Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 109, 111.
But even though the capture of Adalia was not achieved by the Cypriots unaided, a far higher proportion of non-Cypriots seems to have been involved in the campaigns from 1365 onwards. In the case of the expedition to Alexandria (1365), the best indications of the relative strength of the Cypriot and western contingents is to be found in the sizes of the fleets. The sources differ: according to Leontios Makhairas, a total of 165 ships assembled at Rhodes consisting of 106 from Cyprus, the others comprising the vessels including 16 galleys bringing Peter and the westerners from Venice and the 4 galleys provided by the Hospitallers;¹ the 'Chronique d'Amadi' similarly gives the total as 165 ships, but states that 92 were from Cyprus;² Phillip of Mézières estimated the Cypriot fleet at almost 60 and the total, excluding the 4 huissierii and other ships provided by the Hospitallers, at almost 100.³ Though these ships would have varied considerably in size, the indications are that the Cypriot contingent was somewhat larger than that from the West. Of course, the numbers of vessels gives only the most general impression of the number of men involved, but though, not unnaturally, western writers stressed the participation of the western knights in the campaign, the role of the Cypriot feudatories should not be underestimated. Leontios Makhairas named 29 of the Cypriot knights in the Cypriot fleet, as well as Simon Tenoury, Henry of Gibelet and Peter Malocello who had accompanied the king from Venice.⁴ Whether the brothers of the

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 162, 167.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 163, 167.
Hospital, said to number 100,¹ and the western knights together outnumbered the Cypriots is not known, but the evidence would appear to indicate that they did not.

For 1367 the picture is much the same. At the beginning of the year, of the 43 knights named by Leontios Makhairas as participating in the abortive Tripoli campaign,² 31, including Peter Malocello and Ralf Carmain, were Cypriots, 8, Louis of Rochefort, John Lascaris, Marco Cornaro,³ Peter Grimani,⁴ John of Grimante,⁵ Bermond of La Voulte, Alphonso Ferrand,⁶ and Florimond of Lesparre, were foreigners, and 4, Philip 'Doukizes;'⁷ John Moustry,⁸ John of Mouri and John of Rafier,⁹ uncertain. The Hospitallers

¹. Philip of Mézières, Int Peter Thomas, p.125.
². Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 190.
⁴. A Venetian who had served on the Alexandria campaign of 1365. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 167.
⁵. A Genoese knight in the service of the king of Aragon. See also Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 209, 213, 219.
⁶. Elsewhere described as a Catalan merchant and member of Queen Eleanor's household. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 342, see also paras. 200, 500; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 3828.
⁷. The name is corrupt in the text. See Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.119.
⁸. Apparently a royal favourite who tried to stave off the revolution of 1369 and then fled into exile. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 273, 283. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.291; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, pp.139, 144; Richard, 'Un évêque', pp.127 note 6, 133; William of Machaut, pp.114, 139, 145, 147, 153; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 194, 199, 200, 206, 208, 214, 248. It is possible that he or his family was of burgess origin: from a surviving tomb stone a John 'Monstri' is known to have had a son who was a jurat of the cour des bourgeois at Nicosia. Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicossienses, p.25.
⁹. Neither John of Mouri or John of Rafier is otherwise known, except that John of Mouri had a house in Nicosia. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 432.
provided 4 galleys and 12 smaller ships, and there were, in addition, a galley from Naples and galleys containing the forces supplied by the legate, by the archbishop of Nicosia, and by John of Olivier, and one containing 'the company of the Most Holy Mother of God'. Half the ships were commanded by 'captains of low estate', which suggests a high proportion of non-noble mercenary and foreign troops on the expedition. 33 galleys were said to have gone to quell the rebellion at Adalla, of which 20 were commanded by Cypriot vassals, including Peter Malocello. The others consisted of the 4 galleys sent by the Hospitallers, one sent by the 'bishop of Cyprus', and one containing the company of John of Olivier. The others were commanded by John of Olivier himself, Florimond of Lesparre, Mariano Cornaro, Leo Spinola, John Lascaris.

1. Presumably Peter Thomas who had died almost exactly a year earlier. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp.311-16.

2. Raymond of La Pradèle. See above, p.190 note 5.

3. A French knight sent to Cyprus by the king of France in 1366. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 175.

4. Possibly a reference to the Teutonic knights (though Iorga evidently confused the German volunteers in 1365 with that Order. See Philippe de Mézières, p.280 note 1, and compare Philip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, pp.126, 138). Alternatively, it could be a confraternity of the type found earlier in the kingdom of Jerusalem. See J.S.C. Riley-Smith, 'A Note on Confraternities of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xlv (1971).

5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 200.

6. Presumably the archbishop of Nicosia.

7. See Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.121.

8. Perhaps a relative of Marco. See above, p.196.

9. Presumably a member of the Genoese family of this name. For Francis Spinola, a Genoese in Peter's service, see Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 103, 139-41.
Bermond of La Voulté and Alphonso Ferrand. From the lists of participants on these two expeditions, it would appear that foreign knights played a substantial role, though the majority of commands were nevertheless given to Cypriots.

But it is possible that Leontios Makhairas underestimated the importance of the foreigners in these expeditions. William of Machaut gives an account of the members of the force which in 1367 went to the relief of Corhigos.

According to William, 6 galleys were used; the first was commanded by the prince of Antioch, who was accompanied by John of Morf, count of Edessa, Simon Tenoury and apparently James of Lusignan; James of Nores, the turcopollier, commanded the second, and was accompanied by John of Ibelin, James Le Petit and three named western knights. John of Moustry commanded the third, containing a number of French knights and also Cypriots, Genoese and Venetians. The others were commanded by Florimond de Lesparre, Le Cordelier de Puignon and Bermond of La Voulté, and from the account seem to have held only French knights.¹ In other words, French knights commanded 3 of the 6 galleys and comprised an important element in 2 of the others. Leontios Makhairas's account of the participants in this expedition is completely different: 10 galleys took part, the commanders of which are named. Only 3 of the commanders are the same as those named by William of Machaut: John, prince of Antioch, Simon Tenoury and Florimond of Lesparre. 8 of the commanders are Cypriots, the other 2 being Florimond and John Lascaris.² Whereas William

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 194.
is undoubtedly concerned to emphasise the role of the French knights, the considerable circumstantial detail he gives for this episode suggests that he was well informed. Even allowing for exaggeration, it would appear that foreigners could have constituted as much as two thirds of the total number of knights, and so have had a far greater importance on this campaign than Leontios Makhairas would indicate. If this is so, it may be that Leontios underrated their role on the other occasions as well.

The foreign knights in Cyprus played an important part in Peter I's campaigns in 1365 and 1367, and it is likely that without their help the Cypriot military effort would have been much less. It is equally clear that the noble families of Cyprus made a considerable contribution throughout Peter's reign.

From the lists of known participants in the capture of Adalia (1362), the sack of Alexandria (1365), the abortive raid on Tripoli (1367), the relief of Gorhigos (1367) and the expedition to Adalia (1367), members of 23 families of noble rank, not counting the royal family, which were established in Cyprus before 1310 can be seen to have joined the royal armies, as well as Philip of Brunswick, John and Ralph Carmain, John Mounstr, Simon Tenoury and John of Tyre. How far the Cypriot vassals were fully behind Peter's military policy is less easy to determine. Some of the more martial would have profited from the spoils of war, and the fact that some, for example John of Antioch, John of Brie, John

1. Antlaume, Antioch, L'ayse, Babin, La Baume, Beduin, Brie, Casin, Chevides, La Ferté, Gibelet, Belia, Mimars, Montgisard, Montolif, Morf, Nores, Novara, Le Petit, Pleseia, Soissons, Veray and Viscount.

54 individual members of these families are named.

2. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 182.
of Belin, count of Jaffa, James of Montgisard, Thomas of Montolif of Klirou, John of Morf and James of Nores, as well as the prince of Antioch, Peter's brother, took part in all or most of the campaigns for which we have lists of participants, might seem to suggest that they at least fully supported the king. From Leontios Makhairas's account, it would appear that Cypriot policy from 1366 was to use force to make the Mamlukes sue for peace, and the history of the following period is that of peace negotiations alternating with naval raids.¹ The murder of Peter in no way changed this policy, though it may have made negotiations easier, and so his murder should not be seen as a victory for an anti-war party.

The assassination of Peter I in January 1369 was the work of the Cypriot feudatories. Of the three knights who reportedly struck the fatal blows,² Henry of Gibelet had been the victim of the king's ira et malevolentia,³ and Philip of Belin, lord of Arsur, had been exiled by the king a few years earlier

---


2. According to the Chronographia Regum Francorum (ii, p.304) a fourth knight was involved, Peter of 'Mediomarte' - Mimars. A Peter of Mimars, son of Aimery, is mentioned in a document of 1327. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 28071. A Peter of Mimars, son of John, took part with his father in the escape attempt from Genoa after 1374, but he is not mentioned among the knights taken there and could have been a minor. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 548. It is not known whether the Chronographia's statement is well founded, and if so whether either of the two Peters was the knight in question.

and the pope had had to intervene in an attempt to reconcile them.¹ Little
is known of the third knight, John of Gaurelle, before 1369.² The reasons
for the assassination, however, lay much deeper than the private grudges of
individuals; the knights found themselves threatened by the king, and, though
probably in favour of the fighting itself, found the changes dictated by placing
the island on a continuous war-footing against their own interests.

The impression given from the account of the closing months of Peter's
life as narrated by Leontios Makhairas is that the king was becoming unbalanced.
That he should spend his time gratuitously insulting the ladies of noble families
and should build a special prison in which he intended to place his brothers and
other leading vassals suggests that he was not behaving rationally,³ and his
treatment of Henry of Gibelet and his family following a quarrel over a trivial
matter⁴ and his threat to execute John Goran on an even more trivial excuse⁵
would support this view. But Leontios's account cannot be taken at face value,
for it raises chronological difficulties which indicate that he was ill-informed.

2. He had accompanied Peter to the West in 1362. Leontios Makhairas, i,
para. 129. See also William of Machaut, p.254. The family had lived in
Cyprus since the early thirteenth century and were perhaps descended from
Massé of Gaurelle, the ancestor of the Antioch family. See 'Lettre inédite
d'Innocent III', p.122; 'Lignages', pp.460, 467, 471, 472, 473, 474; also
Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicosienses, p.131.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 259-60.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 279.
For example, Peter cannot have been plotting to imprison his brothers at Easter 1368 for he was in the West at that time. But even so, the account of Peter's treatment of the Gibelet family is substantiated by the independent authority of William of Machaut. It is clear that the king suffered from ill-health, and though he was by no means faithful to his wife, the queen's alleged liaison with John of Morf distressed him considerably. By the end of 1368 he found his policies of expansion in ruins; despite his efforts, he had established no permanent foothold on the coast of Egypt or Syria, and this together with the charges against the queen led him, according to Leontios Makhairas, to take a fatalistic stance.

The immediate cause of Peter's murder was his treatment of Henry of Gibelet and his family. The king, without judgement of the court, had imprisoned Henry and his son James and attempted to disparage Henry's daughter, Maria, who was liable to service de mariage, by marrying her to an artisan. The other vassals, led by Peter's brothers, fearing lest the king...

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 260. For Peter's second visit to the West, see Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp.369-81. Similarly, as Peter left Europe in September 1368 and was murdered the following January, it would have been impossible for John Viscount to have been in prison for a year. See Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 257-8. For another example of Leontios's apparently erroneous chronology in this period, see Hill, *History of Cyprus*, ii, p.357 note 2.


3. See for example, Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 209, 229.

4. Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 243, 251, see also para. 242.

5. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 251.

should disregard feudal convention in other cases,\textsuperscript{1} remonstrated with him, but Peter was only angered still more by this and the knights withdrew to debate the situation; the assassination followed in the early hours of the next morning.\textsuperscript{2}

Relations between the king and his vassals had already been soured by the case of John Viscount.\textsuperscript{3} John's allegations that the queen and John of Morf were lovers must remain unproven, but whatever the truth – and it is likely that rumours of the affair were current, though there is no evidence to suggest that there was a special relationship between John of Morf and Queen Eleanor in the period after Peter's murder – Peter seems to have suspected those around him of being involved in some way in keeping the facts from him. Leontios Makhairas dated his hatred of the knights from that time,\textsuperscript{4} and William of Machaut similarly treated the episode as a prelude to the murder.\textsuperscript{5}

Any breakdown of confidence between the king and his vassals should be seen in the context of the effect on Cyprus of the military campaigns of the previous few years. By analysing the remède drawn up immediately after the murder, Jean Richard has shown that infringement of feudal law was only one of

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] The 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p.425) makes it clear that John Gorup had been imprisoned and threatened with death by Peter I without the court being consulted.
\item[2.] Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 268-78, 280-81. See William of Machaut, pp.262-71.
\item[3.] For a discussion of the case, see below, pp. 350-52.
\item[4.] Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 259.
\item[5.] William of Machaut, pp.247-55.
\end{itemize}
several grievances. 1 Clause five of the remède re-asserted the need for judgement by the High Court before the king could touch the person or fief of a vassal. 2 Clause seven summarised the regulations relating to service de mariage. Two other clauses dealt with more general aspects of feudal privilege: vassals were to have their rights and fiefs and were not to be made to perform more service than was due, and they could swear to support one another in defence of their feudal rights in the face of illegal infringements by their lord. 3 Three clauses dealt with legal matters which would concern feudal law: an official version of John of Jaffa’s treatise was to be placed in Nicosia cathedral; the High Court was to meet regularly, at least once a month; 4 and a technical point was made, relating apparently to enquiries into the complaint that by developing his property a man had impaired the value of that of his neighbour. 5 That the feudatories had been complaining about the exaction of excessive services could have been the result of the king’s military demands on them during

1. Richard, 'La révolution de 1369', pp.111-17. Richard redated the remède (printed by Beugnot in 'Bans et Ordonnances', pp.378-9) from internal evidence to 1369. The oldest manuscript containing it correctly gives the date as 1368 (1369 n.s.). Codex Vaticanus latinus 4789, fo. ccxixv col. 2.

2. The words from 'sauve ce que aucua ...' to the end are almost certainly interpolated. In the Codex Vaticanus latinus 4789 (fo. ccxx) they are written across the bottom of the page with a sign that they are to be inserted. The origin of this exception is not known.


4. Clauses 8, 6.

5. Clause 12. For an example of the type of dispute probably envisaged and incidently involving James of Nores, one of the knights concerned with Peter’s murder, see Richard, 'Le casal de Pismofolo', p.125.
the previous few years and similarly the call for regular meetings of the
High Court was perhaps an indication that legal proceedings had been interrupted
and delayed because of the pre-occupation with military affairs. The remaining
clauses probably all arose from the difficulties brought about by the war. The
vassals complained of the financial impositions for military purposes being
extended beyond the terminal date agreed and the revenues being put to other
uses. They were apparently disturbed by the king's alienation of royal rights
over the salles without the court's permission, and they objected to the
financial burdens imposed by the 'office des enquêtes', again without the court's
permission. In short, Peter had abused the aids agreed by the vassals,
alienated the royal domain, and resorted to new financial exactions without
consulting the High Court. According to Leontios Makhairas, the accumulated
wealth of Hugh IV was spent on the expeditions against the Turks at the beginning
of the reign, and before each of Peter's visits to the West revenue had to be
raised by allowing individuals to purchase immunity from the poll tax. As
early as 1366 the king's counsellors had shown concern at the cost to the crown

1. Possibly infrequency of court hearings was a perennial complaint. See
above, p.121.


4. Clause 1. For a full discussion of this office see Richard, 'La révolution
de 1369', pp.113-15.

5. For the subsequent confiscation of fiefs given by Peter to foreigners, see
below, pp. 213-20.

of the military exploits, and it is probable that by 1369, with the alienation of many fiscal rights, the royal finances were in serious disarray. Certainly Peter was heavily in debt to various western merchants at the time of his death. Royal insolvency would have affected the vassals directly and indirectly, and they would undoubtedly have been embittered if this was accompanied by the growth of unsanctioned exactions.

The tenth clause of the remède directly concerned the conduct of military operations. The king was not to declare war nor make peace nor recruit more than a hundred men without the vassals' agreement. In other words, the vassals were trying to control royal policy and expenditure. At first sight it might appear inconsistent that in clause 11 they were placing restrictions on the right of mercenaries to leave royal service: three months notice was to be required if in Cyprus, and twelve if abroad. Far from paying off the mercenaries, they were trying to keep them. The problem lay in the fact that if foreign knights and foot soldiers could discharge themselves at will, a lull in military activities as in 1368 with its consequence lack of adventure and booty or the inability of the government to pay wages would lead directly to the dispersal of an important element in the army, and so make a successful conclusion of peace more difficult. Already in 1367 one garrison had rebelled because of arrears of pay.

More serious was the problem of retaining foreign captains. It is in this context that the episode of Peter's dispute with Florimond of Lesparre should be

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 182.
2. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 13, 20, 134, 291, 718, also no. 128.
3. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 200.
seen. The precise reasons for the quarrel are obscure, but the upshot was that Florimond challenged Peter to a duel, and Peter accepted the challenge. Though the pope tried to dissuade him on the grounds that the duel would be a derogation of royal dignity, it is likely that if Peter had not been prepared to meet Florimond on his own terms, he would have been regarded as a dishonourable coward, his charisma as the leader of the Christian armies would have evaporated, and he would have ceased to be able to attract or retain other western adventurers in his service. Without the person of Peter I, it would have been even more difficult to retain this important element in the Cypriot armies, and so the vassals were trying to counteract the possibility of further losses.

In 1369 the Cypriot vassals murdered their king partly no doubt in the heat of the moment, but partly because their legal and social status was being severely undermined. Peter had shown himself capable of discarding feudal convention; the respect of the vassals for the king and vice versa had broken down; royal finances were in a poor condition; and though the vassals were probably in favour of the war in itself, the war affected them adversely. Even without the attack on them during the closing weeks of Peter's life their situation would have seemed difficult; the king's treatment of Henry of Gibelet threatened the whole basis of their position in society and provoked them to violence.

1. For the dispute, see William of Machaut, pp. 224-45; Leontios Makaliras, i, paras. 206, 214, 216-17. See also Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp. 349-51, 355-6.

2. Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, no. 2567. At about the same time the pope censured Peter for his adultery. Annales Ecclesiastici, 1367 para. 13.
It would not be an undue simplification to divide the reign of Peter II (1369-1382) into three phases: the rule of the prince of Antioch (1369-1373), the rule of Queen Eleanor (1374-c.1378), and Peter's personal rule (c.1378-1382).

The murder of Peter I resulted in the emergence of two distinct factions in the Cypriot ruling class: that led by the prince of Antioch, supported by the knights responsible for the murder and by the feudal class as a whole, and an opposing party centred around Peter's widow, Eleanor of Aragon. Mas Latrie and Hill have both strongly argued that Prince John and his brother James were innocent of Peter's death, pointing to the fact that whereas they were commonly held responsible by writers in the West, the Cypriot historians who give the fullest account of the events acquit them.¹ The Cypriot sources, however, belong to a common tradition and so their unanimity proves nothing,² and it is probable that if that tradition took shape under royal or court patronage, as seems likely, the historians would have been reluctant to accuse their patrons or their patrons' ancestors of regicide and fratricide.³

Immediately after the murder, John, prince of Antioch, was appointed regent.⁴ He ruled until Peter was recognised as being of age at the end of

2. See Leontios Makhairas, ii, pp.8-9.
3. Though Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 280) was at pains to exculpate the prince, he later (para. 553) made it clear that Eleanor held him responsible for the murder.
4. John of Ibelin, pp.3-5.
1371, and seems to have continued to dominate the direction of affairs until the collapse of Cyprus in the face of the Genoese invasion at the end of 1373. Irrespective of whether he was responsible for the murder, the prince made no attempt to punish the murderers, and several of those named as being involved in the plot enjoyed positions of responsibility in the period 1369-1373. Thus immediately after the murder, Philip of Arsour presided at the meeting of the High Court which declared the prince of Antioch regent; Philip, Henry of Gibelet, John of Gaurelle and Raymond Babin were among those entrusted with the duty of establishing the text of John of Jaffa's legal treatise to be placed in Nicosia cathedral; John Gorap participated in an embassy to the Mamlukes; Raymond Babin was evidently a counsellor of the prince, and was sufficiently important to be the recipient of letters from the pope and the commune of Pisa; 7

1. For the date of Peter's majority, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.351 note 2. Peter was crowned king of Cyprus on 6 January 1372. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.379. The prince of Antioch was last addressed as governor by the pope on 22 January. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes... autres que la France, no.518. See Acta Gregorii PP.XI, p.42. The commune of Pisa addressed him as bailli as late as May 1372. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxv (1874), p.105.

2. In addition to those mentioned in the accounts of the murder are ten knights who were exiled in 1374 for their part in the events of 1369. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542. Raymond Babin, whose house was used by the murderers, should be included. See below, p.434.

3. John of Ibelin, p.3.


5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 290.


7. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes... autres que la France, no.718; 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxv (1874), p.106.
Philip of Arsour was also a recipient of a letter from the Pisans and in 1374 the pope intervened on his behalf;¹ In 1372 he had, at short notice, undertaken a ceremonial function at Peter's coronation in Famagusta;² finally, John Gorap, Thomas of Morf, Philip of Arsour, Arnold of Mimars and Raymond Babin were active in the Genoese war.³ It is therefore clear that the prince of Antioch placed himself at the head of the group who had killed Peter I, even if, with his brother James, he had not instigated the murder.

The prince's policy was simple: finish the war, restore royal finances and maintain himself and his supporters in power. We have seen that since the end of 1366 Cypriot policy had been to keep up attacks on Mamluke possessions in the hope of forcing the Mamlukes to agree to a peace which would be advantageous to the Cypriots.⁴ John continued this policy, sending raiding expeditions against the Syrian and Egyptian ports in the summer of 1369 and then co-operating with the Venetians and Genoese in seeking a peace treaty which was concluded in 1370.⁵ Though it would appear that the terms of the treaty were not particularly favourable to the Cypriots,⁶ the prince showed no sign of being over anxious to cease hostilities, and his attitude to the war was

---

1. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2605; 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxv (1874), p.106. See below, p. 456.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 325.


4. See above, p. 200.

5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 284-309.

essentially the same as King Peter's. On the other hand, the prince of Antioch did not share his brother's designs on Armenia; instead he seems to have done nothing until in 1373 the Armenians chose Leo of Lusignan, seneschal of Jerusalem and an illegitimate descendant of Amaury of Tyre, as their king. The Cypriots, threatened by the Genoese, were prepared to allow him to receive the Armenian crown, offering only vague promises of help after the coming war was over. At most the king of Cyprus would have had some form of suzerainty over Armenia, but presumably it was thought that direct rule would only be a drain on Cypriot resources and was not worth attempting.

A return to peace would in itself mean the reduction of royal expenditure, and the resumption of normal commercial relations would almost certainly have led to an increase in the royal revenues from trade. But perhaps the most important method of restoring the crown's finances was to build up the royal domain in Cyprus. Some impression of the extent of the dispersal of the domain under Peter I can be gained from an examination of the surviving accounts for the diocese of Limassol for the year 1367-1368. The total tithe payable by the crown on the royal domain was assessed at 8,424 besants 18 caroubles, in addition to the amounts owed for the casal of Pelendhriakia and for the revenues from the salines at Limassol which were not stated. The total tithe payable in cash by other land owners was assessed at 7,668 besants.

1. See above, p.193. For Peter I's claim to the throne of Armenia, see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.358-9.
3. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp.78-9, see p.91. The crown also owed an undisclosed quantity of wine.
but this total is far from complete as the amounts due from a number of casalia are not known, and the tithe owed on a number of estates was assessed partly in kind. Several lords were probably beneficiaries of grants made by Peter I out of the royal domain: Hugh, prince of Galilee, held Leukara and Vavla; Fantin Cornaro held Episkopi; John Lascaris Calopheros held "Serie", and Bermond of La Voulte Polemidhia and Ayios Reginos. The prince of Antioch's apanage, some at least of which he had acquired in the reign of Hugh IV, included Pelendria, Alaminos and part of Lophos. The tithe assessed on Vavla, Polemidhia, Ayios Reginos, Episkopi and 'Serie' was not given but the total monetary assessment for the other estates was $3,528\frac{3}{4}$ beasants and tithes in kind were due from Alaminos and 'Serie'. From this evidence it would appear that recent alienations from the royal domain accounted for about half the titheable wealth of the diocese not in royal hands, and perhaps equalled approximately half the value of the royal domain within the diocese in 1367-1368. Unfortunately the accounts are incomplete. It is not necessarily true that the estates mentioned were alienations from the royal domain, and some of those that were recent royal grants could have been lands which had escheated to the crown not


3. See below, p.220.

4. See above, p.189.

5. See above, p.181. He already held Pelendria in 1353. 'A register of Santa Sophia', p.126.
long before.¹ It is not known how many other estates listed in the account were recent alienations, nor how many money fiefs were assigned against the revenues from the estates remaining in royal hands, nor how far the value of the alienated estates was limited by earlier assignations against their profits.² But, assuming that the tithe assessments reflect the value of the estates reasonably accurately, the account indicates extensive alienations from the royal domain during the third quarter of the fourteenth century, and in particular during the reign of Peter I.

According to John Dardel, 'After the death of King Peter ... the prince, who held the government of the realm, repossessed all the fiefs which King Peter, his brother, had given to foreigners and took them and seized their revenues...'.³ This is an over-simplification of the situation, but contains a strong element of truth. The prince used at least two devices: he recovered fiefs for which homage had not been paid or for which the title was not valid. The legal writers of the thirteenth century make it clear that failure to perform homage within forty days at the accession of a new king or within a year and a day when

1. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, Alaminos had been held by Philip of Belin, the seneschal, and Episkopi by Guy, count of Jaffa. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.238, 272. When they passed from the possession of those families is not known.

2. Revenues from Lefkara and Peleandria at least were directed to other beneficiaries. M. Perlbach, 'Die Reste des Deutschordensarchives in Venedig', Altpreußische Monatsschrift, xix (1882), p.648; 'A register of Santa Sophia', no.126. Such rents became the responsibility of the grantee if the estate was alienated. See below, p.387.

an heir entered his inheritance should result in the loss of the fief for life, 1 and the prince seems to have applied this rule rigorously. The class of feudatories which would suffer most by this would be those who were non-resident in Cyprus, 2 and those western knights who had received Cypriot fiefs and who had subsequently returned home would have been particularly affected. In March and again in May 1371 the pope wrote asking the prince to allow Bermond of La Voult to defer performing homage to Peter II for five years, and then in August of the same year he asked that, now that Bermond was dead, his heirs should have their father's fief and that William, Bermond's eldest son, might postpone homage. 3 It is probable that these requests were refused, for in the reign of James I, Bermond's former fiefs were transferred from the prince of Antioch's legitimate son to his illegitimate son. 4 Apparently in this instance the estates had been used to enrich the prince's own family.

This was not the only example of the papacy intervening to request the postponement of homage or permission to perform homage by deputy, 5 and for a knight to petition the pope to intercede in this way on his behalf would strongly suggest that he was threatened with the loss of his fief.

1. Geoffrey Le Tor, pp.437-8, 446; John of Ibelin, pp.287, 305; James of Ibelin, pp.454, 455, 456.

2. Geoffrey Le Tor (pp.437-8) made an exception of those who were abroad at the time of the lord's accession.


4. See above, p. 181.

5. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 802-3, 897-8, 1004-5 (see no. 352).
The absence from Cyprus of a vassal could mean that not only would the formality of homage not take place, but that the man would not perform in person the services due from the fief. There is at least one example from the years 1369-1373 of the pope requesting the granting of a licence of non-residence for a Cypriot vassal, presumably so that he might enjoy the revenues of his fief while not performing his services in person. The pope also intervened in 1371 and again in 1373 on behalf of Hugh, prince of Galilee, who left Cyprus in 1368 with King Peter and had not returned to the East.

It is clear from the papal letters that Hugh's fiefs and his wife's dowry were withheld from him. Whether they had been confiscated as a result of his failure to perform homage or for default of service is not known, but in this case it appears that Hugh later returned to Cyprus and recovered his estates.

John Dardel described how the prince of Antioch confiscated the fiefs given by Peter I to Isabella of Lusignan, wife of the Despot of the Morea and a descendant of Amaury of Tyre, and Eschiva of Scandelion, the king's mistress.

1. Gregory XI, *Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France*, no. 1540.
2. Leontios Makhairas, *Lettres secrètes ... se rapportant à la France*, no. 2829. In August 1368 the pope asked Peter I to allow Hugh to go to France for two years. Urban V, *Lettres secrètes ... se rapportant à la France*, no. 2829. In 1373 the Genoese falsely alleged that he was with them in the Invasion fleet, whereas the Cypriots thought he was still in the West at that time. Leontios Makhairas, *Lettres secrètes ... se rapportant à la France*, nos. 253, 1417.

5. For Eschiva of Scandelion, see Leontios Makhairas, *Lettres secrètes ... se rapportant à la France*, nos. 253, 1417.
on the grounds that they were not his to give. It would appear that these estates, Aradhippou and Athalassa, were part of the patrimony of Amaury of Tyre, which had been administered by the crown since the 1310's and which Amaury's descendants had been claiming ever since. From the 1340's, Isabella was Amaury's sole legitimate descendant, and Peter I allowed her part of the inheritance. She was evidently not in Cyprus at the time of his death and the prince of Antioch seized the fief. When she arrived in the island, armed with papal letters requiring him to return it, he refused. In what sense the fief was not Peter's to grant can only be surmised, but a possible explanation is that Peter I and Isabella were disputing the title to Amaury's estates in the High Court, and as long as the case was unresolved Peter could not alienate any of the estates. Peter and Isabella may have agreed on a composition by which Isabella received Aradhippou and gave up her claim to the rest. Peter was thus free to grant Athalassa to his mistress, but the prince of

3. See John Dardel, pp.22-6, 37-40.
4. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, pp.75-6.
5. For a discussion of her career and family connections, see S. Binon, 'Guy d'Arménie et Guy de Chypre. Isabelle de Lusignan à la cour de Mistra', Annaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves, v (= Mélanges Émile Boisacq, 1) (1937), pp.134-41. She had enlisted papal support in her attempt to recover the Cypriot fiefs as early as the 1340's. Clement VI, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, nos. 1422-4, 1938.
6. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 86-7; John Dardel, pp.37-8, 40-41; Leontios Makhalras, 1, para. 345, see para. 351. See also Binon, 'Guy d'Arménie', p.138.
Antioch probably refused to recognise the composition, and used this as an excuse for withholding both the estates. If this is so, the point at issue would be whether the composition, which had probably been arranged at Modon, had been properly ratified in the High Court, and it would appear that the prince was using this technicality to deprive Isabella and Eschiva of their estates. The impression given is that the High Court could have confirmed the arrangement if it had been sufficiently well-disposed towards the two women, but it chose not to.

The treatment of the non-resident fief-holders in the period immediately after the murder of Peter I brings us to the question of the extent to which there was antipathy between members of the long-established Cypriot noble families and the foreign knights recruited by Peter I and given fiefs in the island. It is possible that the latter were deeply resented, but it would be wrong to assume that newcomers were automatically hated by the older families. Those who were prepared to settle permanently in Cyprus and identify their interests with those of the existing nobility would have been accepted by them. Peter Malocello, for example, the Genoese who became chamberlain of Cyprus, was attacked by the mob in the anti-Genoese riot at Peter II's coronation in Famagusta, but the Cypriot knights came to his aid; if the populace regarded him as a foreigner, the nobles thought of him as one of themselves. 2 Also there is little direct evidence for tension between the Cypriots and foreign knights before Peter's


2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 330. For an alternative version of this incident, see Acta et Processus Canonizacionis beate Birgitte, pp.430-31.
murder, other than a quarrel between John Moustry and the lord of Rochefort. But it is clear that the prince of Antioch's regime was opposed both to Peter's former favourites and to absentees. Of Peter's favourites, John Moustry fled into exile, Philip of Mézières chose to remain in the West, and his mistress, Eschiva of Scandellon, was dispossessed. At a time when royal finances were poor, the government could not afford to allow substantial fiefs to be held by men who lived outside the kingdom and showed little or no sign of wanting to contribute to its good. The interests of these members of the royal family who only spent short periods in the island and whose real interests lay elsewhere, and of knightly adventurers who had served for a few months, had been given fiefs and then returned home would not have been safeguarded by a regime faced with heavy expenditure at a time of declining prosperity.

The only clear example of the dispossesssion of a foreign knight who stayed in Cyprus after 1369 is that of John Lascaris Calopheros. John had joined Peter's expedition to Alexandria and then settled in Cyprus where he married Maria of Mimars, the widow of John of Solissons. It appears that, perhaps with Maria's help, he had secured his wife's personal fortune and dower to the exclusion of the children by her earlier marriage. Maria seems to have

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 206. The incident is expanded by Florio Dustron (p.265), but whether on good authority is not known. For John Moustry, see above, p.196 note 8.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 283.
died soon after the murder of Peter; her son John (Janot) supported by his two brothers-in-law, Leo of Lusignan and Baldwin of Nores, then seized his mother's possessions, and John Lascaris was imprisoned. After repeated papal demands he was released, apparently in 1372, and departed to western Europe to appeal to the pope, leaving Maria's property still in the hands of her children. This is a clear instance of a foreigner who apparently behaved in a manner unacceptable to the Cypriot feudatories and was then the victim of a reaction after the death of King Peter. The case is complicated by the possibility that he was involved in a subversive scheme instigated by Queen Eleanor, but, taken with the dispossession of foreign knights who were away from Cyprus, it is a pointer to a widespread policy of excluding the foreign beneficiaries of Peter I's grants from Cypriot feudal society.

However, the loss of revenues by foreign knights may not have been always the result of deliberate policy. It is likely that in view of the government's financial difficulties the sources of royal income against which money fiefs were assigned were not necessarily sufficient, and in this event vassals in Cyprus who could press for payment in person would probably be more likely to receive their due than those who were abroad. This seems to have been what happened in the case of the dowry of Maria of Bourbon, widow of Peter I's eldest brother, Guy. In 1368 it was agreed that the dowry was to be worth 5,000 florins annually, to be paid in two instalments. From the surviving

---

1. See Jacoby, 'Jean Lascaris Calophéros', pp.190-95. For the legal issues of the case, see below, pp. 352-5.
account of the payments, extracted from the registers of the secrète, it is clear that the prince of Antioch acknowledged his obligation to abide by the agreement as payments were made during the years 1369-1374, but the sums dispatched fluctuated wildly, never totalling the agreed amount. In 1371 Maria had the pope write to the prince, complaining about this, but it is to be assumed that the income at the secrète was simply not enough to meet all the demands made upon it and so less pressing payments were not met.

Not all the foreigners who came to Cyprus in the reign of Peter I and received fiefs lost them during the prince's rule, and one family in particular established itself permanently in the island. In the 1360's the brothers, Frederick, Marco and Fantin Cornaro, were engaged in trade with Cyprus and advanced loans to King Peter. By 1367, Fantin, the member of the family resident in the island, held the valuable fief of Episkopi and was the farmer (apautour) of the royal casal of Pelendhrakia. Though in 1371 and 1372 the pope had to press the Cypriot authorities to pay the debts owed to the Cornaros, there is no indication of any move to deprive them of their estates. In 1374

---

5. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 291, 718.
Frederick was involved in efforts to secure a peace treaty between Genoa and Cyprus, and a few years later acted as Peter II's proxy in his marriage to Valentina Visconti. In the fifteenth century his descendants were to play an important role and eventually the Hospitaller Grand Commandery was reserved for members of that branch of the family.

There can be no doubt that the importance of aliens in Cypriot feudal society during the minority of Peter II was not nearly so great as during the latter part of the reign of Peter I. The prince of Antioch's policy of retrenchment proved a major factor in their decline, but the extent to which this retrenchment was coupled with xenophobia is less apparent. The evidence seems to point to a current of opinion among the members of the older noble families with whose support the prince ruled that was opposed to the newcomers and royal favourites, and it is probable that this hostility together with the financial difficulties brought about the reaction against them.

The history of the period 1369-1373 is overshadowed by the murder of King Peter and by the Genoese invasion of 1373-1374. The invasion was not the direct result of the murder, but the two episodes are linked. The antipathy felt by Queen Eleanor for the prince of Antioch was behind much of the internal politics of Cyprus during these years, and the Genoese war was in part the

1. Gregory XI, *Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France*, nos. 3056, 3075.
consequence of this hostility. Eleanor's opposition to the prince arose partly from a desire for revenge on the murderers of her husband, and partly because the prince tried to exclude her from the exercise of authority and patronage. The feudal custom of the Latin East and the Cypriot precedents of 1218 and 1253 provided that in the event of a minority a surviving parent should have the bailliage, or in the case of the crown, the regency. Only in the absence of a surviving parent did the rights pass to the nearest heir present in the East. In 1369, therefore, Eleanor would have had a claim to the regency, but was deliberately passed over in favour of Peter II's nearest adult heir, the prince of Antioch. There is no positive evidence that she regarded herself as being deprived of her rights to the regency, but she must have been aware that she would have had a good claim to it in law. It would appear that the prince also tried to deny the queen the custody of her son. Whereas it seems that she continued to bring him up after his father's death, we know from a papal letter of 1371 that the prince had asked the pope to nominate a guardian.

The prince's request probably arose from an incident which took place in 1370. It was discovered that Nicholas of Naoua, a senior official in royal service, had been writing letters on the queen's behalf to rulers in the West, denouncing the prince for the murder of Peter I and seeking to arrange for Genoese ships to take Eleanor and her son to the West to lay her complaints.

1. See below, p. 375.


before the pope. According to Leontios Makhairas he had also written to the Genoese calling on them to invade Cyprus.\(^1\) The prince of Antioch, at a time when the conclusion of peace with the Mamlukes was imminent,\(^2\) would have been anxious to avoid papal displeasure. As it was, Urban V had been reluctant to give the prince's regime his approval,\(^3\) and he and his successor showed their lack of confidence in the prince's intentions by urging him to proceed with his nephew's coronation; in May 1371 Pope Gregory XI told Eleanor and John to assign the castle of Kyrenia or that of Famagusta to the young king for his security.\(^4\) It is possible that it was only fear that Eleanor would be more embarrassing for his government if exiled that prevented the prince from sending her away. At the time of the trial of John Viscount in 1368 it had been argued that, if the queen were killed, the Aragonese would make war on Cyprus.\(^5\) The king of Aragon was said to have sent an embassy to console her after Peter's murder,\(^6\) and in 1371 her father, the franciscan Peter, son of James II of Aragon, was planning with papal encouragement to come to Cyprus, presumably with the purpose of helping her.\(^7\)

---

2. See above, p. 193.
3. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 310. See also Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp. 392, 400-1.
4. Annales Ecclesiasticci, 1370 para. 13; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 133, 135, also no. 62.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 255.
7. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 182, 184-6. There is no evidence that he actually came to Cyprus, though a stay of up to three years was envisaged by the pope.
For as long as Peter II was a minor and the prince of Antioch regent, the queen was powerless in law and her influence over the direction of affairs minimal. When at the end of 1371 the king was declared of age, the situation immediately changed since theoretically he was now ruler in his own right.

The prince's special constitutional position lapsed, and the conflict between him and the queen developed into a contest for the control of the king, who, aged fifteen, would scarcely have been able to make his own decisions. It was evidently the pope's desire that Eleanor, John and his brother James should work together as counsellors of the young king, but in fact the prince continued to wield effective power. Immediately after the coronation, the queen used her influence over the king to distribute fiefs to her supporters, and the prince, backed by the other nobles, reacted to this by forcing the king to make a decree that no grants made before he was 25 should be valid. Control of royal patronage was essential for the wielding of effective power, and not surprisingly the queen deeply resented this move.

At the coronation of Peter II as king of Jerusalem in November 1372,

1. See Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 787–9, 791, 2198–9. The queen and the king's uncles were frequently the joint recipients of papal letters relating to Cyprus in the period 1372–1373. See nos. 553, 599, 600, 718, 802, 935–6, 1424, 1511, 2072–3, 2290–91.

2. From the treaty of 1388, it is evident that the Genoese regarded the prince of Antioch as ruling in Cyprus at the time of Peter's coronation as king of Jerusalem. C. Sperone, Real Grandeza de la serenissima Republica de Genova (Genoa, 1669), p.116.

3. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 327, 555.
there was an anti-Genoese riot in which several of their merchants were killed.\(^1\) This riot, the culmination of almost a century of poor relations with Cyprus, was used by the Genoese as a pretext for the war which followed. Eleanor had perhaps already conceived the idea of using them in her struggle with the prince of Antioch,\(^2\) and it is clear that she encouraged their invasion plans, either out of spite or because she hoped that after the war she would be left the dominant figure in Cyprus. According to Leontios Makhairas, she sent Alphonso Ferrand\(^3\) to her father '... to tell him of everything which had gone contrary to her, and to try to bring every trouble upon her enemies for the sake of vengeance',\(^4\) and John Lascaris Calopheros, who had his own reasons for opposing the Prince,\(^5\) may have been involved in diplomatic intrigues on her behalf.\(^6\) The queen’s activities did not themselves lead to the invasion, but they did provide the Genoese with a moral justification for the war: instead of waging war to avenge the deaths of a few merchants and for commercial and

---


2. See above, pp.223-5.

3. For Alphonso Ferrand, see above, P.196.


5. See below, pp.353-4.

financial gain, the Genoese were invited to exact recompense for the murder of King Peter, the conqueror of Alexandria, at the instance of his widow.¹

Fear of possible Turkish advances in the East rather than a desire to help the prince led the pope to try to prevent the impending conflict from escalating.²

In his view the prince was to blame for the war,³ but Leontios Makhairas's assertion that he actively encouraged the Genoese⁴ is mistaken. The idea that the war was the prince's fault, combined with the justification for the war on the grounds of revenge against Peter I's murderers meant, that, so far as the Genoese were concerned, they were fighting 'contra principem Antiochiae et sequaces...'.⁵

The war itself opened with Genoese raids on the coast of Cyprus,⁶ and the Cypriot's return of Adalia, despite papal disapproval, to the Turks.⁷ The main Genoese fleet arrived in October 1373 and soon after captured Famagusta

---

¹ For collusion between the Genoese and Eleanor, see also Andrea Gatari, col. 256; Andrea of Reduells de Quero, col. 760. See also Phillip of Mézières, Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, I, p. 296.
² For the various papal attempts at peace, see Annales Ecclesiastici, 1372 para 31; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... France, no. 2849; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 1408, 1491 (see also 1486, 1489), 1838 (see nos. 1844), 1888-9, 1947, 1960, 2121, 2198-9, 2266.
³ Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 1408.
⁴ Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 352-3, 355-6.
⁶ Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 362, 377-82.
and with it the king, his mother and many knights. The prince of Antioch held St. Hilarion and James of Lusignan, Kyrenia which withstood two unsuccessful sieges. The Genoese then imposed an onerous tribute and left in April 1374, retaining Famagusta and taking with them a large number of knights as hostages to ensure its payment. Having captured Famagusta, the Genoese ambition had been to take Kyrenia and so, by occupying the two most strongly fortified points on the coast, have the whole island at their mercy. Their treatment of the queen at the time of the capture of Famagusta showed that despite their pose as the avengers of Peter I they did not regard her as their ally, but once having her son and herself in their power they tried to use them to secure the occupation of the rest of the island. According to Leontios Makhairas they sought to gain her co-operation by continuing to insist that they had come to avenge her, and they executed Peter's actual murderers, Philip of Arsur, Henry of Gibelet and John of Gaurelle. The queen however, prompted by her son, found that her interests coincided with those of the prince of Antioch and James of Lusignan rather than with those of the Genoese, and, after a period in which she and James seem to have been working at cross purposes, she escaped from the Genoese and joined him at Kyrenia.

1. For details, see Hill, History of Cyprus, II, pp.396-412.
5. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 423; George Stella, col. 1165.
After the war, with James of Lusignan, the sons of the prince of Antioch, and over 70 knights, hostages or exiles in Genoa or Chios, the queen was the most influential person left in Cyprus. Vassals who were thought to have been involved in Peter I's murder were exiled and dispossessed. The prince of Antioch was isolated and murdered. There is some evidence that the queen had around her a group of counsellors who were distinct from Peter II's advisers, and her supporters seem to have been drawn mostly from foreigners. Before or during the war the Catalan, Alphonso Ferrand, and the Byzantines, John Lascaris Calopheros and George Monomachos, evidently enjoyed her confidence, and her associates in plotting the prince's murder included Giacomo di San Michele, the Lombard knight and lawyer.


2. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 542, 620. The dispossessal of the murderers presumably dates from the period immediately after the Genoese war.


4. See Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no.3191.

5. See above, p.225. Both Alphonso Ferrand and John Lascaris retained connections with Cyprus after the war. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 3570, 3573; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 3077, 3625; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 563. See Jacoby, 'Jean Lascaris Calophéros', pp.197-8.


7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.479. See above, p.185. He was engaged in an embassy to the West in 1375-1376. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 3616, 3651-3, 3656, 3659.
the Genoese, Francis of Marin, the Catalan, Francis Saturno, and Paul Marshal, her steward whose origin is unknown but whose son-in-law was a Venetian. Though 'certain knights of Cyprus' are mentioned in the account of the murder, the impression given is that the queen's party was made up of aliens and that she did not enjoy the support of the older Cypriot families.

As Peter II reached full maturity, some diminution of his mother's influence was probably inevitable. The first major dispute between them arose over the execution of Thibaut Belfrage. Thibaut, a Greek burgess who had been converted to Latin Christianity and had been knighted, rose to prominence after the Genoese war. After being in the West on a peace mission, he returned in 1375 with a force of mercenaries, recruited partly at his own expense, defeated the Genoese galleys sent to intercept him and made what appears to have been the first Cypriot attempt after the war to recapture

1. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 553.

2. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 555; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.478. He had been appointed castellan of Kyrenia in 1373, but was refused admittance by the garrison who feared that he was a Genoese agent. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 401.

3. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 555, see ii, p.190. See also paras. 461, 572. Also mentioned was Louis Πούς or 'Ponto'. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 553; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.478. It is not clear whether he was a member of the 'de Bon' or 'Le Bon' families.

4. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 553.

5. See above, pp.11-12.

6. For references to him before 1374, see 'Nouvelles preuves', BEF, xxxiv (1873), pp.77-8; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2073; Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 214, 403-4.

7. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 3570, 3573; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 3012, 3066-7, 3090, 3109-10.
Famagusta. Thibaut was well rewarded, but, when thwarted in his hopes of getting further rewards, he murdered the royal counsellor he held responsible for this reverse and the viscount of Nicosia who happened to be with him at the time. He was an ambitious man who had become the king's favourite, and so came into conflict with the queen: allegedly he had tried to make her servants confess under torture to plans to poison the king. Eleanor pressed for his execution, and Peter reluctantly agreed, though he is said to have regretted his decision later. Eleanor's fall and exile followed the king's marriage to Valentina Visconti. Leontios Makhairas described how Peter's bride urged him to send his mother away and how Eleanor was beginning to intrigue with the Genoese again, as she had before the war. It would appear that Peter resolved to exile his mother soon after his marriage in 1378, but, probably because of the War of Chioggia, she did not leave Cyprus until 1380.

Little is known of the closing years of Peter II's reign, but two developments can perhaps be discerned. The first was the determination on the part of the crown to recover Famagusta by force; in 1378 Peter joined Venice and Milan in a league against Genoa, and later that year a combined Cypriot

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 556-62, 564.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 585-71; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.482-4.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 572.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 580-83, 587. For the date of the marriage, see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.423 note 3.
and Venetian operation failed to capture Famagusta. The diversion of resources to the Adriatic for the War of Chioggia meant that no more help was likely from Venice and, from correspondence of 1382, it would appear that Peter had turned to another possible ally, Peter IV of Aragon who in that year was sending an ambassador to discuss ways of expelling the Genoese. Coupled with these activities were the improvements in the fortifications at Nicosia and elsewhere. The other feature of this period was the beginning of the return to positions of influence of members of the older noble families. It is not clear how many of the exiles and hostages returned to Cyprus before 1382, but in the council of regency which was formed on Peter's death, 10 knights out of the 13 were members of knightly families which are known to have been in Cyprus before 1300. Possibly the most significant development in this respect was the appointment of John of Brie as turcopoliert and the re-appointment of John of Neuville as viscount of Nicosia in 1376 at the time of the fall of Thibaut Belfarage. John of Brie seems to have been Peter's leading counsellor, for in 1378 he negotiated the Cypriot adherence to the alliance of Milan and Venice

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 583-6.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 594-7.
4. See below, Rp. 240-41.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 599. John of Brie, John of Neuville, Hugh and Guy of La Baume, Perot, Wilmot and Arnold of Montoliff, Thomas of Morf, Aimery of Plessia, and Peter of Antioch, as opposed to John Gorap, Renier of Scolar and Thomas Barech.
against Genoa.  

The fortunes of Queen Eleanor and the relative importance of the alien and native-born knights in Cyprus during the reign of Peter II were directly linked. The position of the foreign knights which had been seriously diminished during Peter's minority may have improved somewhat in the period immediately after the war of 1373-1374 in as much as the group centred around the queen were mostly foreigners, but this improvement did not last. On the other hand, the older Cypriot families comprising the party of the prince of Antioch, were ousted, at least temporarily, by the war, though the extent to which Peter II restored them is not certain. Peter's reign, however, did witness the emergence of a new group—men such as Thibault Belfarage or Thomas Barech who were native burgesses converted to Latin Christianity and ennobled.  

The impact of the Genoese war on the Cypriot feudatories cannot be assessed in quantitative terms. Few knights were killed in the actual fighting, and some, for example Nicholas L'Ayze and Peter of Cassin, distinguished themselves by their resource and bravery. Others, such as John of Morf, whose personal ambition is said to have led to the Genoese seizure of Famagusta,  

---

2. See above, pp.11-12. For Thomas Barech, see Liber iurium, ii, col. 814; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 563, 599.  
3. The only knight known to have been mortally wounded was Raymond of Caffran. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 388. Later there was mention of three or four knights being killed, but this may be a reference to the murderers of Peter I who were executed. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 489. See above, p.227.  
or Montolif of Verny, who was accused by Leontios Makhairas of peculation when supposedly organising provisions for Kyrenia castle, showed less merit.

The Genoese pillaging and exactions destroyed many personal fortunes, and their invasion would have disrupted and diminished sources of income so that the returns from estates would in many cases have been reduced and the ability of the crown to pay money fiefs impaired. Presumably those vassals with fiefs in land in areas unaffected by the war would have suffered less, but as the Genoese activities included raids in the coastal regions, and their armies passed from Famagusta to Nicosia and Kyrenia, the unaffected districts may have been limited to the remoter areas in the centre and west of the island.

Perhaps more damaging in the long term was the fact that a substantial proportion of the Cypriot knights were taken from Cyprus as hostages or exiled. Two lists of those in exile survive: Hugh of Montolif enumerated 60 knights and squires 'whom the false Genoese had taken and put in prison by great treachery in the year of Christ 1374 in Famagusta'. He then added the names of 3 men who were allegedly not in prison (though he had previously included their names among the 60 who were), but were taken to be made the sons-in-law of prominent

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 444, 532, see 405. Despite the charges he evidently remained a close associate of James of Lusignan, becoming eventually lord of Sidon. See Liber iurium, II, col. 811; Mas Latrice, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.421; Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 526-8, 530.

2. See, for example, Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 349, 422, 451-3.

3. For coastal raids, see Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 362, 377, 381.

4. For areas of Genoese activity in the island, see Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 387-9, 424-510 passim.
Genoese, and finally the names of the two sons of the prince of Antioch. 1

The imprisonment of the Cypriot knights who were summoned to join Peter II in Famagusta in November 1373 and then arrested by the Genoese is recorded by Leontios Makhairas, 2 and it was presumably this incident to which Hugh was referring when he spoke of 'great treachery'. Leontios Makhairas named 42 knights taken to Genoa as hostages, 9 who were sent to Chios, 2 who were taken away to be married to the daughters of the Genoese leaders, and 10 who were exiled from Cyprus for their part in Peter's murder. 3 It is at once apparent that most, though not all, of the names appear on both lists; in fact, Leontios Makhairas mentioned only 15 individuals not on Hugh's list, and Hugh mentioned 14 not on Leontios's list. An appreciation of the nature of these compilations is important for understanding the Genoese behaviour towards the Cypriot vassals. Hugh of Montoliff's list contained some significant anomalies

1. 'Nouvelles preuves', BÉC, xxxiv (1873), pp. 80-84.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 418, 422.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542. There are corruptions in the text and the translation as given by Dawkins requires modification. In the light of Hugh of Montoliff's list σιρ Λα Μπάμι (variant σιρ Γιλιάμι Πάμε) (p. 536 line 18) should be rendered as 'Sir Guy of La Baume' rather than 'Sir William de La Baume'; the word Τζασουλάν (p. 536 line 24) is a corruption of Guy Jassoulin; σιρε Χαμαρήν Τζάκ Τζακές Μουζέζαρτ (variant σιρε Χαμαρήν και σιρ Τζάκ Μουζέζαρτ (p. 536 lines 7-8) should be 'Sir Almery Isaac and Sir James Montgisard' rather than 'Sir Hamerlin and Sir James de Montgesart'; σιρε Γριμε Βλομούντες (variant της Λμοχούστου) (p. 536 lines 30-31) should be 'Sir Grime (Gilmont/Gremont ?) Viscount, of Famagusta' rather than 'Sir Grime the sheriff of Famagusta', and σιρ Φιλίππε τε Μουζέ (p. 536 line 15) should be 'Sir Philip Le Buffe' and not 'Sir Philip de Montoliff'. (Leontios's Αρολτ (Arnold) is normally rendered 'Raynald' in French and Latin sources.)
quite apart from the fact that he mistakenly called the marshal of Jerusalem, Thomas of Montolif, 'marechal de Chippre', 1 and the count of Tripoli, prince of Galilee. 2 James of Lusignan, who heads the list was certainly not imprisoned by the Genoese in Famagusta, 3 and the names of at least 4 knights who were, Philip of Arsour, Henry of Gibelet, John of Gaurelle and Leo of Lusignan, were omitted. These omissions can easily be explained as the first three were executed soon after their capture, and Leo of Lusignan arranged to ransom himself in order to claim his Armenian kingdom. 4 It would appear that this list consisted of the knights arrested in Famagusta, and was then altered to form in effect a list of the prisoners and exiles taken to Genoa. This explanation would account for the references to the squires taken to be married to Genoese, and for the fact that the names of the sons of the Prince of Antioch were added at the end, since we know that they were not surrendered as hostages until April 1374. 5 The name of James of Lusignan, the most distinguished prisoner, could have been interpolated, but what other alterations were made to the list cannot be known and so its accuracy as representing the captives at Famagusta or at Genoa is questionable. Leontios Makhairas’s lists similarly are not reliable: 63 men were named though he stated that the Genoese took 65

1. See below, pp. 442-3.
2. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p. 83.
3. He fell into Genoese hands on his departure from Cyprus in 1374. See Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 534-41, 544-5.
5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 529.
with them. Later, when listing the 17 participants in an escape-attempt from
Genoa, he included 7 men whom he had not previously mentioned as being taken
there; one of these, John Babin, may be identical with one of three men of
that name said to have gone to Chios, but John and two others, Guy of Mimars
and Raynald Viscount, were included on Hugh of Montoliff's list; of the other 10
who attempted to escape, 2, Philip of Soissons and Raymond Candoufle, were
said to have been exiles and not hostages. Leontios's list of prisoners in Genoa,
therefore, appears to be incomplete, and, in spite of his indication that they
were free men who take advantage of the Genoese shipping to leave the island,
it seems that those who had gone into exile were held there under restraint.
That the lists of prisoners are incomplete is further demonstrated by the fact
that John of Plessia, the one knight held in Genoa on whose behalf the pope
intervened, was not mentioned in any of them.2

It is probable that the majority of the knights taken as hostages to Genoa
were in effect prisoners of war, and that the indemnity for which they were
sureties was a form of ransom. Only the sons of the prince of Antioch were
definitely surrendered as hostages, and, as the case of Leo of Lusignan
illustrates, the Genoese were certainly thinking in terms of ransoming the
prisoners held at Famagusta. Those of the captive knights who were involved

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 543.
2. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 3063. It is
   possible that he was an ambassador from Peter II to Genoa and not a hostage;
   see op. cit., no. 3064.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 529.
in the murder of Peter I were no use as hostages since the Cypriot government had dispossessed them and would not allow them to stay in the island. But 9 out of the 10 listed by Leontios Makhairas as belonging in this category appeared on Hugh of Montolif's list, and it is possible that they were taken to Genoa and held pending ransom payments from their relatives; this would explain why some of them were involved in the escape-attempt, and would also explain the distinction made in the peace agreement of October 1374 between those knights held as sureties for the payment of the indemnity and those held at the will of the Genoese admiral. None of the knights sent to Chios appeared on Hugh's list, and it is likely that these men were either only taken at the end of the campaign, as for example Nicholas of Ibella who had been with James of Lusignan in Kyrenia, or had been held separately, as is possible in the case of John of Morf and Raymond Babin, who, as the betrayers of Famagusta, may have feared for their personal safety if left with the other prisoners.

The number of exiles and prisoners is difficult to calculate accurately. The 'Chronique d'Amadi' gives the total as 72 plus the two sons of the prince of Antioch and John and Thomas of Morf. Leontios Makhairas listed 63, not

1. See above, p.228.
2. Liber lurium, II, col. 810.
3. The exception is John Babin who may be the man of that name held in Genoa.
4. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 500. It is unlikely that the Arnold of Mimars who went to Genoa as a hostage and who is probably the Raynald of Mimars listed by Hugh of Montolif is the same as the Arnold of Mimars 'the Younger' mentioned with Nicholas at Kyrenia.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.475.
including James of Lusignan, and stated that the total was 65, but, as we have seen, he himself indicated there were others, and on the basis of his testimony the total can be made up to 71. There remains the problem of those 14 on Hugh of Montolif’s list not included on Leontios’s: Leontios accounted for James of Lusignan, and for Guy of Mirmars, John Babin and Raynald Viscount, and Janot of Soissons’s presence in Genoa is independently attested; there is evidence that Bartholomew of Montolif was in Genoa in 1383, but he was not necessarily held there by the authorities. The other eight cannot be accounted for. Probably the aggregate total of the prisoners, hostages and exiles amounted to approximately 75. Some idea of the proportion of the Cypriot knightly class this figure represented can be gained by comparing it with the list given by Leontios Makhairas of knights who remained in Cyprus after 1374.

2. 63 + James of Lusignan + 7 in the escape plot who were not previously mentioned.
3. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 548.
5. Sperone, Real Grandeza, p.137.
6. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 563. The following emendations to Dawkin’s translation should be made: for ‘Parek’ (Παλέκ p.558 line 19) read ‘Barech’ (see Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.191); for ‘James Tsappo’ (Τζάκος Τζάπος line 29) read ‘James Chappe’; for ‘Sir Andrew Lengo’ (σίρ Λάντρε Λέγκος line 30) read ‘Sir Andrew L’Engles’.
7. Bartholomew Μάχε (line 28) and Thomas Μάχε (line 29) are probably members of the Mahé (and not Machaut) family; σίρ Λάντρε τα Παριέ, σίρ Νικόλα τα Παπιέ (lines 31-2) are probably Andrew and Nicholas ‘Thabarie’, i.e. Tiberias; it is possible that John Beduin τ’ Λάδσου λρδριτ (lines 32-3) should be construed as ‘John Beduin (the son) of Alice "Ardret"’. 

---

---

---
48 knights are named before the list led into a piece of family history which as Dawkins has shown concerned Leontios's own relatives. This list, however, is by no means complete; for example, of the 5 Cypriot witnesses to the treaty with Genoa of October 1374, Paul Le Buffé, Thomas Barech, Paul of Bon, and Robert 'Moscazoso', only Thomas Barech is included. Among other knights in Cyprus after the departure of the Genoese were Thibaut Belfarage, John of Alarou (or Laron), and Giacomo di San Michele and the others mentioned in the account of the murder of the prince of Antioch.

It is impossible to assess how many other knights were left in Cyprus who were omitted from the list. In 1368 there were about 50 individuals holding fiefs in land in the Limassol diocese, probably the smallest in area of the four dioceses in the island. This figure would seem to indicate that the total number of

1. Dawkins identified the steward as Nicholas Bill. Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.192. John of Pino appears twice on the list, but possibly there were two men of the same name.

2. Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.192.

3. Liber iurium, ii, col. 814.

4. See above, p.190.

5. Captain of Adalia in 1364. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 150.


7. See above, pp.223-30.


knights in Cyprus was far in excess of the figure of about 130 obtained by adding Leontios's 48 knights left in Cyprus to the 75-odd taken into exile, but the knights taken by the Genoese could account for as much as half the total feudal knighthood and probably at least a quarter - in any case a substantial proportion.

In the years immediately after the war the pope interceded with the Genoese on the knights' behalf. As early as August 1374 he expressed his fears for the safety of the Cypriots taken to Genoa, and early in 1375 he supported Thibaut Belfarage in his attempts to make peace and secure their freedom. Two further papal letters survive from later in 1375 in which Pope Gregory tried to induce the Genoese to free the knights. But despite the efforts of the pope and the Cypriot ambassadors, it is not possible to demonstrate conclusively that any of the captive knights returned before the death of Peter II in 1382.

From Leontios Makhairas's account it would appear that the last of the knights in Genoa did not return to Cyprus until April 1385, but perhaps as many as

1. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2801, see no. 2800.
2. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 3109. See above, p. 229-30.
3. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 3275 (see no. 3276), 3659.
4. From the account of the escape-attempt, it would appear that some knights were freed earlier, though the date of this episode is not know. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 548.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 613-14.
five members of the council of regency set up in 1382 had been in Genoa. 1

A large number of the Cypriot feudatories were still there in 1383; for in that year James I 'in presentia multorum suorum hominum ligiorum' witnessed a marriage contract, 2 and 27 witnessed the settlement by which James was allowed to return to Cyprus. 3 How many of the prisoners actually returned is unknown; apart from James I, only 12 of the exiles can be shown to have gone back to the island. 4 It is consequently hard to see how many died in the West or chose to remain there, but it is clear that a substantial proportion of the knights remained in prison for almost ten years.

There is no question that it was the older Cypriot knightly families which provided the overwhelming majority of the captives. By taking the aggregate of the knights listed by Leontios Makhairas and Hugh of Montolif, we find that out

1. Leontios Makhairas, l, para. 599. The five are Guy of La Baume, Perrot and Wilmot of Montolif, Almery of Plessia and Thomas of Morf. Guy of La Baume, Perrot of Montolif, and Almery of Plessia are listed by Hugh of Montolif. Guy of La Baume and Almery of Plessia, together with a Peter of Montolif are listed by Leontios Makhairas as hostages. Thomas of Morf and William of Montolif 'the Younger' were called exiles. For Guy of La Baume, see above, p. 234 note 3. For Perrot and Wilmot, see Leontios Makhairas, l, para. 605.


4. Apart from the former exiles on the council of regency (see above, note 1) there were the two sons of the prince of Antioch, Peter of Cafran, Peter of Floury, William of Four, Raynal of Mimars, James of Montgisard and Raynal of Solissons. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp. 413, 415, 420, 421, 423, 428; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, pp. 219, 257; Demetrios Cydones, Correspondance, i, p. 192; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 613, 619-20. For Peter of Cafran, see also Darrouzès, 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Chypre' (1953), p. 89.
of a total of 81, 3, James, later James I, James, count of Tripoli, and John, later lord of Beirut, were members of the royal family; 61 (76%) were members of families which had appeared in Cyprus before 1310, \(^1\) and only 17 (21%) were members of families not known in the island before that date.

Several of these 17, for example, Andrew, Baldwin and Guy of La Colée, \(^2\) Francis Carmardas, \(^3\) Thomas Armar, \(^4\) Raymond L'Engles, \(^5\) Thomas of Bon, \(^6\) and John of Salazins, \(^7\) belonged to families which had certainly become well

1. These families are: Aretia, L'Ayzé, Babin (5), La Baume, Le Buffle (2), Cafran, Chappe, Concèes, Costa, Floury, Four, Gauvelle, Gibelet, Ibelin, Isaq, Malembec, Mimaros (6), Le Moine, Montgisard (2), Montolif (10), Morf (2), Nefin, Nores (3), Novara, L'Oliva, Le Petit, Plessia, Quevides, Rouslan, Soissons (4), Viscount (5). (Numbers in brackets give the number of members of each family listed if more than one.)

2. The La Colée family first appears as Cypriot knights in the sources for the reign of Peter I. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp. 91, 100; Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 151-2, 220, 285, 317-18, 361, 362. It is likely that they were descended from a Tripolitanian family of this name. See Reg. Hier., nos. 270, 1327, 1467; Richard, 'Le comte de Tripoli dans les chartes du fonds des Porcellet', pp. 368, 375, 377, 382. See also Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 91 note 5.


5. For the tomb stones of the wives of Simon L'Engles (died 1331) and of Peter L'Engles (died 1348), see Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicossienses, pp. 53, 79.

6. The 'de Bon' or 'Le Bon' family is known in Cyprus from 1320. John XXII, Lettres communées, no. 11446. See also, Richard, 'Un évêque', p. 113; Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p. 91; John of Ibelin, p. 6; Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 150, 221-2. There was also a burgess family of this name. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 154.

established in Cyprus by the 1370's.\(^1\) By making a similar analysis of
Leontios Makhairas's list of the 48 knights left in Cyprus in 1374, we find that
effectively 50% were members of families resident in the island before 1310,\(^2\)
and only six others, John Gorap,\(^3\) Aimery, John and Thomas of La Golée,
Andrew L'Engles and Peter of Bon were members of families definitely
established in Cyprus before the 1370's.\(^4\) Most of the other knights who were
not listed by Leontios, but who are known to have been in Cyprus after 1374
were not members of the older noble families.\(^5\)

It is clear that proportionately the long established families were hardest
hit by the exile, and this undoubtedly reflects the composition of the party of the
prince of Antioch. Some individual families may have lost all their adult male

---

1. The others were William of Beves, Raymond Candoulfe, Guy Jassoulin,
   Raynald of Lesigny, Peter, Henry and John Limnat, Guy Poret and the son
   of Philip Provosto. This is the earliest surviving reference to a member of
   the Provosto family in Cyprus.

2. This includes the doubtful examples of the two Peter of Finios (perhaps
   members of the same family as a mercenary knight, Peter 'Fignon',
   mentioned in the account of 1308. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.263), John Poitiers
   (perhaps related to a John 'Potier' mentioned in 1310; 'Chronique d'Amadi',
   pp.387, 388, 391), and Peter Pisano (for Stephen Pisano mentioned in 1308,
   see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.264). The other families are Acrolissa,
   Antlaume, Antloch, L'Ayze, Babin (2), La Baume, Beduin (3), Brie, Chappe
   Four, Neuville, Le Petit, Soissons, Tiberias (2), Verny and Villiers.

3. The earliest known member of the family is mentioned in a document of 1350.
   See Richard, 'Un évêque', p.116 note 5.

4. The other knights are Thomas Barech, Nicholas Bill, William of Charny,
   John Lascaris, Bartholomew and Thomas Mahé, George Monomachos,
   Nicholas Mora, John of Pie, John Ponous, John Poret, John and Thomas
   Provosto, Daniel of Scolar, Nicholas, Richard and 'N' Sunda and Balian of
   La Ville.

5. See above, p.239.
members for the remaining years of Peter II's reign, but the long-term effects of the exile are difficult to appreciate. There is no positive evidence that the war and the exile resulted in an unusually high mortality rate among the nobility, nor in an abnormally large number of noble houses dying out in the male line, though the last known reference to any member of the Ibelin family is to be found in the lists of exiles in 1374. The Cypriot nobility was affected by the war financially, and in the aftermath many of its leading members were away from the island during a critical period in its history.

The apparent effects of the Genoese war on the Cypriot nobility was partly offset by the fact that James I seems to have favoured his former fellow-exiles. We have seen that the older families held a predominant position on the council of regency and that several of its members had themselves been among the prisoners in Genoa. The regency council under John of Briata ruled for almost three years, and apart from a division of opinion within it over the succession to the throne, there is no indication that there was any break-down of governmental control during that period. Before his return, James offered estates to his supporters to secure his accession, and after his accession he revoked the grants made by Peter II before his twenty-fifth birthday, the period of the ascendancy of Queen Eleanor, and promised the knights that he

1. See above, pp. 231, 240-41.
2. See below, pp. 371-2.
3. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 609.
would give them the villages which King Peter took away from them for their treason in killing his father'.

James's grants of lands were listed by Leontios Makhairas and the 'Chronique d'Amadi', of the 9 vassals singled out for reward, John of Brie, John of Neuville, Hugh and Guy of La Baume and John Gorap, had served on the council of regency, and Peter of Caffran, Guy of La Baume, Raynald of Mimars and John Babin, had shared in the exile in Genoa. Raynald of Mimiars and Hugh of La Baume had participated in the moves to have James accepted as king, John Babin had had charge of James's son, Janus, who was left in Genoa as a hostage, and Peter of Caffran was an ambassador to Genoa in 1387 and again in 1390-1391 when he negotiated Janus's release. The date of these grants is not clear; the narratives


2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 620; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494. Both lists stem from a common original and neither are free from corruption. Generally I prefer the list given by the 'Chronique d'Amadi' where the two diverge, but Hugh of La Baume was probably constable of Jerusalem and not constable of Cyprus (see below, pp. 440-41), John of Neuville was lord of Arsour and not lord of Caesarea and the title of 'lord of Caesarea' was in fact given to John Gorap. See above, p. 22.

3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 599.

4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542. For Guy of La Baume, see above, R.234 note 1. For John Babin, see above, p.236.

5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 609; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.492.


8. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.420-23; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 619. For the date of his departure in 1390, see Darrouzès, 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Chypre' (1953), p.89. See also Délibérations des assemblées véantiennes, no. 917.
place them immediately after the arrival of Janus in Cyprus in 1392, but as Leontios Makhairas indicated that the grants were rewards for the knights’ recognition of James as king, it is likely that they were made at the time of his coronation in 1385, especially since Peter of Caffran who is said by the 'Chronique d'Amadi' to have been made admiral at the same time was certainly enjoying that office by 1387. Of the 9 beneficiaries, only John Sozomenos is virtually unknown, and only he and John Gorap were not members of families known to have been established in Cyprus in the thirteenth century.

The pattern of royal rewards for supporters who were members of the older noble families is even more clearly demonstrated by the grants of titular lordships and grand sergeancies. King James revived at least five titles for members of the nobility as well as creating his son prince of Antioch and his nephew lord of Beirut, but as far as is known these titles had no more than an honorary significance. It is possible that James also appointed men as seneschal, constable, marshal, chamberlain and butler for the kingdoms of Jerusalem, Cyprus, and, in about 1394, Armenia, though only six of his

---

2. For another reference to this, see Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 563.
3. See above, pp. 19, 22.
appointees are known. Of the 11 knights honoured in this way, 8, John of Brie, prince of Galilee, John of Neuville, lord of Arsour, Montolif of Verny, lord of Sidon, 2 Raynald of Mifmars, marshal of Cyprus, Hugh of La Baume, constable of Jerusalem, Guy of La Baume, marshal of Jerusalem, John of Tiberias, marshal of Armenia, and John Babin, chamberlain of Armenia, 3 were members of old families, leaving only John Gorap, lord of Caesarea, Renier of Scolar, lord of Bethsan, and Hodrade Provane, chamberlain of Cyprus, 4 who were not. Almost all had had distinguished careers. John of Brie, a veteran of Peter I's campaigns, had been turcopolier and had headed the council of regency; 5 5 others, John of Neuville, John Gorap, Renier of Scolar and Hugh and Guy of La Baume, had served under him on the council, 6 and of these, John of Neuville had been a viscount of Nicosia, 7 and John Gorap auditor. 8

1. For a full discussion of the grand sergeancies, see below, pp. 392-18. It is likely that some of the other offices were held by men who had survived from the previous reign; for example, Raymond Babin, butler of Cyprus, and Leo of Lusignan, seneschal of Jerusalem. See below, pp. 434, 436-7.

2. See above, p. 22.


4. See above, p. 22; below, p. 432.


7. See above, p. 231.

Raynald of Mimars, Guy of La Baume and John Babin had been exiles,¹ and Montolif of Verny was one of two knights whose expulsion from Cyprus was demanded by the Genoese, presumably for his close association with James during the war.² John of Tiberias and Renier of Solar had been sent as ambassadors to Genoa in 1386,³ and Renier subsequently became bailli of the secréte.⁴

Though it is clear that James I honoured his supporters, and in particular members of some of the older noble houses, with titular lordships and grand sergeancies, it is not known what the value of such grants would have been, and it is possible that these grants were more a matter of prestige than of financial reward. None of the newly created titular lords appear to have transmitted their titles to their descendants, and this suggests that either the grants were for life only or that James deliberately chose to honour in this way those of his followers who had no heirs of their bodies.⁵ The grand sergeancies were not heritable;

1. See above, p. 245.
4. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p. 420. As Renier is given the title of lord of Bethsan and bailli of the secréte in 1390 but not in the documents relating to the Genoese embassy, it is to be assumed that he did not receive his lordship and office until after his return from Genoa. Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 599) names him as bailli in his list of members of the regency council, but he is probably using the designation retrospectively, since in 1383 that office was held by Thomas of Montolif. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p. 396.
5. From the absence of any mention of his heirs in his grants to Nicosia cathedral in 1383 and 1391, it might be assumed that John of Brie had no children. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp. 396-400. I have found no reference to any member of the Brie, Gorap or Solar families in the fifteenth century, and though branches of the Neuville and Verny families survived, no member appears to have held a titular lordship.
though it is possible that James tried to limit his honours by giving
sergeanties to those with heirs and lordships to those without heirs, this
cannot be proved.

By surrounding himself with vassals to whom he had given titles and
honours, James was doubtlessly trying to re-invigorate the nobility after the
crisis of the 1370's, but he was not concerned merely to achieve a restoration
of the pre-1373 noble society. Burgess families were advanced also. Leontios
Makhairas recorded that James employed the sons of burgesses as his squires
in preference to the sons of knights.¹ A secrété official and burgess, Nicholas
Busat, was given a large annuity;² In the fifteenth century the Busats were to
rise to the nobility and inter-marry with the family of the counts of Jaffa.³

How common such promotion was is uncertain, but Thomas Baroch, a member
of the regency council, was a Greek convert who had been knighted,⁴ and
possibly John Sozomenos, who was given a fief by King James and was related
by marriage to the Bill family⁵ had a similar background. Leontios Makhairas
himself was a member of a Greek burgess family which with the Bills, Pissologos
and Busat families, to name only a few, formed a class of administrators and

¹. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 97.
³. For the family see, Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp.127-8.
⁴. See above, pp.11-12.
⁵. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 563. The Makhairas family which was
certainly Orthodox was also related to the Bills. Leontios Makhairas, I,
para. 633.
royal servants from which any Cypriot non-noble who managed to enter noble society would most likely have been drawn. ¹

James's task was to repair the damage suffered by Cyprus and Cypriot society as a result of the exertions of the 1360's and the disasters of the 1370's. To build up a nobility which would serve him well and form a fitting entourage was only part of his programme. From his accession until the mid-1390's he tried by peaceful means to obtain more favourable terms from the Genoese and pay off the indemnity; in this he was largely successful and his achievement was crowned by the release of his son Janus who arrived in Cyprus in 1392.² After Janus's release, James seems to have changed his policy:

John of Lusignan, lord of Beirut, was sent to the West to try to secure the support of Venice and France and also of the Avignon papacy to which Cyprus now transferred its allegiance, having previously, like Genoa, supported the Roman pope.³ Meanwhile in Cyprus James may have been involved in intrigues for the recovery of Famagusta, the first sign of any offensive act since the reign of Peter II.⁴ Under King Janus the Cypriots made more sustained efforts to recapture the city.⁵ Whether paying the indemnity or engaging in warfare and

---

1. For these families, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 110, 366-7, 456, 475, 495, 499, 566, 612.
2. For a discussion of the various agreements, see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.433-8.
3. For John's mission, see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.442-3, 444; Richard, 'Le royaume de Chypre et le grand schisme', passim.
4. The incident is obscure. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 626.
5. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.448-60 passim.
diplomacy, James needed money, and this he raised by taxation from which the nobility were not exempt. The nobility had to share in the cost of reconstruction, and it is clear that some of its members benefited from the results. How the lesser members and those who did not enjoy royal patronage reacted to the economic conditions can only be guessed, but behind the titles and honours at the Cypriot royal court, it is likely that crown and nobility were much poorer than before.

This attempt to survey the history of the Cypriot nobility and to examine its importance in the political developments of the kingdom of Cyprus has perhaps posed more problems than it has solved. It is easy to say that the fall of Acre, the Black Death or the Genoese war had profound repercussions on the ruling class; it is quite another matter to get behind the superficial manifestations of these traumas to see their impact. Similarly it is not hard to detect the existence of a system of clientage within the ruling class, but how permanent the groupings, how powerful, how widespread and whether they changed much in character over the period of two centuries remain problems. The interrelation between the new and old families is another potentially major issue which cannot be ignored but which may be exaggerated. The problems lie partly in the nature and distribution of the source materials - abundant for some periods

1. Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 618, 621-3, 625. The taxes appear to have been a property tax of 4%, a poll tax and a salt tax. In 1393 James remitted the property tax for the vassals, but it is not clear whether he halved it to 2% or reduced it from 2% to nothing. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 623.
and sparse for others - giving tantalising glimpses of features which may or
may not have been common, and failing to provide concrete evidence of changes
in the wealth and power of the nobility as a whole or of individual noble
families.

But the nobility did show remarkable consistency and resilience. From
the time of the settlement, through the civil war of 1228–1233, the destruction
of the mainland crusader states and the crisis of the early fourteenth century,
the nobility seems to have been essentially buoyant. Even after the difficulties
of the third quarter of the fourteenth century, in many instances the same
families survived as prominent elements in feudal society; examples include
the Brie, La Baume and Mimars families which originally came to Cyprus at
or soon after the settlement at the end of the twelfth century. But noble
society was constantly changing - houses rose and died out, new men entered,
individuals distinguished themselves. The nobility was a necessary part of
society and survived the various upheavals with remarkably little change until
well into the fifteenth century.
FEUDAL LAW AND NOBLE RESPONSIBILITY

1. Philip of Bosra, *De vita*, pp. 426, 427. For a similar classification in the ninth century, see the *Service militarum*, etc. For a description of the military fields in Cyprus and Crete, see the works of...

2. His relationship with the court's espionage network is also significant. See Philip of Majo, *De vita*, pp. 426, 427.

3. For a Cypriot case cited as a precedent in the contemporary disputes between King Richard and Thomas of England in *suo sibi* (1213), see *De vita*, pp. 426, 427. It is clear that...

regard this precedent did not have the effect of an appeal of civil cases from Cyprus, even for...

II
Chapter 1

THE FEUDAL OATH

We have seen that the nobles played a major role in the history and development of Cyprus during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Their importance arose partly from their military capacity and wealth, and partly from their special relationship with the crown, which ensured that they would be the leaders of society. They were the royal vassals, linked to the king by a contractual oath of vassalage, and from among them were drawn the landowners and royal counsellors.

Near the beginning of his treatise, Philip of Novara stated a principle which underlay Cypriot feudal law:

... one is bound in Cyprus to hold to the usages and the assises of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.¹

It followed that Jerusalemite precedents could be cited in the Cypriot courts² and vice versa.³ But Jerusalemite institutions did not necessarily suit

¹ Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.478, see p.523. See Geoffrey Le Tor, p.444; 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.404, 406; 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.428. For a difference in the rules of inheritance of fiefs in Cyprus and Jerusalem, see below, p.380.

² But only with the court's express permission in the absence of Cypriot precedents. See Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.524.

³ For a Cypriot case used as a precedent in Jerusalem, see the account of the dispute between Oste Beduin and Thomas of Malandre. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.404, 406, 408. It was objected (p.406) that as an esgard this precedent did not have the force of an assise, but the principle of citing cases from Cyprus was not questioned.
Cypriot circumstances. For example, there were no castles held as fiefs and no lords with rights of high justice, and so regulations governing such aspects were not applicable. In Jerusalem feudal convention had taken shape against a background of endemic warfare; in Cyprus military necessity was not so acute, and it is probable that had feudal law developed independently in the early years of Latin rule, there might not have been the same insistence on the military function of the fief. It has been said that 'Palestinian feudalism was in fact inappropriate...', and in the sense that feudalism was superfluous in a society with a developed money-economy and a highly organised bureaucracy this is equally true of Cyprus. But just as the settlers from the West had introduced notions of vassalage into an alien environment after the First Crusade because to them vassalage was the normal method of organising society, so the settlers from Syria introduced into Cyprus the same concepts for the same reasons. It should not surprise us that the Cypriot settlers retained the principles which bound them together and ordered their relations among themselves. But vassalage applied only to the fief-holding, knightly class; except in as much as it determined who their landlords were, the peasantry were unaffected.

The legal writers of the third quarter of the thirteenth century were sufficiently unanimous in their descriptions of feudal law as to give the impression at first sight that the conventions were long-established and immutable. But these conventions were subject to modification; in his prologue,

---

1. See above, pp.14-16.

2. See above, pp.2-10.

3. Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.4.
John of Jaffa gave an account of the tradition that the rulers of Jerusalem were constantly asking pilgrims and crusaders for information on western practices with a view to improving Jerusalemite customs,¹ and as late as 1171 there was an example of a custom being changed on the advice of a French lord.² Philip of Novara gave some invaluable examples of changing practices: it was not until after the Ibelin-Longobard war that children of traitors born before their father's treachery lost their rights to their patrimony,³ and the lord of Sidon was recorded as explaining that the action following a breach of service de mariage was once much different.⁴ On a number of occasions Philip expressed his uncertainty on particular points of custom and told how other prominent jurists had disagreed with one another.⁵ During the second half of the thirteenth century there seems to have been some confusion among the jurists over the continuing influence of French law on that of Jerusalem,⁶ but the extent to which non-Jerusalemite practices affected the feudal law of Cyprus and Jerusalem after the closing decades of the twelfth century was probably small.

Cypriot feudal custom was in essence the law as practised in Jerusalem, and

1. John of Ibelin, pp.24-5.
2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.15.
5. For example, Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.494, 499, 538, 539-40, 541, 559-60.
6. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.140.
from the time of the settlement appears to have developed parallel to it. 1

The feudal law of Cyprus and indeed of all parts of Christendom in which feudalism took a hold had two aspects: it was the law of the fief, the customs governing conditions of tenure and rules of succession to the beneficium, whether in land, kind or cash, and it governed the system of contractual relationships between the lord and vassal whereby the parties entered into agreements for their mutual benefit with promises to safeguard one another's rights. Because the king was himself frequently a party to such agreements, the relationship was more than just that of landlord and tenant; it concerned royal government and the constitutional framework of the kingdom. The contract was never the sole basis of royal authority, for the crown exercised considerable prerogative rights outside the system of vassalage, but feudal law was an important element in both land law and constitutional law, and the two were closely interconnected.

At the centre of the feudal contract lay the ceremony of homage, the formal act which initiated and gave sanction to that contract. Consequent on that ceremony were the duties of the vassal to serve and support his lord and the duties of the lord to protect and provide for his man. But to the jurists of the thirteenth century the possession of a fief did not follow from the performance of homage; homage followed from the possession of a fief. As

1. Grandclaude (Étude critique, pp.114-18) argued that until 1232 the Cypriots had their own customs which were distinct from those on the mainland; the evidence adduced to support this contention does not bear examination.
Ralf of Tiberias was reported to have said "'l'omage est pour le fief', and he added that just as, under certain circumstances, a man could renounce his fief, so he could renounce the faith that was owed for it.¹ The importance of the fief was brought out in the wording of the ceremony of homage preserved in the legal treatises. As given by John of Ibelin, it began, '"Sire, je deviens vostre home lige de tel fief ..."';² Hugh III put this even more clearly: his paraphrase of the act of enfeoffment ran, '"Je te doñas tel chose en fie por le service de ton cors," ou" de tant de chevaliers, et por lige hommage."³

Geoffrey Le Tor, however, in what was probably the earlier of the two commentaries on feudal law attributed to him, gave a formula for homage which contains no reference to the tenure of a fief.⁴ Unfortunately this treatise cannot be dated precisely, but as it is probably older than any other except the 'Livre au Roï', his form of the wording could indicate that the concept of the fief as the pre-requisite of homage in the ceremony itself was of recent origin in the 1260's when John of Ibelin was writing. But the act of homage and the tenure of a fief were inseparably linked; for example, the recollection that homage had been received by a lord from a man for a particular fief was one form of

---

2. John of Ibelin, p.313. Similarly James of Ibelin (p.454), where the form of the oath to be administered is: '"Tu fais lige homage a mon seignor le rei, por le fief que tu as et tiens, lequel tu dois tenir de lui..."'.
record of court which could be invoked when seisin was disputed.  

Closely associated with the concept of homage by which the man made himself the vassal of his lord was the concept of fealty by which he swore to support his lord. Geoffrey Le Tor, John of Jaffa and James of Ibelin all seem to indicate that fealty was sworn not separately but as part of the ceremony of homage. Alone among the jurists, James of Ibelin described a separate oath of fealty which the liege men could be called upon to swear, promising to protect the person of the king and his lands. The formulary dating from the first half of the reign of Hugh IV gave no example of the act of homage, but provided two specimen oaths of fealty: the first, which was evidently the more usual form, began by repeating the oath as given by James of Ibelin and then continued by adding the requirements to swear to keep the secrets of the court, to serve in Syria for three months and to maintain the laws and customs. The specified military service is extraordinary; almost certainly the clause had its origins in the dispute over military services of 1270-1273 which eventually ended with the agreement that the vassals were liable for four (and not three) months service in Syria. That such a specified requirement of military service should be included in an oath of fealty is perhaps without parallel, and it is omitted from the other form of the oath included in

3. It is possible that the first of these two forms is Hugh's, and that the second is that of the jurist James of Ibelin. The formulary from which it is taken, 'Formules', p.385

4. See below, p.268.
the collection. But it is not clear whether the presence of references to separate oaths of fealty in these two comparatively late sources, the one dating from the mid-1270's and the other from c. 1330, and their absence from earlier sources should be seen as evidence that separate oaths of fealty developed towards the end of the thirteenth century.

The ceremony of homage, with the man kneeling before his lord, had expressed the personal subordination of the vassal. But by stressing the idea that homage was conditional on the possession of a fief, the jurists reduced the personal aspect of the ceremony as the man no longer appeared dependent on the lord's generosity but was merely going through a formality to add title to seisin. Even so the kings could and did appeal to their vassals for support on the strength of the oath: in 1310, at the time of his arrest before being sent into exile, Henry II is said to have called upon his men by the fealty (la fede)

1. 'Formules', p.386. This formula was for the procurator of Walter of Brienne to swear fealty. Walter is not known to have visited Cyprus in person and so it is possible that the oath had been modified to exclude a requirement which he could not reasonably be expected to fulfil.

2. The only evidence apart from that of the law books which I have found that separate oaths were sworn to the Cypriot king dates from 1310 when Amaury of Tyre proposed that, 'nobiles et incole dicti regni Cipri facerent sibi homagium et fidellitatis pretarant sibi juramentum, et in sola fidellitate teneantur dicto regi'. Perrat, 'Un diplomate gascon', p.70.

3. It is possible that the form of homage stressing the importance of the fief developed at a time of monarchical weakness in both Jerusalem and Cyprus (1220's - 1260's) and that the separate oath of fealty was a product of the return to strong monarchy under Hugh III. If this is true, it is likely that Hugh was deliberately trying to restore the emphasis on royal superiority, not by reverting to an earlier form of homage, but by introducing the oath, possibly under western influence.
which they owed and by the homage (homagio) which they had performed to protect him.¹

Not all fiefs in Cyprus were held directly from the king. The extent to which subinfeudation was practised is difficult to assess, though John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, was said to have divided his lands among his sons on his death bed with the provision that the younger sons were to hold their fiefs from their eldest brother.² If his wishes were observed presumably some of the leading vassals in Cyprus would not have held their fiefs directly from the king. There were important limitations on the extent to which fiefs could be alienated by subinfeudation,³ and there is good evidence that lords who wished to develop an armed following did not necessarily use fiefs to buy support.⁴ The relationship between a tenant-in-chief and his vassal was the same in theory as that between the king and the tenant-in-chief, with the important qualification that as a result of the Assise sur la liæce the rear vassal was required to perform homage to the king, a requirement which had the consequence of giving him direct access to the High Court.⁵ As no Cypriot vassal could authenticate his own subinfeudations,⁶ all grants to rear vassals had to be made

¹ 'Chronique d'Amadl', p.319, see p.322.
² 'Gestes', p.225. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.15. When fiefs were partitioned among heiresses, the younger sisters held from the eldest.
³ See above, pp.2-3.
⁴ See above, pp.33-4.
⁵ See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.34-3.
⁶ See above, p.16.
before the High Court. As Hugh IV told the Genoese in 1338,

... the fiefs which are given by my liege men to those who should be their sub-vassals should be given according to usage before the king and the court by someone who has enough service in his fief that he can give it and otherwise the gift that has been made is invalid; ... 1

Homage was performed in three circumstances: when a fief was newly granted, when a man entered a fief he had inherited, and at the accession of a king or lord to whom homage was owed. When the fief was newly granted, homage followed immediately; 2 the son or daughter of a fief-holder who had died could enter the father's fief without reference to the High Court if he or she was of age, 3 but a minor on coming of age 4 had to apply in the Court;

In these cases homage had to be performed within a year and a day; 5 tenants-in-chief were allowed a delay of up to forty days at the accession of a king or a regent, 6 though rear vassals had a year and a day in which to perform liege homage. 7 A new king had to swear two oaths, one at his

2. 'Formules', p.387. See Locational Makharas's description (i, para. 131) of the granting of fiefs to Hugh of Lusignan in 1362.
5. Geoffrey Le Tor, p.437; John of Ibelin, p.305.
6. For homage owed to regents, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.187. Alice of Champagne (1218) and John, prince of Antioch, (1369) are known to have received homage. 'Tracles', ii, p.360 (ms. 'A'); 'Gestes', p.670; John of Ibelin, p.5. Information is lacking for the minorities of Hugh I and Hugh II.
7. Geoffrey Le Tor, pp.437-8; James of Ibelin, p.455.
coronation, and another in the High Court in which he swore among other things that he would uphold the 'bons us et les boas costumes et les assises' of the kingdom, guarantee the gifts and privileges accorded by his ancestors and see to it that if any dispute arose concerning these gifts or privileges they would be determined by 'l'esgant ou la connaissance de sa court'. Only then did the vassals do homage.

A lord was obliged to accept homage under normal circumstances, but, as James of Ibelin explained, if homage was properly offered and no reason for the refusal given, after a year and a day the vassal was no longer under an obligation to perform homage or services, and at the same time he did not lose his privileges as a liegeman. The only recorded example of a king refusing homage dates from 1309 when Henry II did so apparently out of spite for his brother. It appears that he objected to the dispositions in feudal matters arranged by Amaury whereby the homage was owed, and so by refusing to accept it he was presumably placing the validity of the arrangements in doubt.

The act of homage was an essentially personal bond owed for all fiefs

---


3. For this procedure at the accession of Hugh IV in 1324, the appointment of the prince of Antioch as regent in 1369 and the coming of age of Peter II in 1372, see 'Documents relatives à la successibilité', p.422; John of Ibelin, p.5; Leontios Makhiras, 1, para. 323.

4. James of Ibelin, p.455.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.302.
and feudal rights including wardship and dower.\(^1\) Because of its personal nature, there was a reluctance to allow homage to be performed by a deputy,\(^2\) though Walter of Brienne seems to have sworn fealty by proxy in the time of Hugh IV,\(^3\) and the pope requested that Philip of Mézières be allowed to perform homage by deputy in 1372.\(^4\) Though the jurists stressed the necessity for the possession of a fief before homage was performed, homage was the legal bond from which the privileges and obligations of the vassal and the feudal rights and limitations of the lord flowed.

---

2. Homage by proxy to the crown was not allowed in France until the fifteenth century. See Bloch, *Feudal Society*, p. 147.
3. 'Formules', p. 386.
4. Gregory XI, *Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France*, nos. 802-3. It is not known whether his request was granted. Possibly Marie of Bourbon performed homage by proxy for her dower in 1369 and 1372. See Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, II, p. 425.
Chapter 2

FEUDAL OBLIGATIONS

The feudal bond which linked the king or the lord and the fief-holder was a contract which demanded of the latter both specified and unspecified services. It was normal for a fief to be burdened with military service comprising one or more knights or mounted sergeants or a combination of the two. Evidence in Cyprus for non-military feudal sergeancies is slender. There is no indication that the offices of the seigneurial servants were feudalised as for example in the lordship of Arsuf on the mainland. The grand sergeancies were presumably held in return for homage with the office of marshal being held from the constable and not directly from the crown. Otherwise the only known example of a fief for which services of a non-military nature were owed was Isabella of Lusignan's estate of Aradhippou. There the service in 1371 consisted of the annual provision of a falcon. Probably the service had been agreed at the time Isabella, a non-resident whose husband, the Despot of the Morea, would presumably not have agreed to perform service de corps, was given the fief. How widespread this form of tenure was must remain unknown.

1. See above, pp. 2-7.
2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp. 4-5.
3. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p. 5. For the grant sergeancies, see below, pp. 302-18.
4. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 87.
Knights could be called upon to perform a variety of services which are usually grouped by historians under the headings of auxilium and consilium. Auxilium included military obligations, and, for heiresses and widows, service de mariage; consilium included not merely advising the king, but all the duties necessary for making the High Court function. John of Jaffa headed his list of feudal obligations with military service; the precise obligation varied according to the conditions attached to the particular fief, but it would appear that service could last for up to a year within the kingdom. John lists only three circumstances in which knights could be expected to serve outside the kingdom:

... one is for the marriage of (the lord) or of any of his children; the second to guard and defend his honour and faith; the third for the evident need of his lordship or the common profit of his land.

There is no known example of a king summoning his vassal to attend his marriage or that of a member of the royal family outside Cyprus; the wording of the other two circumstances in which services could be owed abroad is vague and open to extremely wide application.

It need not be supposed that lords habitually insisted on the maximum possible service from their men, but not unnaturally the vassals were concerned to minimize their more onerous obligations. In 1271, a few years after John of Jaffa described the circumstances in which vassals could serve outside the

1. For service de mariage, see below, pp.293-7.
2. For consilium, see below, pp.278-89.
Kingdom of Jerusalem, Hugh III and his knights had a major dispute on that
issue. Hugh had made heavy demands on his men: In 1265 and 1266 he
brought large forces from Cyprus to Acre; possibly he brought another
expedition in 1268 when he was again in Acre, apparently with the intention of
making a truce with Balbaris; in 1269 he was on the mainland for his
coronation as king of Jerusalem, and probably would have expected his Cypriot
knights to accompany him. Though it seems that there was no Cypriot
expedition to Palestine in 1270, in 1271 the vassals objected to serving there,
possibly in view of the abortive Mamluke raid on Limassol in that year. The
dispute over military obligations came to a head about August 1271. The
Lord Edward who at that time was in the East on his crusade was appealed to
as an independent adjudicator and the transcripts of Hugh's speech and the reply
by James of Ibelin on behalf of the Cypriots have been preserved. Edward's
role is unclear: it has been suggested that he was asked to give an opinion
which would be binding on the parties in the short term and which would influence

1. 'Eracles', ii, pp.450, 455; 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.452; 'Gestes',
   pp.759, 766.
2. 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.458; Ibn al-Furât, Ayyubids, Mamlukes and
   Crusaders: Selections from the Tārīkh al-Duwal wa'l-Mulūk, ed. and translated
   U. and M.C. Lyons with historical introduction and notes by J.S.C. Riley-
4. None is mentioned and Hugh himself was in Nicosia in June and October of
   that year. Reg. Hier., nos. 1374b, 1375.
6. 'Eracles', ii, p.462; Walter of Guisborough, Chronica, ed. H. Rothwell
a subsequent definitive decision in the High Court, but it is also possible that
the parties had agreed to accept Edward as an arbiter and be bound by his
decision. Edward's opinion in the dispute is not known. A compromise was
worked out in 1273 whereby the vassals were obliged to serve outside Cyprus
for a maximum of four months in a year, and then only if led by the king in
person or by the king's son. ²

The depositions of King Hugh and James of Ibelin before the Lord Edward
show what arguments were used and also pose fresh questions. Hugh spoke first,
stating the principle that service was owed and then surveying Cypriot history to
show precedents for the vassals serving abroad in answer to a feudal summons;
James endeavoured to answer him point by point. Hugh stated that vassals owed
service as specified in their privileges and so must serve at the will or need of
their lord. ³ To this James could only use the rather unconvincing argument
that as the boundary of Cyprus was the sea and the king had no right to demand
of his knights 'service de mer', he could not demand that they serve abroad,
and he added that notwithstanding the wording of the privileges there were limits
to the amount of service a knight could be expected to perform, just as much as
serfs in Cyprus were only obliged to work for their lord for two days a week. ⁴

1. Beebe, Edward I and the Crusades, p.68.
2. 'Eracles', ii, pp.463-4; Marino Sanudo, 'Liber secretorum fidelium crucis',
ed. J. Bongars, Gesta Del per Francos (Hannover, 1611), part 2, p.225.
³ Gregory X (Annales Ecclesiastici, 1273, para. 36) congratulated Hugh on
the conclusion of the agreement. Gregory's letter is undated, but from internal
evidence it can be dated to the period between the summons to the Second
Council of Lyons (April 1273) and the opening of that council (May 1274).
4. 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.430 (paras. 2-3).
Unfortunately the problem of what was a reasonable amount of service was not further elaborated, and though the jurists stated that service outside the kingdom must be held to be necessary, they placed no further limitations on the power of the lord to command it. There is no other indication that knights should not be expected to travel by sea, though there is evidence that knights were not expected to fight unless mounted: an *assise* of King Amaury of Jerusalem had laid down that a knight was not obliged to do service during a siege anywhere his horse could not carry him. But Hugh does not seem to have been calling on his men to engage in naval battles, only to travel by ship to the scene of the campaign.

Hugh began his survey of the precedents by stating that the vassals of Jerusalem had served outside that kingdom since the time of Godfrey of Bouillon and that Cypriots, who were bound to keep the Jerusalemite usages, had served overseas at the command of their kings and *baillis* since the conquest. In answer James argued that as the customs of the Latin East were derived from those of the West and of France in particular, and that as nowhere in the West did vassals serve abroad out of obligation, the customs in the East could not demand such services. This argument is ingenious, but again not convincing. It was not true that such services were unknown in the West, and by appealing

2. See *Gestes*, p. 721.
3. 'Document relatif au service militaire', pp. 427-8 paras. 4-7).
4. 'Document relatif au service militaire', pp. 430-31 (paras. 4-5).
5. As Dr. Beebe has pointed out, Edward I claimed similar services at the time of the crisis of 1297: *Edward I and the Crusades*, pp. 150-51.
to French customs and minimizing the importance of Jerusalemite practice for Cypriot law, James was contradicting accepted legal principles in the East.1

Hugh then proceeded to give a long list of the occasions on which Cypriot knights had served outside Cyprus: Raynauld Barlais's expedition to Jaffa (1197); the various occasions on which Almery of Lusignan as king of both Cyprus and Jerusalem brought Cypriots to Jerusalem (1197-1205); Walter of Montbéliard's expeditions to Satalia and Rhodes (1205-1210); Hugh I and the participation in the early part of the Fifth Crusade (1217); the Damietta expedition (1218-1221); the crusade of Frederick II (1228-1229); the relief of Beirut (1231); the crusade of Thibaut of Navarre (1239-1240); St. Louis's first crusade, when, so Hugh alleged, John of Jaffa and Philip of Montfort had urged Henry I to use a feudal summons to persuade the knights to participate (1248-1250); twice during Hugh's own bailliage of Cyprus (1261-1267), and twice since he became king of Cyprus (1267).2

James began his answer3 to this by making the general point that the fact that Cypriots had served abroad with their lord did not necessarily mean that they were obliged to do so; Cypriot knights had indeed often fought outside Cyprus, sometimes with their lord and sometimes not. Among others they had

1. For the dependence of Cypriot law on Jerusalemite law, see above, pp.254-5. In 1264 Hugh of Brienne had unsuccessfully tried to base his claim to the bailliage partly on French law, and so it would appear that there was a recent precedent for the High Court of Jerusalem not accepting the argument that French custom was more authoritative than Jerusalemite custom. See 'Documents relatifs à la sucessability', pp.404, 408, 411, 414 and also pp. 406, 409, 413 where Hugh of Lusignan argued against the validity of French law.


3. 'Document relatif au service militaire', pp.431-3 (paras. 6-13).
served with the Hospitallers, Templars, successive lords of Beirut and the count of Jaffa, and, as James asserted near the end of his speech, if serving with a particular lord was a precedent for obligations, the Cypriots ought to be bound to serve the house of Ibelin rather than the king. Of the examples given by Hugh, James declined to discuss those that dated from before the time of Henry I on the grounds that they had passed out of living memory. As for the relief of Beirut, James, quite rightly if Philip of Novara’s account is to be believed, denied that Henry summoned the knights to accompany him as he was under age at the time, and said that John of Beirut called on them as his peers and friends to help him voluntarily. According to James, the Cypriots accompanied Frederick in 1228 as a result of the settlement made with John of Beirut and not following a summons. Again, if Philip of Novara is to be believed, it would seem that James was correct, for the Cypriots were careful not to admit the rights of Frederick as bailli, though homage was paid to him as overlord, and if he were not bailli they would not have answered his summons. This view is supported by Philip’s statement that the Cypriots were to serve at their own expense, since feudal levies outside the kingdom were normally entitled to

1. 'Documents relatifs au service militaire', p.431 (paras. 6-7). Cypriot participation in several of the events alluded to is supported from other evidence. Cypriots accompanied the Hospitaller expedition to Montferrat (for the date of the expedition and the sources, see above, p.105 note 4. The 'Old Lord' of Beirut led Cypriots to the relief of Beirut and to Montferrat. 'Gestes', pp.702-4, 724. Ballian of Beirut called on Henry I to provide Cypriot help for the relief of Ascalon in 1247. 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.442.


3. See above, p.88.
provisions. On the other hand, if Hugh were right in thinking that the Cypriots obeyed a feudal summons in 1228, the implication would be that throughout the period 1229-1232 the Ibelines were in rebellion against the bailli they had recognised.2

The core of James's answer to the claim that Cypriot knights did military service at the time of the crusades of Thibaut of Navarre and St. Louis was that they were under no obligation, but went as crusaders.3 His version of what happened at the time of St. Louis's crusade differed considerably from Hugh's: the knights were summoned but no one answered the summons as service was not owed; they agreed to go 'por Dieu' and the king undertook to pay them; when Henry returned from Damietta he made an agreement with Louis for 120 knights to remain for a year under the command of the constable of Cyprus, but the knights were persuaded to stay out of love for the king and not out of any obligation. The French chronicles of the crusade support James to a certain extent: Henry I and the Cypriots did take the cross; Henry was present at the capture of Damietta, but had left the expedition before it moved south, and Guy of Ibelin, the constable of Cyprus, with his brother, Baldwin the seneschal, did command the forces from the Latin East which remained.4 There seems to be

1. See above, p. 84. For the terms of the agreement, see 'Gestes', pp.681-2. See also John of Ibelin, p.347.

2. See above, p. 87.


no reason why knights should not discharge their feudal obligations while at the same time benefiting from crusading privileges, but James was claiming that the knights went solely as crusaders. The difficulty is to understand why, if the knights were volunteers, Henry should have accepted the responsibility to pay them. It is possible that they were simply paid as mercenaries, but James does not say they were, as doubtless he would have done if it had been true.

Alternatively, if they went in response to a summons, the king was obliged to supply them with provisions. There is no independent evidence for the terms under which the Cypriots served, and so no way of resolving these conflicting accounts.

James concluded his account of the history of Cypriot service overseas before the reign of Hugh III with the assertion that no knight of Cyprus had ever served outside the island following a summons, though knights had often gone at their lord's request; they had disputed the right to be summoned many times, but the king's counsellors had seen to it that the king never allowed the issue of whether service was owed abroad to be put to an esparrt and so there had never been a definitive ruling. Perhaps the self-interest of the vassals would have ensured that a vote on this issue in the High Court would go against the king. But it is also likely that some of the king's closest advisers, men such as Philip of Montfort and John of Jaffa, who, according to Hugh, had urged Henry to summon the knights at the time of St. Louis's crusade and who had interests on the mainland, would stand to gain by the obligation of the Cypriot vassals to serve there.

---

James then came to the question of the summonses issued by Hugh:  

the knights had served because they did not want to quarrel with him; the need was great and they would have been ashamed not to have gone, either through love and concern for honour or out of ignorance of what their true obligations were; what had been done voluntarily should not be used to the knights' prejudice, and the fact that service overseas had been disputed in the past was in itself evidence that such service was not customary. Once again James's arguments are unconvincing. Undoubtedly the need for military assistance in the 1260's was great, but it is hard to believe that the knights were unaware of their obligations, especially if there was, as James indicated, a long history of disputes over them.

Having surveyed the history of Cyprus, Hugh concluded with two legal arguments which supported his contention that the precedents he had cited proved that services were owed. The kings had always recognised their obligations to provide shipping and provisions, and he himself had confiscated the fiefs of men who had defaulted in their service overseas, in one case for failing to serve and in a second for departing prematurely from the host.  

To the first of these points, James, with naive simplicity, replied that of course knights who had volunteered to serve abroad would accept free shipping and provisions, and so the fact that they were offered proved nothing.  

This did not fully answer Hugh's point, for if the knights were going voluntarily, the

kings would not necessarily have admitted their responsibility. James had much to say about the two cases of dispossession. The knight who had failed to perform services had come to the king and had asked to be allowed to commend his fief as it was too small to support him in the services due from it; the court recognised this, and it was decided that the king should hold it for a year and a day. Apparently the legality of the summons to serve overseas had not been raised, and the confusion had arisen because the period of a year and a day during which the lord held the fief when commended was the same as the period it was forfeit following default of service. The weakness of James's position, as he himself seems to have realised, was that the knight had recognised his responsibility to answer the summons and had not questioned the king's right to summon him overseas. According to James, the second case referred to a knight who, when the Cypriots were in Acre, had committed some misdeed and had failed to answer the charge and was then found to be absent from his post; in order to bring him to court to answer the charge, the king had had the court recognise that the man's fief was to be taken into his hand by way of distraint. Here again there would seem to be a weakness in James's position, for if the court met in Acre, the king had assembled the High Court of Cyprus outside the kingdom; if the vassals would perform the service of consilium in Jerusalem, then there was no logical reason why they should not perform military service or auxilium there as well.

2. For commendation of fiefs, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.520, 556-7.
3. In 1269 Hugh III had issued a privilege granting lands in Cyprus to the Hospitallers, witnessed by members of the Cypriot High Court, at Acre. Reg. Hier., no. 1368.
James concluded by summarising his main points, and adding that the loyalty of the knights would not come through coercion. There is no doubt that Hugh had had the better of the argument; James's reply on a number of issues had been unconvincing, although, particularly in his discussion of the precedents from the reign of Henry I, he had made some telling points. The debate had raised a number of important issues, in addition to the central theme of whether service was owed outside Cyprus. James had disputed all Hugh's arguments, but with the opinion of his father, John of Jaffa, against him, it would have been easier to have admitted that services were owed and to have claimed that Hugh's demands were excessive. Instead James had used the potentially dangerous device of challenging the basis of Cypriot feudal law by claiming that French law was more authoritative. But what would have been a reasonable service? In 1273 four months in a year was agreed, but the liability to repeat this service regularly seems to have remained. Unfortunately many of the claims and counter-claims advanced in the speeches cannot be checked, but some principles show up clearly: knights should serve as knights; knights could fight in answer to a summons, but could also participate in a campaign as volunteers, perhaps in fulfilment of a crusading vow. In its historical setting the dispute is important. It has been suggested that some of the Cypriot magnates with fiefs in Jerusalem found it in their interests to support

2. See John of Ebelin, p.347.
3. See above, pp.269-70.
the principle of feudal service abroad, but by the 1270's many of those fiefs had been lost and so the number of Cypriots with vested interests had diminished. The greater the pressure on Jerusalem, the less interest the Cypriot knights would have in defending what was left. If John of Jaffa had been a leader of the party in Cyprus in the 1240's calling for service abroad, his son, only three years after Jaffa had been lost, was spokesman for the party opposing that principle.

The interest of the dispute for the historian lies in the issues that were debated rather than in its effect on subsequent developments. Soon after the hearing before the Lord Edward, Cypriots participated in his expedition to Qauna, though whether as volunteers, mercenaries or out of obligation is not known. It has been shrewdly pointed out that had Edward found in favour of Hugh, Hugh would have had to borne the expenses of his knights, but, had Edward favoured the knights, he himself could have found himself having to hire them as mercenaries if he needed them. The truce of 1272 with the Mamlukes probably reduced the friction between the king and his feudatories, and the compromise of 1273 presumably put an end to the dispute. Hugh had established the principle of service abroad, and the restriction to four months was probably not important as it was unlikely that the king could keep his army

---

1. See above, p. 273.
5. See above, p. 268.
in the field for much longer and presumably he could still command military
service inside Cyprus for the rest of the year. Even so, according to Marino
Sanudo, Hugh's attempt to re-occupy Acre in 1279 was frustrated by the knights
leaving the expedition after four months. The dispute of 1271 demonstrates a
fact of fundamental importance for understanding feudalism in Cyprus: auxilium,
the obligation to perform military service in return for a fief, was required by
the king and was paid. Though an attempt was made to argue that service was
not owed abroad, there is no suggestion that the system of feudal services was
anachronistic and in decay, and by the compromise of 1273 even the principle of
service abroad was upheld.

Consilium, the obligation of the vassal to give counsel, can be seen as
having two closely related aspects. The vassals had the duty to give advice to
the king, and to participate as full members of the High Court. The king could
argue that he needed the advice and consent of his men before any act was
legal; thus in 1309, when Amaury of Tyre was putting pressure on Henry II
to confirm him as governor, the king claimed to be unable to do anything as he
was 'senza consigliar et senza aiuto'. It was natural that the kings or regents

1. Marino Sanudo ('Liber secretorum', p.228) and, following him, the author
of the chronicle normally attributed to Jordan (Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre,
II, p.131, see p.130 note 1) alone refer to the four-month service. The
other sources simply record the attempted re-occupation and state that it
was unsuccessful. 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.457; 'Gestes', p.784;
'Chronique d'Amadi', p.214.

2. See above, pp.8-10.

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.308.
should turn to their vassals for advice, either formally in the High Court or informally. It is arguable whether informal consultations with knights on matters of policy could be described as consilium in the strict feudal sense, though there is evidence that the leading feudatories expected to be consulted: in 1306, an important source of discontent was that the king had ignored them and relied exclusively on the advice of his uncle, Philip of Ibelin, and this was reflected in the complaint that he had allowed various abuses to continue 'sans nul conseil, sauf le conseil de volonté'.

From the practice of informal consultations grew the royal Council, a body with a restricted membership and distinct from the High Court. The origins of a recognisable Council in Cyprus can perhaps be discerned during the later years of the reign of Henry I, though its early history is obscure. The first unmistakable reference to a Council in the Latin East is given by James of Ibelin who included betraying the secrets of the Council among cases which can be decided by wager of battle. This provision would appear to have its antecedents in Philip of Novara's discussion of treason, where it was stated that some regard an instance in which '... le seignor a esté trahi aparament ... de consell qui alt esté descouvert ...' as apparent treason. James of Ibelin, when discussing the summons at the time of St. Louis's crusade in his speech against military service overseas, seems to contrast the counsellors of the king and the feudal

1. 'Gestes', p.357. See above, p. 122.
2. 'Texte officiel', p.336.
knights of Cyprus: the knights refused to answer the summons, but the counsellors would not allow the issue to be put to an esgar.¹ In the fourteenth century, references to the Council become more frequent, and its members were recognised by contemporaries as forming a distinct group.²

The memorandum of 1311 to the pope on the subject of the reconquest of Palestine was drawn up by the king and his Council;³ in the reigns of Peter I and Peter II the 'lords of the Council' are regularly shown advising the king on military and diplomatic matters.⁴ Few individuals, however, were specifically described as counsellors in the surviving sources: those that were include members of the royal family such as John of Lusignan, lord of Beirut, in 1335,⁵ knights such as Hugh Beduin, Thomas of Piquayg and Simon of Montolif in 1328, John Beduin in 1344 and Peter of Caffran in 1390,⁶ clergy such as the

1. 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.432. See above, p.273. Riley-Smith (Feudal Nobility, p.225) has suggested that the Council was introduced into Jerusalem from Cyprus by Hugh III.

2. See for example, Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 251, 277. See also Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 150, 302, 3204. For the Council of Queen Eleanor, see above, p.228.


4. John Dardel, p.44; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 123, 182, 192, 411 ( ἄρχοντες τῆς βουλῆς σου ), see also paras. 366, 373, 397 and also para. 390 where the Council was summoned by the prince of Antioch even though Peter II was of age at that time.


franciscan Aimer, later bishop of Paphos, in 1315,¹ and lawyers such as Giustino dei Giustini in 1328 or Guido da Bagnolo in 1365.² It can be assumed that the Council was not a public debating institution, but that its composition consisted of the king's friends and that no one had a place there as of right. In practice the members of the Council who were vassals would probably have taken the lead in the High Court, but there is no evidence that the Council took over any of the Court's judicial functions. Its members were not necessarily knights and their responsibility lay in providing the king with advice on matters of policy; their agreement did not in itself provide the king with legal authority to implement his decisions when this was held to be necessary.

By virtue of the feudal bond, a vassal was obliged to give his lord honest advice to the best of his ability when and if required, but the formal institution in which the services of consilium was exacted was the High Court. Though participation in its activities could be onerous, access to the High Court and membership of it gave the feudatories important privileges, and all feudatories, including rear vassals, as a result of their liege homage to the king, shared in these privileges.³ The business of the High Court was varied, but can be seen as having two aspects: first it was where royal enactments were agreed and ratified, and secondly it was the highest feudal court, the court of the king as 'chef seignior', where matters concerning fiefs and fief holders were dealt with...
and where, by applying principles similar to those for the succession to fiefs, the succession to the throne was settled.  

The duties of the feudatories as members of the High Court were correspondingly varied. Royal enactments which they were called upon to agree to and witness ranged from confirming diplomatic treaties as for example in 1310 with Oshia of Armenia 2 or in 1391 with Genoa 3 to investing knights with fiefs or churches and other institutions with non-feudal tenements. Both the act of investiture and the accompanying formal diploma were witnessed in the High Court. In 1369 the vassals demanded the right to approve future declarations of war and future peace settlements, 4 and it was in the High Court in 1231 that John of Ibelin called for the support of the Cypriot knights in the relief of Beirut. 5 Royal ordinances were issued by the king and his men there, 6 and the Court seems to have had supervision of certain aspects of the royal finances: in 1228 John of Ibelin offered to answer for the financial administration of his bailliage there, 7 in 1306 important sections of the royal debt came within the

1. For the role of the High Court at the time of the royal accession and in minorities, see below, pp. 364-79.
6. For Aygue of Betham's ordinances of 1310 which were agreed by his Council and then published in the High Court, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.369-70. For the participation of the vassals in forming legislation, see for example 'Bans et Ordonnances', pp.368 (1311), 377 (1355); 'Formules', p.385.
7. 'Gestes', p.679.
competence of the High Court, and in 1369 the vassals demanded the right to agree to taxes and financial impositions. It was in the High Court that the kings or regents appointed lieutenants to govern on their behalf or procurators in diplomatic negotiations: thus in the 1220's it was there that the vassals rejected Alice of Champagne's nominee, Almery Barlais, and in 1330 that James I appointed Peter of Caffran as his procurator for negotiations with the Genoese. These examples of the responsibilities of the members of the High Court show that the vassals had an important role in the royal administration and in matters concerning the public rights of the king as sovereign in addition to the feudal rights of both the king as chief lord and of themselves as his vassals or rear vassals.

The competence of the High Court in feudal matters was total. It was there that the ceremony of homage was performed, the seisin, sale, exchange, return and commendation of fiefs were witnessed, and litigation over fiefs conducted. It was there that vassals were appealed for breach of faith or for criminal offences, and there that disputes over debt, pledge or sales involving vassals were heard. To use John of Jaffa's phrase, the vassal was answerable before his lord in the High Court 'de son cors et de son fil et de

1. 'Texte officiel', p.539.
3. See above, p.71.
5. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.131.
son honor'. It was the duty of his peers, the other feudatories, under the presidency of the king or his deputy and acting together in the discharge of their service of consilium, to witness, record and determine the business brought before them and to make the procedures and decisions of the Court operative.

There were some responsibilities which were borne by all the members of the Court who happened to be present at a particular session, and others which, as the need arose, were given to individuals or small groups of members. The general responsibilities were that the vassals present should 'faire esgarts, et conoissans et recors de cort'. Esgart means decision, and the uses of the term ranged from deciding the date a case should be heard or determining the method of proof which was applicable or particular points of law and procedure before a verdict could be obtained to forming the final judgement. The esgart was obtained by a majority vote of those present, which, as the jurists explained, meant that the Court could be 'packed'. The distinction between conoissance and esgart was somewhat blurred, but conoissance was essentially the formal recognition by the Court that a prima facie case had been established. In a case of default of service described by James of Ibelin, Hugh III demonstrated that a man was not at his post and that he had been duly summoned; the court

---

1. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.398. See also John of Ibelin, p.418.
2. 'Chronique d'Abbeville', pp.107.
4. 'Chronique d'Abbeville', pp.107.
5. See for example, Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.477, 479, 480, 482, 486, 487.
8. Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.131.
recognised that Hugh had established his facts and the penalty, confiscation of
the man's fief, was then exacted. In 1314 there was a judicial duel arising
from an appeal of murder; after the duel 'la corte conobbe che messer Zacco
(the defendant) era vinto' and the execution then followed. Recort de cort was
the testimony of the High Court itself as expressed by individual members of it
as to what had been established or done in court in the past. If a man was
claiming a fief, he could, especially if he had no privilege, call upon the court
to bear recort that it had witnessed the grant or had witnessed him or his
ancestor enjoying seisin. Similarly, when a commission of three members of
the High Court, themselves constituting the Court, had been sent to issue a
summons, they could subsequently bear recort de cort in a full meeting of the
Court that the summons had been made. In other words, the vassals were
expected to be able to remember what they, as members of the High Court, had
witnessed and were, as part of their duty of consilium, obliged to testify to it.
The jurists were well aware of the limitations of the system: Litigation could be
protracted, and, as John of Arsul pointed out in 1251 (1250 o.s.), it was
difficult for the vassals to remember exactly what had been said and done in
court on previous occasions earlier in the dispute; Philip of Novara drew

1. 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.433. See also Philip of Novara,
2. 'Chronique d'Amadil', p.396.
5. 'Abrégé', p.247.
attention to cases in which the decision depended on events long past, and in which the claimant could say that he could have proved his case by recort but for the fact that 'le recort faut par obli ou par mort de ceaus qui y furent'. The solution to the inherent dangers of injustice in a system which relied on the collective memory of the Court was that the Court's business should be recorded in writing. This was discussed in 1251 and then, after it had been agreed with the proviso that written record should only be used when recort de cort was unsatisfactory, shelved. It was not until the reign of Henry II (1266-1324) that minutes were kept of the proceedings in the High Court of Cyprus; reliance on the memory of the Court was further reduced in 1369 when it was agreed that recourse could be made to a version of John of Ibelin's legal treatise.

The specific duties that the vassals could be called upon to discharge are neatly summarised by John of Jaffa; they could be required to act as counsel for litigants, or serve on commissions of the court to view the bodies.

2. 'Abrégé', pp.246-9. For a further discussion of the admission of written records in the High Court, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.133-4.
5. John of Ibelin, p.347.
6. For a discussion of the service of conseil, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.132-3.
of murdered men or the wounds of claimants for mayhem, to summon men to
answer in court,1 hear testimony, to arrange the division of property, to serve
on inquisitions, view lands or other properties2 or do anything else the lord
should order them to do 'come court'.3 Normally a commission consisted of
three men, one as president, deputising for the lord, and the others as
witnesses constituting the quorum. They thus formed a microcosm of the High
Court and could then bear recort de cort 'en plaine cort' of what they had
witnessed or done.4

There is no doubt that the vassals could find the service of consilium
profitable,5 though doubtless the duties, like those of the knights of the shire
in England, were heavy. Even so, it was in their own interest for the knights
to take an active part in the routine business of the High Court, and there is no

1. For summons, see also Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.529. Summonses to
perform services could be issued in the same way. See Philip of Novara,
'Livre', p.520. For an example of feudal summons by 'tre cavalleri per
corte' in 1310, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.360. For the formula for
ordering three vassals as 'court' to summon a lady to perform service de
mariage, see 'Formules', p.389.

2. For inquisitions into property boundaries, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre',
pp.532-4; 'Formules', pp.387-8.

3. John of Jaffa (p.347) also included taking messages as a service which could
be required, but presumably this was not necessarily in connection with the
business of the High Court.

4. For this procedure with reference to summons, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre',
p.529. Also, see above p.285.

5. There were presumably financial incentives in the form of gratuities, and a
clever and accomplished pleader could easily have found advancement in the
service of a king or magnate. Philip of Novara is the most obvious example
of a knight who owed his success to his legal ability. See Riley-Smith,
Feudal Nobility, p.126.
hint in the legal treatises that lords found consilium difficult to exact: the careful descriptions of the procedures for summons to perform service de cors and of the penalties for default of military service are not paralleled for consilium. The duties of the vassal arising from the feudal bond were undoubtedly exacted. Military service was definitely performed as late as 1373. We know less about the degree of interest in feudal law in Cyprus and about the practitioners in the High Court in the fourteenth century than in the previous century; in the fourteenth century the traditions, legal concepts and institutions continued in a vigorous, if less original, fashion: the legal treatises continued to be copied and modified; the surviving narrative sources give impressive echoes of the phraseology of the thirteenth century treatises, thus indicating that their content was familiar or that the same principles and terminology were employed. At the end of the century, Philip of Mézières

1. See above, p. 10. For comparison, the last attempt to raise the feudal army in England was in 1385, by which time the exaction of military obligations had long been obsolete. See N. B. Lewis, 'The Last Medieval Summons of the English Feudal Levy, 13 June 1385', EHR, lxxiii (1958).

2. For thirteenth-century jurists and pleaders, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.121-9.


4. See for example, 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.268: Baldwin of Ibelin '... li ha scongiurati, in la fede che li delevano, come soli pari, che non li dovessero far alcuna ingiuria o violenza de trarlo fora de il dove si trovava; et questo medemo disse a messer Joan de Bries ... il quale sapeva benissimo le assise et usanze del regno de Cyprio'. For other examples, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 106, 277; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.319, 403.
cited the procedures of the Cypriot High Court as an example of equitable and speedy justice. ¹

¹ Philip of Mézières, Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, I, p.487. Philip, however, seems to have exaggerated, for on at least two occasions in the fourteenth century there were complaints about delays in the courts: explicit in 1306 ('Texte officiel', p.536) and implicit in clause 6 of the remède of 1369 ('Bans et Ordonnances', p.379).
Chapter 3

FEUDAL INCIDENTS

In any western feudal society the lord was entitled not only to the services owed by the vassals for their fiefs but to certain other rights over the fiefs themselves. These rights, usually described by historians as 'feudal incidents', gave the lord a share in the financial returns of lands or rents held by feudal tenure, and could be valuable.

With one exception, the feudal incidents known in the West, escheat, wardship, marriage, aids and relief, were also known in the Latin East. The exception was relief, the payment levied from the heir on entering his inheritance. 1 The explanation of its absence is to be found in the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the twelfth century; at the period when the conventions of tenurial law were taking shape, it is to be presumed that the kings were so short of man-power that they could not afford to discourage settlers by burdening their heirs in this way; once the principle of free entry to fiefs was established, it would have been difficult for a king to have imposed the payment of relief, and the principle then passed to Cyprus with the settlers from Jerusalem at the end of the century.

---

1. I find no reference to its payment in Cyprus, and there is only one dubious piece of evidence for it in Jerusalem. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.38 note 116 (p.247). In view of the silence of the sources, it is to be assumed that it was not paid.
The lord's right of escheat\(^1\) operated when a vassal died without heirs or when a fief was forfeit as a result of a breach of the feudal bond. When a family died out, its fiefs reverted to the lord;\(^2\) similarly, if a vassal died and there was no heir who could claim the fief immediately, the lord held it until a claimant appeared. All heirs other than the son or daughter of the last in seisin had to request the fief from the lord, and Philip of Novara envisaged situations in which the lord refused a request for a fief and withheld it while the claimant took action in the High Court, and in which the lord had granted a fief to someone else before an heir of the last in seisin made his request.\(^3\) By the rules of inheritance in Cyprus, only the heirs of the grantee and his wife could inherit a fief.\(^4\) Thus collateral heirs of the original grantee were excluded, and so the likelihood of a lord's recovering his grant through the failure of heirs was correspondingly enhanced. The more generations a fief had been in a family, however, the greater the possibility of the existence of collateral heirs of the last in seisin who were themselves descended from the original grantee, and so the more remote the possibility of the fief reverting to the lord. This would have meant that in the early years of Frankish rule in Cyprus, when all grants of fiefs were of recent date, escheats were common.

1. In the legal treatises, the verb 'escheat' is used in two senses: it can mean either 'passes by inheritance', or, less commonly, 'revert to the lord'. For examples, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.543, 553-4. It is in this latter sense that the word is commonly used in English and will be used in this discussion.

2. John of Ibelin, pp.222-3.


It is probable that the restoration of the royal finances under King Aimery was achieved partly by the king retaining the fiefs which had escheated following the deaths without issue of those vassals who had been among the original settlers. ¹

A man's fief was forfeited to his lord for a breach of the conditions of service or fealty under which it was held; in cases of default of service, loss of fief was for a year and a day; the penalty for failure to do homage, for failure to answer summons to perform service de cors or for any felony not regarded as treason was forfeiture for life, and for treason, heresy or apostasy, forfeiture by the man and his heirs for ever. ² Philip of Novara indicated that the deprivation of heirs of traitors born before the treachery was perpetrated only dated from the time of the Ibelin-Longobard war. ³ In Cyprus, as elsewhere, the lord as grantor or descendant of the grantor of the fief retained the right to repossess it if the conditions under which it was granted were not fulfilled, either by the lack of an heir to inherit or by the failure of the holder to keep faith, and so no grant from the royal domain in feudal tenure was necessarily lost to the crown permanently.

Wardship or, to use the normal expression in the Latin East, bailliage was not the prerogative of the lord. ⁴ In Cyprus an heir under age and his fief

---

¹ For Aimery's restoration of the finances and the chronicler's explanation of how this was achieved, see above, p. 54.

² Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp. 555-6; John of Ibelin, pp. 287, 303-10; James of Ibelin, pp. 458, 460. James of Ibelin (p. 456) indicated that the forfeiture for failure to do homage lasted until either the man or the lord died, whichever was the earlier. See Geoffrey Le Tor, p. 438. Failure to do homage to a baili led to loss of fief for the duration of the bailiage. John of Ibelin, p. 305.

³ Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p. 498. For disinheritance at the end of the war, see above, p. 89.
would be given to the care of the surviving parent, and if there were none the
custody of the fief until the heir came of age would pass to the nearest adult
relative who could inherit, the plus droit heir apparent, while the person of
the heir was given to the care of someone else. The interests of the minor
were thus protected in that a potential heir to an estate would be less likely
to waste it. Only in the absence of a parent or adult heir who appeared in
the High Court to claim it did the lord hold the bailliage himself.\(^1\) We have
seen that the possibility of a lord recovering a fief by escheat diminished as
succeeding generations increased the potential number of collateral heirs
descended from the original grantee: similarly the possibility of the lord
enjoying the profits of a fief during a minority decreased the longer the fief
had remained in the particular family, for the chances that there would be an
adult member of a collateral branch who could take the bailliage increased with
every generation that passed. The ability of a lord to benefit from minorities
was substantially less than in most other feudal states, and it appears that
differing principles governing the rights of wardship lay behind the disputed
claim of Frederick II to the bailliage of Cyprus in the 1220's.\(^2\)

In Cyprus a lord had the right to control the marriages of all women
between the ages of twelve and sixty\(^3\) who held property owing service de cors.
Service de mariage was regarded as a form of service; the procedures for

\(^1\) Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.494-5; John of Ibelin, pp.261-7; James of
Ibelin, p.461. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.38.

\(^2\) See above, pp.81-2.

\(^3\) For age limits, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.559; John of Ibelin,
pp.362-4.
summons and the showing of essoins were similar to those for military service. 1 Failure to perform service de mariage was punishable, as was failure to perform service de cors, by loss of fief for a year and a day or longer depending on the circumstances: failure to answer summons was punishable by loss of fief for a year and a day; 2 according to John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, John of Jaffa and Philip of Novara, marriage without permission was punishable by loss of fief for the duration of the marriage, but according to the author of the 'Livre au Roi' and Ballan of Sidon, for life. 3 In 1309 Henry II refused to accept homage from the husbands of heiresses apparently on the grounds that he had not approved them; he was powerless at that time to dispossess them, but by refusing homage was refusing to ratify what had been done. 4 The purpose of the system of service de mariage was primarily that a suitable man could be found to perform service de cors for a fief held by an heiress or widow. 5 A widow under sixty could be summoned to


2. Thus John of Ibelin, p.361. Philip of Novara ('Livre', p.559) stated that in the event of failure to answer summons, the lord held the fief until the woman performed service de mariage. Failure by a widow to do service de mariage for the bailliage of her child's fief resulted in the loss of her dower as well as the fiefs held in bailliage. John of Ibelin, p.282.

3. 'Livre au Roi', p.627; Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.559-60; John of Ibelin, pp.365-6. Ralph of Tiberias argued that the penalty should be loss of fief for a year and a day. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.559. If the husband was a vassal and had entered his wife's fief, he could be appealed for breach of faith. John of Ibelin, pp.366-9. See 'Livre au Roi', p.627.

4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.302, see p.348.

remarry if she held a fief owing service de cors or if she was acting as bailli for her children, but if she only owed service de mariage by virtue of her bailliage she could surrender the bailliage, thereby avoiding her obligation to remarry, and keep her dower. Widows were not required to remarry simply because they held feudal property as dower, but they and heiresses with fiefs not burdened with service de cors had to have their lord's permission to marry. Any unmarried woman of marriageable age holding the bailliage of fiefs owing service de cors as plus droit heir apparent was liable for service de mariage. The procedure for service de mariage was simple: the woman was summoned to appear in the High Court where she was given a choice of three potential husbands; the marriage ceremony then followed at a suitable time. A widow could not be summoned within a year and a day of her previous husband's death, and the prospective husbands had to be the peers of the woman or, in the case of a widow, of her former husband. According to the 'Livre au Roi', refusal to choose one of the three resulted in loss of fief for life.


2. John of Ibelin, p.281. Her right to surrender the bailliage once having taken selsin of it was limited.

3. John of Ibelin, p.279; James of Ibelin, p.467. In the fourteenth century, Maria of Gibelet appears to have owed service de mariage for her dower land, and evidently sought to avoid it by surrendering her dower to the king. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 286.


6. 'Livre au Roi', p.627.
though Leontios Makhairas, writing in the fifteenth century, stated that failure to make a choice gave the lord the right to nominate a husband.\footnote{1} The most celebrated example of disparagement of heiresses in Cyprus was the case of Maria of Gibelet whom Peter I tried to marry to an artisan.\footnote{2} The ill-feeling caused by this incident led directly to Peter’s murder in 1369,\footnote{3} and in the \textit{remède} enacted immediately after the murder it was ordained that the lord needed the consent of the woman’s next of kin before he could exercise his right of \textit{service de mariage}.\footnote{4} This would appear to mark a significant reduction in the lord’s rights in this respect. Previously the relatives had been able to demand that the lord should exercise his rights, but this process appears to have been intended chiefly to prevent a lord who held the \textit{bailliage} of an heiress’s fief prolonging his enjoyment of the revenues since he would have the custody until she married.\footnote{5} The importance of the right to demand \textit{service de mariage} for the lord lay partly in the control it gave him over the succession to fiefs as he could exclude anyone he did not want from acquiring a fief by marriage,\footnote{6} and partly in the profits which could be acquired; the marriage to an heiress could be used as a reward for services, or could be exploited for

\begin{enumerate}
\item\footnote{1} Leontios Makhairas, \textit{i}, para. 277.
\item\footnote{2} Leontios Makhairas, \textit{i}, paras. 265-8, 277.
\item\footnote{3} See above, pp. 202-3.
\item\footnote{4} 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.379.
\item\footnote{5} John of Bellin, pp.264-6.
\item\footnote{6} In Jerusalem, kings were not always able to exercise this power. See Riley-Smith, \textit{Feudal Nobility}, pp.28, 147, 224.
\end{enumerate}
financial gain. John of Jaffa mentions financial incentives offered the lord by the relatives of an heiress to allow her to marry a man of their choice,¹ and there is another reference to the financial profits from the lord's rights in the narrative account of events of 1309.² Marriage rights were valuable to the lord, and it is significant that in 1306 and 1310 Henry II reserved his rights over a limited number of marriages at the same time as his income was agreed.³

In a feudal society a lord could call upon his vassals at times of particular need to give him assistance in excess of their normal obligations. This was in accordance with the general promise of support contained in the oath of fealty, and frequently, as in England, this extraordinary assistance or 'aid' was regularised as a financial levy payable under certain limited circumstances. In Cyprus, if the traditions preserved by the chronicles are to be believed, the right of the king to require material help from his vassals was asserted early: King Aimery is said to have ordered his men to return part of their fiefs to alleviate the poverty of the crown.⁴ Feudal aids in the form of taxes levied on the fief are not known until the end of the thirteenth century. The only circumstance in which aids of this kind were envisaged by the thirteenth-century legal writers was the ransom of the lord; John of Jaffa

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.302: '... tutti li maridazi che sono accaduti in tempo del governo del signor de Sur, che lui li ha dati et venduti ...'.
stated that the vassals should organise a one per cent levy on their fiefs, but only when the sum demanded could not be raised from the lord's property or by loans. The tenants-in-chief in Cyprus were never called upon to tax themselves in this way as no Cypriot king was held for ransom in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. But in the late 1280's, not long before the fall of Acre and the other Christian ports on the mainland, the Cypriot vassals agreed to a tax or 'taille' to be levied on their fiefs for purposes of defence. Whether this was unprecedented in the 1280's is not known, but by 1306 it had been paid regularly for the previous seventeen years. In 1311 it was ordained that everybody should pay his arrears of 'taille' except those who had been exiled or imprisoned; almost certainly we have here another reference to the levy on fiefs, and it would appear that the aid had become a permanent feature of royal finances, payment of which was due even for the years of Amaury of Tyre's usurpation. In the second half of the fourteenth century, the financial difficulties of the crown led to new and heavier taxes. In 1363 the vassals complained about the misuse of a 'taille' which they had agreed for specific purposes over a limited period. The precise nature of this tax is not clear, but it is probable that it was a general subsidy paid by all classes; the vassals on this occasion asserted the right to sanction all further taxes and to scrutinise

3. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.369. Most of the other clauses in this ordinance relate to the affairs of the feudatories, and the references there to the exiles and prisoners would seem to relate to the royalist knights victimized by Amaury. See above, pp. 141-3.
the spending of moneys raised. In 1373 there was a forced loan to which
the knights contributed, and in the 1380's James I imposed a tax of ten per cent
on all incomes including incomes from fiefs, as well as property taxes from
which the vassals were not initially exempt. From the time of Peter I, the
vassals were taxed within the framework of a system of general taxation which
applied to all the subjects of the Cypriot crown, though they appear to have been
exempt from the poll tax. Only the 'taille' paid in the late thirteenth and
early fourteenth centuries is clearly discernible as an aid levied on the fiefs,

1. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.378. For a discussion of the complaint, see
Richard, 'La révolution de 1369', pp.111-12. According to Philip of
Mézières ('Épître lamentable', pp.486-7) a general subsidy had been
offered in 1310.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 397. For a forced loan in 1310 which was
paid by the Jews and burgesses only, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.327.
See also Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 625.

3. See above, p.251 note 1. Previously exempt groups such as the
Venetians were made liable for taxation. See Diplomatarium Veneto-
Levantinum, ii, pp.216-19.

4. Though something called the testaria is recorded in 1239 (Mas Latrie,
Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.643, see p.908), the poll tax seems to have been
introduced in 1292 when only clergy and members of the Military Orders
are known to have been exempt. Boniface VIII, no. 2609, see also no.
3114. In the 1360's burgesses were permitted to purchase exemption,
but as there is no mention of the knights being given this privilege, it
is likely that they were not liable for the tax. Leontios Makhairas, i,
paras. 157, 215. In the reign of James I only francomati and men of
servile status were liable. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 623.
but for how long its payment continued is not known.\textsuperscript{1}

When we come to consider the widely diverse rights over fiefs that a lord possessed other than the services of auxilium and consilium, it is possible to conclude that the value of these rights to the lord was limited.

The right of wardship of minors which in contemporary England was perhaps the most valuable feudal incident\textsuperscript{2} was circumscribed, perhaps for the same reason that it has been suggested that there was no relief.\textsuperscript{3} The profits from service de mariage and aids, which may not have been exacted before the late thirteenth century, could have diminished due to inflation during the fourteenth, especially if the sums payable became fixed by convention. This hypothesis

---

1. It perhaps continued until the tax reforms of James I when the king abolished the office of the ταλία; if so the aid would have been replaced by taxes on income and property. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 618. On the other hand the account for the estates of Walter of Brienne in the 1350's contains no indication that a proportion of the returns were paid to the king. 'Compte du domaine', pp.14-28. The term 'taille' could refer to any financial imposition including seigneurial dues from burgess properties (for these dues in Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.83), or the poll tax; thus in 1298 the pope referred to the poll tax as 'collectam seu tallam annuum que testagium dicitur ...'. Boniface VIII, no. 2609. In 1229 there is a reference to a 'baillivus tallie' though exactly what sources of revenue he would have been responsible for is not known. Mas Latrè, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.158.


3. See above, p.290. Incentives offered by the kings for knights to settle in Jerusalem early in the twelfth century would appear to have included, besides the absence of reliefs and seigneurial wardship of minors, the absence of control over the marriage of heiresses. See Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.558.
has an important corollary: if the profits of feudal incidents were small, the value to the lord of the lands and money fiefs held from him in feudal tenure would lie primarily in the services owed; hence the stress on the preservation of these services. ¹ Similarly, if the burden of feudal incidents on the vassals was limited, there would be less incentive to devise methods of avoiding them along the lines of the English system of feoffment to use. It can therefore be suggested that the level of feudal incidents in Cyprus was a factor which would have helped preserve feudal tenure and services in their primitive vigour into the fourteenth century.

¹ See above, pp.2-3.
As a consequence of the feudal bond the kings of Cyprus commanded specific services from their vassals and retained certain other rights over their fiefs and persons. But besides allowing them their legal due, many vassals served the king in special capacities. Some held permanent office under the crown; others accepted duties with limited duration and scope. For some the granting of an official position was an honour which could be seen as a reward for services in the past; for others it carried heavy responsibilities which perhaps gave the recipient the opportunity to supplement his income and even to raise his standing in noble society. Though vassals had a general responsibility to serve their lords, the kings, so far as is known, could not and did not oblige their men to accept office, but there is no indication that at any period during the first two centuries of Latin rule in Cyprus there was a shortage of knights prepared to take on official duties in the royal service.

The most prestigious royal officers were the holders of the grand serjeanties. In the twelfth century the offices of seneschal, constable, marshal, chamberlain and butler were imported from the West to Jerusalem and, subsequently, thence to Cyprus. After the fall of Acre, the Cypriot kings, as
titular rulers of Jerusalem, maintained both the Jerusalemite and Cypriot
grand sergeants. At the end of the fourteenth century, when James I took
the title of king of Armenia, he introduced grand sergeants of Armenia as
well. 1 Whereas in certain instances in the East 2 and commonly in the West
these offices became hereditary, in Cyprus their hereditary tenure was unknown
before the late fifteenth century. 3 It is true that the office of seneschal of
Cyprus passed from Ballian of Ibelin (before 1287 - 1361) to his brother
Philip (1301-1318) and then to Philip's son, Guy (before 1328 - after 1336), 4
but this cannot have been by inheritance as Ballian had a son who died in 1308 5
and there is evidence for another Ballian of Ibelin holding the office between
Philip and Guy. 6 There are other examples of sons succeeding fathers either
immediately or after an interval, but in no case did an office remain in the
same branch of a family for more than two generations. 7 The fact that the
kings of Cyprus were able to resist any tendency for these offices to become
hereditary is partly an indication of their own strength, but it may be partly

1. See below, pp.447-8.
2. For the hereditary constables of Tripoli, see J. Richard, Le comté de
For the hereditary chamberlains of Jerusalem, see L. de Mas Latrie, 'Le
fief de la Chamberlaine et les chambellans de Jérusalem', BEC, xlii (1882),
p.651. See also Cahen, Syrie du Nord, p.453.
3. For the hereditary constables and seneschals of Cyprus, see Du Cange,
5. For Guy, son of Ballian, see 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442;
Benedict XI, no. 161; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.233.
the result of the terms under which they were held. Though homage may have been owed for the offices themselves, there is no evidence that in Cyprus there were fiefs attached to the offices. The two best documented hereditary grand sergeanties in Syria, the chamberlainship of Jerusalem and the constableship of Tripoli, both seem to have had fiefs in land accompanying them. In such cases, when the fief became hereditary, so would the office. But in Cyprus, if there were no fiefs pertaining to the grand sergeanties, there would not have been the same pressure for them to become heritable.

From an analysis of the holders of the grand sergeanties in Cyprus it is possible to divide these offices into two groups. The seneschals and constables of Cyprus and, from the end of the thirteenth century, of Jerusalem were drawn from the higher ranks of the nobility and from members of the royal family.

At the end of the twelfth century the seneschal and constable were respectively members of the Rivet and Bethsan families. From 1236 until the end of the fourteenth century all known seneschals and constables of Cyprus were either descendants of John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, or members of the Lusignan family. The fourteenth-century constables and seneschals of Jerusalem were

1. The marshal did homage for the marshalcy to the constable. John of Ibelin, pp.31, 411, 413-14. There is no concrete evidence that the other officers did homage for their offices.

2. See Mas Latrie, 'Le fief de la Chamberlaine', pp.647-9; Richard, Le comté de Tripoli, pp.49-50.


4. The only constable who was not an Ibelin or Lusignan was Humphrey of Montfort (1326). He was titular lord of Beirut, being the descendant of Ballan of Ibelin, and also son of Hugh IV's half-brother. See below, pp.459-60.
nearly all members of the Lusignan family or closely related: thus Odo of Dampierre (constable from before 1328 – after 1340) was Hugh IV's brother-in-law, and Philip of Brunswick (constable 1360 – after 1363) Peter I's step-father.

The exceptions were a James of Bellin, constable of Jerusalem apparently in the 1360's and Hugh of La Baume, constable of Jerusalem or perhaps of Cyprus under James I. The seneschals were drawn from among the magnates, whereas elsewhere in the Latin East they were frequently knights of relatively humble origins. The other officers, the marshals, chamberlains and butlers, were mostly drawn from important knightly families which were not related by marriage to the Lusignans. In the thirteenth century members of the Antioch, Montolif, Soissons and Le Tor families were among the holders of these posts; in the fourteenth the grand sergeancies of Jerusalem and Cyprus were held by members of the Babin, La Baume, Mimars, Morf, Neувille, Nores, Plessia, Soissons and Viscount families, as well as by several members of the prolific Montolif family. James I's marshal and chamberlain of Armenia were John of Tiberias and John Babin. A few of the holders of grand sergeancies were members of less distinguished Cypriot families, for example Nicholas of Acrolissia, chamberlain

1. Leo of Lusignan, seneschal of Jerusalem under Peter II, was only distantly related to the royal branch of the family, and was also illegitimate. See Rüdt de Collegenberg, Rupenides, p.76, and see tables III(H2), VII(C).
2. See below, pp. 437-9, 440-41.
3. See Richard, Le comté de Tripoli, p.48; Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.192.
of Jerusalem under Peter II,¹ or foreigners such as Peter Malocello, chamberlain of Cyprus under Peter I.² The appointment of members and close relatives of the royal family to the posts of constable and seneschal is an indication of the prestige attached to the grand sergeancies and afforded their holders. Many members of knightly families were presumably given their offices as rewards and further responsibilities following services in the past; thus, for example, Hugh Martin had served Guy of Lusignan at Acre in the 1190's,³ Geoffrey Le Tor had twice been on diplomatic missions,⁴ Bartholomew of Montoliff and John Babin, chamberlain of Cyprus and marshal of Jerusalem under Hugh IV, had served the crown since the time of Henry II's conflict with Amaury of Tyre,⁵ and Raynald of Mimars and Hugh of La Baume had helped secure the accession of James I.⁶ Even though the marshal is said to have owed homage for his office to the constable,⁷ the choice of appointees seems to have lain with the king. Thomas of Montoliff and Raynald of Mimars, marshals of Cyprus appointed in 1324 and 1385, and Guy of La Baume, marshal of


2. See below, p.432.


5. See below, pp.431, 441.


7. See above, p.304 note 1.
Jerusalem in 1385, all appear to have been royal nominees. 1 It is not possible to show that the marshals were members of the constable's affinity before or after their appointment, though Raynard of Soissons, marshal in the reign of Hugh I, was the brother-in-law of the constable, Walter of Caesarea, 2 and Guy of La Baume, marshal of Jerusalem at the end of the fourteenth century was the brother of Hugh of La Baume, the constable of Jerusalem. 3

In his account of the duties of the seneschal, constable, marshal and chamberlain, John of Jaffa described at length their ceremonial functions on the day of the coronation and, in the case of the seneschal and chamberlain, at other formal crown-wearings, before giving an account of their normal duties. 4

According to John, the seneschal was responsible for all royal baillis and escrivains, except those of the royal household, and their financial returns; for provisioning castles, the castellans of which were under his command; for deputising for the king as president of the High Court if the king had not appointed a lieutenant; 5 for supervising the king's share of the spoils of war; and for the payments of assignations at the secréte; on occasion he could be a military commander, otherwise his place was by the king's side in battle. 6

1. 'Chronique d'Amadl', pp.402, 494.
3. See Leoníios Makhairas, i, para. 599.
4. John of Ibelin, pp.407-14, see also p.31; Florio Bustron, pp.284, 287.
5. Cases concerning the body, fief or honour of a feudatory could not be initiated before the seneschal except at royal command.
The responsibilities over internal defence, royal administration and finance and in the administration of justice would therefore appear to have been extensive, but it is difficult to illustrate the seneschals of Cyprus fulfilling these duties. Whereas individual seneschals are known to have commanded armies in the field, for example Baldwin of Ibelin in 1247 and 1248, it is not known how castellans were appointed or who was responsible for the provisioning of castles and the payment of their garrisons. In 1373 James of Lusignan, later James I, garrisoned and provisioned Kyrenia, and later, on the king's instructions, left Luke of Antaume there as castellan, but it would appear that James's role was dictated by the emergency rather than by any responsibilities he may have had by virtue of his office. There is no evidence from Cyprus for the seneschals participating in the administration of the royal revenues, either in their collection or in their disbursement as assignations. Though assignations were paid by the officers or farmers responsible for a particular source of royal revenue, they were also, and perhaps more normally, paid at the central financial office, the secréte, headed by the bailli of the secréte. In the fourteenth century it was to him that the escrivains of the cour des bourgeois rendered account, and through him that royal instructions

1. See below, p. 415.
5. 'Abrégé', p. 243.
were transmitted to the bailiffs throughout the island. The bailiff of the secrète would thus appear to have been in charge of this area of royal administration, though it is still possible that he himself was answerable to the seneschal. The role of the seneschal as president of the High Court in the absence of the king is similarly difficult to illustrate. Apart from John of Jaffa's assertion that he presided there, the legal writers are otherwise silent on this role. There is, however, some evidence that Baldwin of Ibelin was recognised as a legal expert. At the accession of a new king, the seneschal presided over the meeting of the High Court at which the vassals made a connaissance that the claimant to the throne was in fact the heir and, if necessary, determined who his regent should be. In 1324 and 1369, the only occasions for which details of the meeting of the High Court at a royal accession are preserved, the seneschal was not present and the vassals had to nominate one of their own number as acting-seneschal to take charge.

In 1324 and 1369, the only occasions for which details of the meeting of the High Court at a royal accession are preserved, the seneschal was not present and the vassals had to nominate one of their own number as acting-seneschal to take charge.

The duty to preside at the High Court at the time of a royal accession is the only function of the seneschal, other than the ceremonial duties at the coronation, which can be

1. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.199. In 1324 Hugh IV '... commandera a son balle della secrète que il laisse passer les Venessiens ...; et que enel commande as autres baillis dou royame jusque au commandement dou Roy'. In 1355 an otherwise unknown official, the 'bailly de la seignourie', seems to have been in charge of the provincial baillis. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.377.

2. For the bailli of the secrète and role of the secrète in the payment of money fiefs, see below, pp. 326-8, 385-7.

3. He was presumably the seneschal mentioned by Philip of Novara ('Livre', p.540) who was called on to give a legal opinion.

4. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.419-20; John of Ibelia, p.3. See below, p.418 note 2.
attested from Cypriot sources; the silence of the sources on the other duties described by John of Jaffa is not in itself evidence that the seneschals' actual responsibilities were slight, but it does tend to suggest that the duties were less extensive than he indicated.

The duties of the constable, as described by John of Jaffa, were basically those of commander-in-chief; when the king was on campaign the constable was under his direction, and he could be called upon to lead a campaign in person. He had powers over deciding who was summoned to perform military service, and jurisdiction over claims by mercenaries for pay and over all other military matters.¹ There are a number of instances on which constables of Cyprus can be seen acting as military commanders: Walter of Caesarea served under Hugh I in 1217 and commanded the Cypriots at Damietta;² Guy of Ibelin commanded the Cypriots on St. Louis's first crusade;³ Henry II brought Baldwin of Ibelin with an army to Acre in 1266 when a threat of force was needed to remove the king of Sicily's lieutenant, Odo Poilechien, from the castle there,⁴ and John of Lusignan, prince of Antioch, regularly accompanied Peter I on his campaigns,⁵ in 1365 was responsible for bringing the Cypriot army to Rhodes,⁶ and at the relief of Gorhigos in 1367 and again in 1373 was himself given command.⁷

---

1. John of Ibelin, pp.410-11, see also, pp.210, 212. See 'Livre au Rol', pp.615-16.
2. 'Eracles', ii, pp.322, 339-40 (ms. 'A').
3. See below, p.421.
4. 'Gestes', pp.792-3.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 167, 190, 200.
6. Phillip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, p.125; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 163.
7. William of Machaut, pp.136, 137-8, 146-72 passim; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 194, 378.
There is little evidence apart from that given by the legal treatises to show the extent of the constable's jurisdiction, though his control over the hiring of mercenaries was attested in 1369. 1 In 1367 his banier was selling the possessions of Guy of Ibelin, the late bishop of Limassol; it is not clear why he should have been entrusted with this task, but possibly he was taking a purveyance to supply the military activities which were particularly heavy in that year. 2 The marshal's duties were simply to assist and act as deputy for the constable in the organisation and command of the armed forces, and he had special responsibilities for horses. 3 Though it is not possible to illustrate the marshals of Cyprus exercising their jurisdiction, examples can be found of their participating in military campaigns: Simon of Montoliff died at the siege of Acre in 1291; 4 another marshal of Cyprus was reported to have been killed at Smyrna in 1345, 5 and John of Morf accompanied Peter I on his expeditions; 6

1. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.379.

2. Richard, 'Un évêque', pp.118, 127 note 6, 132, 133. Could Matthew of Plessia, on whose orders the banier was acting, be the constable's deputy? See Richard's discussion, p.127 note 6 and compare p.132. For the campaigns of 1387, see above, pp.192-3.

   The jurisdiction of the marshal and constable over military tribunals was normal in western Europe. See M.H. Keen, The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965), pp.26-8. The closeness of their spheres of responsibility may help explain why on occasion their offices were confused. See below, pp.423 note 5, 427.

4. 'Lignages', p.463.


6. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 163, 190, 200.
in 1369 John prince of Antioch, the regent, appointed John of Morf to lead a raid.  

The chamberlains duty was to administer the oath of homage, for which he received a fee. In the early years of the reign of Peter II this amounted to ten besants. It is necessary to distinguish the chamberlain from the official who from the mid-fourteenth century, if not earlier, controlled the financial office of the royal household, the chamber. The documentary sources for the second half of the fourteenth century normally differentiates the offices: thus Peter Malocello was 'cambellanus dicti nostri regni Chipri', whereas John Mounstry appears in the same documents of 1368 as 'camerarius noster'; in the 1390's Hodrade Provane was 'regni Cipri camerarius', and at the same

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 285. John is not known to have been marshal of Cyprus after 1364, but he probably continued in office. From 1365 he was count of Edessa, and is normally referred to by that title. See below, pp. 429, 469-70.

2. John of Ibelin, p.414. See James of Ibelin, p.454 variant, note 5. For the chamberlain's role in the amicable breaking of homage, see John of Ibelin, p.400.

3. Mas Latrié, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.425. Peter Malocello, the then chamberlain, received this sum from Maria of Bourbon, presumably when homage was done to the prince of Antioch as regent in 1369 and to Peter II at his coming of age in 1372; homage was performed by the vassals on both occasions. See John of Ibelin, p.5; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 323.

4. This distinction was noted in respect of Jerusalem by Rey. Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.629.

5. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, pp.139, 144. Compare Mas Latrié, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.291 where the impression is given, wrongly, that Peter Malocello was chamberlain of Jerusalem.

period James 'Solonan' was described as 'ordinatus super officio camere'.

Neither John of Jaffa nor any of the other legal writers described the duties of the butler, and it would appear that in Jerusalem the office had fallen into disuse by the end of the twelfth century. In the twelfth century the term 'placerna' was normal in the East, though the holder of the corresponding office in France was known at that time as the 'buticularius'. In Cyprus both Jerusalem and Cyprus are found from the early years of Hugh IV's reign, and so it is likely that the titles were introduced into the island at about the time of his accession, when perhaps the office was regarded as having been imported from the West and not as the revival of a long defunct institution from Jerusalem. The duties of the butlers of Cyprus are not known, and there is no indication that the office was other than a purely honorary position.

It is difficult to avoid the impression that the grand sergeancies in Cyprus were either sinecures or placed few demands on their holders. The seneschals may have had much of their work done for them by the secrète officials, and it

1. *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, ii, p.257. For other references to the controller of the financial office, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 157, 215, 625.

2. The last butler of Jerusalem is mentioned in 1186 and the last butler of Antioch in 1216. See *Reg. Hier.*, nos. 657, 888.


5. See below, pp. 433, 445.
may be significant that on the two known occasions in the fourteenth century when they should have presided at the High Court they were absent or the office was vacant. Though constables and marshals held military commands and went on campaigns, it is difficult to be certain that they would not have done so if they had not held those offices. For example, John prince of Antioch was the brother of Peter I and his lieutenant when he was in the West; he may have fought on his brother's campaigns because he was constable, but it is equally likely that he fought because after the king he was the greatest lord in the kingdom. Neither can we be certain that the chamberlain actually administered the oath of homage; he may have had a fee on every occasion homage was performed to the king, but there is no mention of his presence in 1309 at the meetings of the High Court at which Henry II refused to accept homage. The problem is that not enough is known about the structure of the royal administration or the tasks of those other officials, the baili of the secréte, the auditor, the admiral or the turcopoliier, who perhaps performed or shared the duties ascribed by John of Jaffa to the holders of the grand sergeancies.

If it is difficult to see the vassals who held the grand sergeancies of Cyprus at work, it is even more difficult to determine the functions of the Cypriot holders of the grand sergeancies of Jerusalem and Armenia in the fourteenth century. Their existence could be a pointer to the continued existence.

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 132, 214.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.302.
3. For these officials, see below, pp.319-31.
of the institutions of government of these kingdoms in Cyprus, though the extent to which those institutions may have been maintained is less easy to assess. Hugh IV, Peter I, Peter II and James I all had separate coronations as kings of Jerusalem.  

It might be asked whether after 1291 there continued to exist a separate High Court of Jerusalem in which the Jerusalemite grand sergeants played comparable roles to their Cypriot counterparts. The jurisdiction of the court would have been over those vassals who after 1291 still regarded themselves as knights of Acre and over the holders of the titular Jerusalemite lordships; possibly it would have had jurisdiction in Famagusta, where the fourteenth-century kings of Jerusalem were crowned until its capture by the Genoese, and where the cross of Jerusalem featured on the seal of the commerium and arsenal. There is however no direct evidence that High Courts of Jerusalem and Cyprus existed side by side in the fourteenth century. The only known functions of the grand sergeants of Jerusalem were the ceremonial duties at the coronation. It seems probable that in the fourteenth century these offices were filled at the time of the coronation and then allowed to remain vacant if the occupant died before the next royal accession. Peter I appointed men to fill all five sergeancies near the beginning of his reign, and


2. See above, p. 116.

3. See Richard, 'La situation juridique de Famagouste', pp.222-5. Richard does not discuss the possibility of the High Court of Jerusalem continuing in Famagusta.

4. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 104.
Peter II seems to have followed his example. The appearance of a new constable, marshal and butler of Jerusalem early in the reign of Hugh IV suggests that he also filled these offices at the time of his coronation.

Significantly, the only grand sergeant of Jerusalem who was definitely not appointed at the time of a coronation was Simon Tenoury, marshal of Jerusalem under Peter I and he was apparently appointed at the period when the king seriously hoped to recover Palestine. No grand sergeancies of Jerusalem are known from the period 1291–1324 except that of the constable, Amaury of Tyre; similarly no grant sergeants are known between 1343 and the end of Hugh IV's reign in 1359. If, as seems likely, the appointments were made at the coronation and allowed to remain vacant on the death of the appointee until the next coronation, the offices must have been purely ceremonial in function.

The problem of the extent to which the grand sergeancies of Cyprus were filled at the time of the coronation and then allowed to lapse is more complex.

It is possible that Aimery Rivet's appointment as seneschal coincided with Aimery of Lusignan's coronation, and that the appointment of Walter of Caesarea

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326. For Leontios's contradictory statements about the date of James of Lusignan's appointment as constable of Jerusalem, see below, pp.439–40. A Thomas of Montoliff appears as marshal of Jerusalem in 1374 and was probably appointed at the time of the coronation. See below, pp.442–3.

2. See below, pp. 437, 441, 445.

3. See below, pp.441–2. For a possible fresh appointment to the post of constable of Jerusalem in Peter I's reign, see below, p.439.

4. See below, p.437. He was appointed before the fall of Acre.

5. See below, p.414.
and Raynald of Solissons as constable and marshal coincided with Hugh I's
coronation. ¹ But it is almost certain that no appointments were made at the
time of Henry I's coronation in 1225, for despite the comparatively extensive
documentation of the following ten years, with the exception of Walter of
Caesarea who had been appointed constable before the end of 1210, no grand
sergeants are known in Cyprus until Ballian of Ibelin appears as constable in a
document of 1236.² As a minor or a regent other than a parent could not
make permanent grants of fiefs,³ and since there is some evidence that
appointments at coronations were for life, it is possible that it was held that
a minor or his regent could not appoint men to hold grand sergeancies at the
time of the coronation of a minor.⁴ By the 1240's, Henry I had filled the four
grand sergeancies known in the thirteenth century.⁵ The history of these offices
in the reigns of Hugh II and Hugh III is obscure, but Henry II is known to have
filled the posts of seneschal and constable of Cyprus following the deaths of their
former occupants.⁶ Hugh IV appointed his son Guy constable some time after
the death of Humphrey of Montfort, and seems to have appointed Baldwin of Nores

¹. They are first known with these positions in 1210. See below, pp.420, 425-6.
   Hugh came of age in that year but the date of his coronation is not known.

². See below, p.420.

³. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.186.

⁴. See Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 88. In thirteenth-century Jerusalem
   regents did appoint knights to grand sergeancies, but under what
   circumstances is not known.

⁵. See below, pp. 414-15, 420, 426, 430.

⁶. See below, pp. 415-17, 421-3.
marshal to succeed Thomas of Montoliff. 1 Peter I replaced Philip of Arsur, with whom he had quarrelled, with his own brother, James, as seneschal of Cyprus. 2 Philip of Arsur is the sole unmistakable example of a grand sergeant who was dismissed. On the other hand, the fourteenth-century kings of Cyprus seem to have filled vacant offices at their accession, 3 which suggests that the grand sergeants of Cyprus fulfilled their functions at the coronations and also that the posts could remain vacant at other times. If the posts were allowed to remain vacant, it can be assumed that they were not essential to the royal administration. The fact that posts were filled at times other than the coronation could have meant that a man was needed to discharge the duties which went with them, but it could indicate only that the king wished to reward his vassal with the title and perquisites of a sinecure. Perhaps by the late fourteenth century the grand sergeants were used as rewards, consisting like the titular lordships of grandiose titles which flattered their recipients without giving them the substance of power and responsibility, and which gave the crown a heightened sense of grandeur. 4

1. See below, pp.423, 428.

2. See below, pp.418, 455-6.

3. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.402, 494. Possibly Peter I appointed men to fill the vacant grand sergeancies before his coronation, though Leontios Makhairas, whose chronology for the early years of his reign is poor, would seem to indicate that the appointments were made almost a year later. See i, para. 100 and compare paras. 86 (which gives a probably erroneous date for his coronation) and 90.

4. For the use of titular lordships and grand sergeancies by James I, see above, pp.246-9.
Leontios Makhairas distinguished the grand sergeancies or 'offices of the kingdom' from other offices which he termed 'offices of Cyprus', and which included the posts of admiral, auditor, collector, turcopoliier and viscount. There existed a large group of posts other than the grand sergeancies which were normally held by vassals and which took care of various aspects of government and administration. The duties and importance of these offices varied. The kings or regents could appoint a lieutenant to govern on their behalf; Alice of Champagne appointed Philip of Ibelin as her deputy and then attempted to appoint Aimery Barlais; Peter I appointed his brother John to govern while he himself was in the West or was ill; Amaury of Tyre failed to persuade Henry II to appoint him his lieutenant in a manner which was to the general satisfaction. Other offices were concerned with the routine of local administration or the running of the royal household.

Two of the offices mentioned by Leontios Makhairas were concerned directly with military organisation. The earliest known admiral was Bohemond 'Rossia' (or 'Rossel'), mentioned as one of the knights who escorted Philip of Ibelin into exile in 1308; in 1310 he was described as Amaury of Tyre's marshal. In 1310 a mercenary knights, Novello of Argent, was described as the 'admiral of Famagusta'. The later admirals, unlike these two obscure

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 88.
2. See above, pp. 69-71.
3. See Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 132, 209, 214.
4. See above, pp. 128, 130, 141.
5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 275, 316.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 337.
figures, were normally men of important knightly families or had followed
distinguished careers. Early in the reign of Hugh IV, Hugh Beduin, formerly
the loyal supporter and trusted counsellor of Henry II, held this office. From
the reign of Peter I until the close of the fourteenth century, it is possible to
construct a list of successive admirals. John of Tyre was admiral by 1369
and seems to have held the post until his death in May 1368. At the
insistence of the Genoese who held him jointly responsible for an anti-Genoese
riot in 1364 and demanded his exile as a condition of peace, he was out of
Cyprus in 1366 and 1367, employed by the king as an ambassador to the West.
During his absence John Mounry acted in his place. John of Tyre was

1. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.150, 162; Diplomatarium Veneto-
Levantinum, i, p.214. For references to his earlier career, see
Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.705; 'Nouvelles preuves', BFC,
xxxiv (1873), p.63; John XXII, Lettres communes, nos. 14681, 16969;
'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 253, 264, 299, 338, 373, 390, 395, 397,
400, 401.

2. For his career till 1363, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.179;
Acta Urbania PP.V (1362-1370), ed. A.L. Tàutu (Città del Vaticano, 1964),
pp.45-6; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 127, 132, 143; 'Chronique
d'Amadi', p.410 (compare Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 104). For his
career after his return from exile and for his death, see Leontios Makhairas,
i, paras. 209, 220, 222.

3. For John's part in the quarrel with Genoa and his exile which followed the
attack on Alexandria in which he served, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras.
145-6, 154-5, 163, 171, 173-5, 209. See also Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre,
ii, p.263; Vitae paparum Avenionensium, i, p.357.

4. 'Monstri' is named as admiral in the account of the events of these years
given by William of Machaut (pp.114, 153 and see pp.120, 139, 145, 147,
151). For the possibility that Peter Mounry, mentioned by Leontios
Makhairas (i, paras. 177, 180) as active in naval affairs at that period
was the same man, see Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.117. Leontios Makhairas
(i, paras. 273, 283) names John Mounry as admiral in his account of the
year 1369, but he had probably ceased to hold the position by then.
succeeded as admiral by his son Peter who held the office by November 1366 and who died in October 1373. In that same month Guy of Minars, a veteran of Peter I's campaigns, is first described as admiral; captured by the Genoese in 1373, he seems to have remained in exile until at least 1383. Peter of Caffran, another exile in Genoa, was made admiral by James I and continued to hold that office until after 1391. The task of the admirals seems to have been to equip and organise ships for military purposes rather than acting as commander-in-chief at sea. In 1368 John of Tyre fitted out ships for a raiding party which John of La Colée commanded. In 1364 his responsibility for equipping the navy led to his clash with the Genoese: two Genoese nationals whom he had hired as sailors deserted and the dispute that followed arose over the question of his right to jurisdiction over them. Though the admiral was known to have been present on naval expeditions in 1362, 1364 and 1369, it is clear from the narrative accounts that he was not in command. But on occasion the admirals did take charge: an un-named admiral, perhaps Hugh

1. Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, no. 2875; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 341, and see paras. 131, 285.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 392, see H, pp.159-60. For his earlier career, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 163, 196, 333.

3. Speroee, Real Grandeza, p.136; 'Nouvelles preuves', BFC, xxxiv (1873), p.81; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 548.

4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494.

5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 220.


Beduin, cleared the seas of pirates in the reign of Hugh IV; 1 John of Tyre commanded a raid on Myra, 2 and John Mousy seems to have commanded a raid in 1366. 3

The other officer concerned with military organisation was the turcopoller.

The office is first recorded in 1306 when it was held by a John of Brie who subscribed two acts of Amaury of Tyre in that year. 4 Only two other turcopollers are known in the first half of the fourteenth century, Robert of Montgisard, a supporter of Henry II in his struggle with his brother, in 1316, 5 and Peter of Montolif, butler of Cyprus, in 1330. 6 By 1360 the turcopoller was

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 64. In 1322 Hugh Beduin had been in charge of the fleet sent to Armenia at the time of the fall of Ayas to the Mamlukes, but it is not known whether he was already admiral at that time. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.400.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 127. Florio Bustron (p.260) indicated that the commander was the turcopoller, but this is probably an error arising from the ambiguous phraseology of the 'Chronique d'Amadi' (p.412) or their common source.


4. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.42; 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442. Three Johns of Brie are known from the period. Of these John son of Bohemond and John lord of Paradhisi were subsequently supporters of Amaury, whereas John of Pistaki supported the king. See above, pp.18 note 1, 164 note 8. The turcopoller was presumably one of the supporters of Amaury but it is not clear which.

5. 'Nouvelles preuves', BFC, xxxiv (1873), pp.63-4. For his earlier career, see 'Processus Cypricus', p.159; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.269, 335, 362, 376. Presumably the Robert of Montgisard imprisoned in 1316 was a namesake. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.383. The turcopoller is last known in 1318. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.399.

6. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.161. For other references to him, see below, p.433.
James of Nores,¹ a distinguished servant of Peter I who is last known in 1372 when he helped frustrate a proposal to marry Peter II to a daughter of the Emperor John V because of his ambition that the king should marry one of his own daughters.² In 1375, following his timely return to Cyprus with a force of mercenaries, Thibaut Belfarage was made turcopoller and he held this office until his fall the following year,³ when yet another John of Brie succeeded him.⁴ John, a veteran of Peter I's campaigns,⁵ led the council of regency following Peter II's death and was still turcopoller in 1397.⁶ Though the turcopollers presumably commanded the force of turcopoles, it is clear that by the reign of Peter I their duties were far wider. James of Nores certainly had turcopoles at his command,⁷ but Thibaut Belfarage as turcopoller commanded the mercenaries that he himself had recruited in the West, and it would appear, though Leontios Makhairas is slightly ambiguous, that John of Brie inherited his


2. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 349. He presumably died soon after this as he is not mentioned in the accounts of the Genoese war and was certainly dead by 1383. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.771.

3. For Thibaut's career, see above, pp.229-30. For his appointment as turcopoller, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.482.

4. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 578.

5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 119, 133, 163, 190, 200.

6. For his career from 1376, see above, pp. 22, 231-2, 245. By 1403 Francis Carmadas was turcopoller. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.467.

7. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 123. For turcopoles in Cyprus, see above, pp.5-6.

8. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 127?
command over these men as well as the title of turcopolier. In 1365 there is a reference to the 'company' of James of Nores the turcopolier on the Alexandria campaign; James himself was not present as he had been left in charge in Cyprus, but whether his company was the force of turcopoles or a mercenary retinue, recruited like Thibaut's at his own expense, is not clear. In 1367 James participated in the relief of Cornigos and was sent back for reinforcements. In 1362 he had been present at the capture of Adalia, and was appointed its first governor by King Peter. The careers of the turcopoliers in the second half of the fourteenth century show that they were men of great importance in the kingdom: James of Nores, Thibaut Belfarage and John of Brie were all entrusted with diplomatic missions, and James and John both acted as regents of Cyprus. These turcopoliers were evidently military commanders of some importance, and, particularly in the cases of Thibaut and John, behaved as the most powerful men in Cypriot royal service.

It is possible to gain further insight into the duties and development of the offices of admiral and turcopolier by comparing them with the Hospitaller

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 578; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.481-2.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 163, see para. 162.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 123.
5. For James, see William of Machaut, pp.177-201; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 147, 193, 202-5, 214. For Thibaut, see Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 3012, 3066-7, 3090, 3092, 3109-10; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 3570, 3573. For John, see Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, II, p.180.
6. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 162, 599.
offices of the same names. The first Hospitaller admiral is known in 1299 and the following year the post was given the rank of conventual bailiff; he hired the crews and had command at sea and in port, though the marshal could exercise command if present in the fleet. The admirals of Cyprus can certainly be shown to have had responsibilities for hiring the crews, and it is noteworthy that in 1369 the marshal, John of Morf, commanded a naval raid in which the admiral, Peter of Tyre, participated. The Hospitaller turcopoliier first appears in 1203 and in 1303 was given the rank of conventual bailiff; he commanded the turcopoles under the overall command of the marshal. The proximity in time of the first appearance of the admiral and turcopoliier of Cyprus (1308 and 1306) with the promotion of their Hospitaller counterparts to the rank of conventual bailiffs (1300 and 1303) is striking, and it would appear that the changes in organisation of the command structure of the Order and of the kingdom, probably under the stimulus of the new political situation after 1291, ran parallel. The relationship between the Cypriot officers and the grand sergeants is difficult to establish, but as by the second half of the fourteenth century the admiral had charge of recruiting naval crews and the turcopoliier was an important mercenary commander, it would appear that some at least of the responsibilities for the mercenaries in the royal forces had been passed to them from the constable and marshal.

2. For example in 1364, See above, p.321.
4. Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, p.325.
The most important non-military 'officer of Cyprus' was probably the bailli of the secréte. The earliest reference to the secréte dates from 1231 when the office of bailli was held by Arnaud of Gibelet, but, as it would appear that the secréte was a survival from the period of Byzantine rule, it is likely that the office of bailli had been in continuous existence since the Latin conquest. After Arnaud, no bailli is known by name until Thomas of Piquigny, who is known to have held the office in 1306. James of Floury, who like Thomas had supported the king in the period 1306 - 1310, was bailli in 1315, but Thomas

1. The title was sometimes embellished: Philip of Novara ('Livre', p.511) speaks of the 'grand bailli'; in the late fourteenth century Renier of Scollar was 'secreto regis Cipri capitaneus et ballivus'. Mas Latrice, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.420. Compare his description of τοῦ τεταμένου τοῦ συνγριφτού by Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 599; 'capitano de la secreta'; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.490). It is nevertheless likely that Nicholas of Naoua described as τον κατεξελεύν μέγαν τοῦ συνγριφτού (Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 311) or 'maestro della cancellaria' ('Chronique d'Amadi', p.430) was not bailli of the secréte but was either a senior official at the secréte under the bailli or an official of the Chancery. For a contrary view, see R. de Mas Latrice's note to Diomedes Strambaldi, 'Chronica del Regno di Cipro', in Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi, ii, p.125.

2. 'Gestes', p.710.

3. Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 158) seems to have regarded the Frankish secréte as the successor to the similarly named Byzantine office, though it has been noted that instead of the Byzantine σπρετον Leontios uses the word σύνγριφτον. See Dawkin's glossary s.v. σύνγριφτον. Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.269. For the secréte in Jerusalem, see Riley-smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.58-61. For the activities of the secréte in Cyprus, see above, p.307-9; below, p.386-7.


5. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.64. For his earlier career, see 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.264, 299, 338, 374, 390.
had replaced him by 1316, and he continued in office until at least 1338.

Under Peter I the post was held by John Tenoury (1363) and then Nicholas 'Catellus' (1362). In 1372 the bailli of the secrète was Thomas of Montoliff, the auditor, and in 1383 the office was held by another Thomas of Montoliff, the marshal of Jerusalem. James I's baillis included John of Antioch, Renier of Scolar, and Thomas Mahé. The baillis of the secrète before 1400 were predominantly knights of prominent families, the exceptions being Nicholas 'Catellus' and Renier of Scolar; they had under them a staff of esrivainas or

3. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, II, p.64. For John see also Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.179; Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicossienses, p.80.
5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.396; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 849. For a discussion of the Thomases of Montoliff at this period in which it is argued that the auditor and marshal were separate persons, see below, p.442.
7. For Renier, see above, pp.247-8.
Secrets, and were themselves perhaps under the direction of the seneschal.

The secréte was the central office of royal finance at which the royal revenues and expenditures were accounted, where royal loans were contracted, where records of title to property, money fiefs and rights of restor were kept, and from which money fiefs and other types of annuity were paid. Physical control of the personnel and records of the secréte was essential for a ruler: hence Amaury of Tyre transferred it from the royal palace to his own residence in 1306 and it was transferred back in 1310. The bailli of the secréte was therefore a leading civil servant with extensive responsibilities.

Little is known of the collector (πρυτατος) who presumably was responsible for supervising the collection of taxes, except that in the 1370's the post was held by Nicholas Bill. It is possible that the same office was


2. See above, pp.308-9.


4. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.154; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 128. See also 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.369.

5. For the payment of money fiefs and the work of the secréte in respect of feudal properties, see below, pp.386-7.

6. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.249, 252, 346, 348. By the 1370's the secréte was apparently housed in a building of the same name. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para.454.

7. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 88, 445.

8. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 563, see ii, p.192.
held by John of Plessia named as 'balivus tallie' in 1329.¹

The earliest references to the auditor show him as a judicial officer with a court that could take cognisance of debts. Jean Richard has drawn attention to a reference to 1307 to a debt contracted by the countess of Jaffa 'scriptum ... ante auditorem',² and the remède of 1311 laid down provisions for debts contracted during the rule of Amaury of Tyre before the High Court, the secrète, the auditor or elsewhere; evidently the auditor's court was a court of record as there is mention here of an 'escrivain' and a 'cartulaire'.³

Though the office was in existence by the early years of the fourteenth century, the first auditor known to us by name is Thomas of Montolif, first mentioned with this title in 1355.⁴ Thomas as prominent in the service of Peter I and during the regency of the prince of Antioch, and is last mentioned in 1373.⁵

By 1378 he had been succeeded by John Gorap,⁶ who continued in office until

1. Mas Latré, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.158. For taxation, see above, pp.297-300.
5. See below, pp.446-7. In 1372 he was appointed butler of Jerusalem.
at least 1390. In 1395 Amaard of Soissons was auditor. Thomas of Montolif and John Gorap were both important figures in Cypriot politics during the second half of the fourteenth century, and it is difficult to know which of their recorded actions illustrate the duties of the auditor. It has been suggested that the post involved acting as a royal procurator in the High Court as Thomas of Montolif made formal requests there in 1369 and 1373 for the prince of Antioch and for Peter II. Although this tells us that Thomas was a senior and respected member of the High Court and a reliable pleader, it does not follow that he acted by virtue of his office. In 1355 Thomas was one of two knights given the task of dispensing justice in cases of theft of livestock in the Nicosia district and he was later engaged on a diplomatic mission, but it is unlikely that these responsibilities were part of his duties as auditor. However little is known about

1. Mas Latrîe, *Hist. de Chypre*, ii, p.420; *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, ii, p.219; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 599, 620. See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494. He was presumably the un-named auditor in 1383. Mas Latrîe, *Hist. de Chypre*, iii, p.771. For his title lord of Caesarea, see above, p.22. For his career before 1378, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 279-80, 290, 333, 395, 406-7, 563. For a John Gorap in the household of Guy of Della, bishop of Limassol, see Richard, 'Un évêque', p.133.

2. Mas Latrîe, *Hist. de Chypre*, ii, p.426. It is not clear whether he was the Arnold or Raynauld of Soissons taken prisoner by the Genoese. 'Nouvelles preuves', *BEC*, xxxiv (1873), p.82; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542, see also para. 190.


4. 'Bans et Ordonnances', pp.376-7, see also p.378. In all the other districts the local bailli was one of those appointed, but there is no evidence that the auditor had any particular jurisdiction in Nicosia and not elsewhere.

the competence of the auditor's court, its existence from the early fourteenth century is of importance since it provides the earliest indication of a departure from the thirteenth-century system of the High Court and Cour des bourgeois as the principal judicial tribunals for noble and non-noble Franks. 1

Before turning to the knights employed in the royal household or in provincial administration, there is one other post in the central government which was of significance. Until the mid-fourteenth century, the chancellors were drawn from the clergy, 2 but Peter I departed from this practice by appointing laymen educated in the West to this position: first Uomobuono of Mantua, 3 and then Philip of Mézières, a French knight celebrated as a crusading propagandist. 4 Philip continued to style himself chancellor of Cyprus until his death, though he never returned to the island after Peter I's murder. 5

It appears that his title remained undisputed, for no other chancellor is known during the reigns of Peter II or James I: in the 1370's Giacomo di San Michele

---

1. See Richard, 'La révolution de 1369', pp.121-2. Whether the auditor's jurisdiction extended beyond civil matters is not known. Perhaps the court's procedures followed Roman Civil Law, though none of the fourteenth-century auditors can be shown to have had formal training in Roman Law. Thomas of Montolif, however, seems to have been experienced in the procedure of the High Court: besides acting for the Prince of Antioch and King Peter II he was among the knights responsible for the official version of John of Jaffa's legal treatise in 1369. John of Ibelin, p.6. In 1373 Thomas was addressed as 'auditor generalis causarum'. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2073.

2. For chancellors of Cyprus to 1330, see Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, pp.674-5.

3. See above, p.185 note 3.

4. See above, p.186.

was named as vice-chancellor; Cdo Benedict and Manuel of Valente, both of whom were described as 'regis cancellarius', are thought to have been no more than chancery officials.

The role of liegemen in the running of the royal household and in the administration of the royal estates may have varied during the first two centuries of Lusignan rule, but it would appear that knights normally served the kings in these responsibilities. The bailli of the royal court ('Balio della corte del re', διομολής τῆς αὐλῆς) seems to have been the king's major domo; Leontios Makhairas recorded that Peter I held the bailli of the royal court responsible for failing to provide oil for the asparagus. In 1310 Raymond of La Baume was replaced in this post by Peter Isaac; in 1369 the occupant was John Gorap and in 1383 Thomas Barech. Under Hugh IV Baldwin of Nores held the post of 'marescalculus curie regalis' or 'marescalculus hospitii regii'. The king's chamberlain, the head of the household financial

1. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.781 note 1; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2073.

2. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.429; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, p.219. See Richard, 'Le royaume de Chypre et le Grand Schisme', p.505; Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.135. Philip of Mézières and his predecessors were normally described as 'regni cancellarius'. For an exception of the early thirteenth century, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.609.

3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 279, 280, 607; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.326.

4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 279.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.326.


7. See below, p.428.
office, seems normally to have been a burgess, though an exception was John Moustry who held the post under Peter I. The royal estates were apparently under an official described as the 'ballo dell' terreni de li casali', or as the 'ballo dell' casali del re'; little is known of the office except that in 1316 it passed from Peter of Gibelet to Ballian of Montgisard. The royal estates were commonly let out at farm; in 1367-1368 the farmers (apautours) of the royal estates seem mostly to have been non-nobles, though they included the lady of Arsur and Bartholomew Mahé as well as the Cistercian abbot of Beaulieu near Nicosia. The royal administration doubtless changed according to the requirements of the time, and it should not be supposed that all these offices existed throughout the period under consideration, though information is too scanty to provide any clear pattern of their development.

Local government as it affected the non-noble population was not unlike that of the kingdom of Jerusalem. The principle court was the cour des bourgeois comprising a body of jurors drawn from the Latin burgess population and presided over by a liege knight who had the title of viscount or bailli; it possessed both civil and criminal jurisdiction and had responsibilities for public

1. For references to this office and for a discussion of the distinction between the household official and the grand sergeant, see above, pp.312-313. John Moustry was described as a knight by Leontios Makhairas (I, para. 273), but he may have been of burgess origin. See above, p.196 note 8.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.312, 326.
order. In Jerusalem the terms visconte and bailli were interchangeable, but it is clear that in Cyprus in the fourteenth century a distinction was made. At the beginning of the century there were viscounts of Nicosia and Famagusta and perhaps of other centres, but the pattern subsequently emerged of a single viscount, that of Nicosia, and provincial baillis in Famagusta, Limassol, Paphos and Karpasia. These baillis were not concerned with the exploitation of the royal casals, but represented the king in the administration of justice.

From a procès-verbal of the early fifteenth century, it is clear that the castellan of Kyrenia was also president of the local cour des bourgeois. There is some evidence that at the time of the Genoese war the posts of bailli and castellan or

1. For a description of the cour des bourgeois dating from the reign of Hugh IV, see 'Abrégé', pp.236-44 and passim. For the cour des bourgeois in the kingdom of Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.85-7.

2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.85.

3. For the viscount of Famagusta, see 'Actes passés à Famagousta', no. 114; 'Gestes', p.866.

4. For the baillis of Famagusta, Limassol, Paphos and Karpasia ('Le Chief', 'Cavo de Sancto Andrea'), see 'Bans et Ordonnances', pp.377-8; Mas Latrue, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.170, 200; I libri commemori, ii, p.69; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2073; Leontios Makhiras, i, paras. 80-81, 146, 378, 386; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.265, 272, 439. Leontios Makhiras (i, paras. III, 332) mentioned viscounts in Famagusta in 1360 and 1372, but it is not clear whether he was referring to the viscount of Nicosia or the bailli of Famagusta.


6. For the bailli of Famagusta, see 'Abrégé', pp.323-4.

7. 'Nouvelles preuves', REC, xxxv (1874), pp.120-21. The document was drawn up in the presence '... capitanel et castelani castri et burchi Cerinarum (a member of the L'Engles family) ... et allorum dominorum consciolarorum et juratorum sue curte ...'.
captain of Famagusta were combined, though they were evidently separate at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Whether the captain of Karpasia mentioned in 1344 and 1373 was identical with the bailli is not clear. Two other judicial officers deserve notice: jurisdiction in commercial matters was in the hands of the bailli of the commerchium, and in minor disputes involving non-Latinos in those of the rays of the Syrians. While there is no direct evidence that the bailli of the commerchium was a knight, fourteenth-century evidence indicates that the rayses were liegemen. The viscounts of Nicosia were assisted by a muhtasib, and perhaps also by a bailli. Most of the


2. See 'Chronique d'Amadı', p.250.

3. John Dardel, pp.33-4; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 391. The 'vicar' (δικαστής) of Famagusta mentioned with the captain of Karpasia in 1373 could be either the bailli of Famagusta or the representative of the bishop. A captain (τζιβιλινος) of Polis (Khryskhou), Baldwin of Morf, is recorded in 1365. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 152. See also Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.205.

4. See Documenti sulle relazione delle città toscane, pp.123-4; Francesco Pegolotti, p.89. His office was probably similar to that of the bailli of the chaîne in Acre. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.91-2.

5. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.377; Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicosaleseae, pp.31, 64. For the rays of the Syrians in the kingdom of Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.89-91.


7. Evidence for separate offices of viscount and bailli is slender. Ferrand of Majorca mentioned that '... baillivus et vicoeomes civitatis Nicosase deposuerunt eum de equo ...'. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.201. Compare the reference of a few years later to the '... serjans dou balliu et dou viscompte de Nicsosale ...'. 'Compte du domain', p.19.
known viscounts, men such as Amaury of Remelles, ¹ Andrew of Nablus, ² Thomas of Luque, ³ Hugh Pilstiau ⁴ or John of Bay ⁵ in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, or Bartholomew Mahe ⁶ or John of Laron ⁷ later in the fourteenth century were members of little-known families; only Henry of Gibelet ⁸ and John of Neuville ⁹ played significant roles in Cypriot history. ¹⁰

1. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.357. For a John of La Ramelle, see Mas Latrie, L'ile de Chypre, p.342.


3. 'Bans et Ordonnances', p.359. For other members of this family, see Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 6225; 'Lignages', p.463.


7. 'A register of Santa Sophia', no.130.

8. See above, pp. 200-2, 227.
For other references to his career, see John of Beilin, p.6; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 161, 165, 167.

9. See above, pp. 231, 245.

10. Other known viscounts were Simon of Aguilliers (1310) ('Processus Cypricus', pp.163-4; see also John XXII, Lettres communes, nos. 7971-2, 9948; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 264), John Lombard (1310) ('Processus Cypricus', pp.387-3; see also Clement V, no. 2469; 'Gestes', p.871; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.323, 392-3), Elias Aleman (1329) (Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.158), John of Montolif (1363) (Urban V, Lettres communes, ed. M.-H. Laurent et al. (Paris, 1954- ), nos. 2353, 4166), and Peter of Floury (1397) (Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantium, ii, p.257; see also Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542).
The *baillis* and castellans were knights of moderate importance: in the fourteenth century Baldwin of Tyre (c.1336), 1 John of Soissons (1364), 2 and Hugh of Montolif (1373) 3 were *baillis* of Famagusta, Simon of Montolif (1368) 4 and a Lombard, Domenico of Montepulciano (1373), 5 *baillis* of Paphos and Philip of Novara (1368) *baillis* of Karpasia. 6 Fourteenth-century castellans of Kyrenia included John Ferrand (1306), 7 Montolif of Aretia and Peter of Gibelet (1310), 8 and Luke of Antlaume (1368, 1374 - after 1383). 9 The castellans of Famagusta included Philip and John of Erle (1293, 1310). 10 The greater the responsibility, the more important the knight charged with it.

1. I libri commemoriali, ii, p.69.


3. Gregory XI, *Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France*, no. 2073; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.446. See 'Nouvelles preuves', *BFC*, xxxv (1874), p.106; also Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 119, 163.

4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.265.

5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 378.

6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.272, see pp.365, 386.

7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.250.

8. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.344.

9. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 235, 512, 514, 517-18, 522, 533, 612. See also Chamberlayne, *Lacrimae Nicossienses*, p.23. Leontios gives various forms of his name: Δουκήτ, Διόνυ, Διούμεν, Δούλισσο, Διόμε,Δουκῆς (see also paras. 150, 200, 205, 583) and even Οὐνυκ (para. 235 see ii, p.129). Dawkins translates the name as either Leo or Luke, but it is probable that all the references relate to one individual.

10. 'Gestes', p.829; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.333-5.
This can be illustrated from an analysis of the captains of Adalia during the years 1361 - 1373 when it was under Cypriot control. Immediately after its capture in August 1361, Peter I appointed as captain the turcopoliere, James of Nores; in May 1362 James was replaced by the admiral, John of Tyre, who later that year was succeeded by John Carmain on John's death in 1363, his son, Ralf, was made captain. In September 1364, Luke of Antaume was given the command, and he remained there until 1367 when Thomas of Montolif of Kilrou took over. At an unknown date, evidently after June 1369, he was replaced by John of La Colée. In 1370 Eustace Passanto, a Genoese, was appointed, and he remained until the town's evacuation in May 1373. The early years of Cypriot rule when the turcopoliere, the admiral and then John Carmain, who had already served Peter I as an ambassador to the West, were...

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 123. For James, see above, pp.322-4.
2. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 127. For John of Tyre, see above, pp.326-27.
3. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 129, 132. For John Carmain, see above, p.186.
4. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 135, see para. 138.
5. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 150.
7. John of La Colée ceased to be captain in 1370, but was evidently not in office in June 1369 as he was then in Cypriot service on a naval raid. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 285, 317-18.
in command seems to have been the period when Adalia was most threatened. 

Subsequently, when the town was under less pressure, men of less distinguished station were appointed. Significantly, the only other captain who is known to have been important in royal service before his appointment was Thomas of Montolif who was given the captaincy following the garrison's mutiny of 1367. 

Beside the knights who held specific office, there were many who served the kings on an ad hoc basis as ambassadors or military commanders. These tasks were often shared with clerics and non-nobles. Some idea of the extent to which the knights performed them can be seen from the fact that between 1301 and 1350 at least fourteen knights are known to have travelled to the West, in particular to the papal court, as the ambassadors of the Cypriot authorities: John Lombard and John of Brie (1308),\(^1\) Simon of Carmardus (1311),\(^2\) Hugh Beduin (1314),\(^5\) Peter Le Jaune (1316),\(^6\) Bartholomew of Montolif (1317),\(^7\)

---

1. See Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 126-8, 132-4. An offensive in 1370, the only attack known after 1363, seems not to have been anticipated. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 317, see also para. 208.

2. For Thomas's career before 1367, see Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 119, 190. The only other captain of Adalia known in royal service before his appointment was John of La Colée. Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 220, 285.


5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 395.


7. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 399. See also Acta Ioannis XXII, p. 74.
John Le Tor and Simon of Aguilliers (1318), Peter of Montolif (1329),
Peter Le Jaune again (1332-1333), Guy Babin (1336), Thomas of Montolif
and Giles of Blanchegearde (1343), John Beduin (1344), Louis of Nores and
a certain Denis (1349), and Simon Le Petit (1350). This example serves to
underline the feature of Cypriot noble society demonstrated by the survey of
the various offices held by liegemena: the Cypriot nobility contained within
itself a large number of men who were prepared to accept responsibilities,
which were sometimes heavy, in royal service in excess of the formal
requirements of the feudal bond. Military commands and the senior posts in
what today would be termed the civil service and household service were filled
by royal vassals. The lower ranks of the bureaucracy were probably staffed by
Greeks, though the non-Latin administrative class is rarely glimpsed before the
late fourteenth century. Unfortunately, as the surviving evidence for the

3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p. 165; John XXII, Lettres communes,
nos. 60648-9, 60777.
4. Benedict XII, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, nos. 752-3.
5. Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, nos. 311, 422.
6. Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, no. 833 see nos. 360, 575.
7. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 83-4. See Clement VI, Lettres closes ...
autes que la France, nos. 2061, 2278. It cannot be inferred from the
chronicler that Denis was a member of the Nores family as have Dawkins
(Leontios Makhairas, ii, p. 87) and Hill (History of Cyprus, ii, p. 303).
8. I libri commemoriali, ii, p. 184; Clement VI, Lettres closes ... autres que
la France, no. 2288 see nos. 2299, 2300.
administrative classes in the thirteenth century is slender, it is not possible
to come to any conclusions as to the extent to which the Lusignans used the
former Byzantine administration and administrative expertise. With the
exception of the occupants of the traditional grand serjeanties, the feudatories
who held office under the crown were not as a rule members of the haute
noblesse; thus we do not find members of the Ibelin or Dampierre families
as viscounts of Nicosia or baillis of the secrète. For men of less prominent
families who were seeking a better career than that of a simple knight
dependent on an ancestral fief, royal service provided the most obvious answer.
The kings evidently looked to their vassals to serve them, and so far as is
known the vassals fulfilled the offices they received willingly and responsibly.

1. A Guy of Ibelin, however, seems to have been a castellan of Nicosia
castle in the early fourteenth century. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.399;
G. Schlumberger et al., Sigillographie de l'Orient latin (Paris, 1943),
p.157; Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, p.62.
Chapter 5

LEGAL PRIVILEGE AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

By entering into a feudal contract, the vassal acquired both obligations and rights. Those rights consisted of protection of person and possessions in the High Court, and, as all vassals owed liege homage to the crown, certain constitutional privileges. Above all, the tenure of and succession to fiefs was guaranteed by the lord, and, in theory at least, could only be interfered with after the High Court had judged that the vassal was guilty of a breach of faith or that another had a greater right. The king promised before he received homage to maintain the uses, customs and assises of the kingdom and protect the vassals' gifts and privileges in accordance with the judgements of the courts, and it was this promise which guaranteed the vassals' position. Philip of Novara, however, indicated that the king as chef seigneur was not totally the prisoner of feudal and legal convention; lords could and did intervene in the working of the courts to prevent the powerful using their position to deprive the weak of justice. Because of their underlying responsibility to see that justice was done, lords could stop the judicial procedures taking their course in the interests of equity, even though this could be to the detriment of their own liegemen. Philip claimed to have

1. John of Ibelin, pp.311-12, see pp.29-30. See above, pp.262-3.
seen this done often, but there are no examples surviving to illustrate
intervention of this type, and it is to be assumed that any lord who acted in
this manner would have had to be certain of the facts of the case lest he
precipitated a clash with his men. Though the obligation of the crown to see
that justice was done could supersede the obligation to abide by the procedure
of the courts, the right of a feudal lord to take action against the interests of
any of his vassals was dependent on the approval of his court. Ballian of Sidon
is reported to have indicated that lords at one time - he is apparently referring
to conditions in Jerusalem in the twelfth century - had acted summarily without
recourse to due judicial process against heiresses who married without
permission and their husbands,1 but the legal writers of the thirteenth century
make it clear that the lords had no right to pass final sentence affecting a
vassal or even to distrain him to answer charges without esgari of court.2

In Cyprus the vassals of the crown had the right to trial in the High
Court, and consequently their obligation to render consilium as expressed in
participation in its workings was of the utmost importance for them.3 In the
High Court it was the vassals who, under the presidency of the king or his
representative, passed judgement. A vassal who went to law in the High Court
was thus guaranteed a decision based on the opinions of his fellow vassals, his
peers. As feudal law was largely a matter of precedent, notions of self-interest

2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.142. For examples of distraint
dependent on esgarit of court, see Geoffrey Le Tor, pp.437-8; Philip of
Novara, 'Livre', p.559.
would have tended to draw the vassals together to dispense justice in a manner that was both equitable and in their best interests as a class. Even so, as the judgement rested on a majority decision of those present, it was possible to 'pack' the High Court; though all legemen had the right and the duty to attend, the quorum was only three, the president and two others. What the normal attendance was is not known, though presumably the more important or sensational the case, the greater the concourse. Because of the duties of consilium, and in particular the duties to pass judgement and act as consell, there was always a group of knights who practised in the working of the Court, and it was from this group that the legal writings of the thirteenth century emanated.

The 'school of feudal jurists' who produced the treatises on feudal law discussed the rights of the vassals in the context of the Assise sur la Ligece. It has recently been demonstrated that their interpretation of this assise 'had little correspondence to reality', and that its sanctions 'depended on the opposition of a weak king'. The two underlying assumptions of their interpretation, however, are important: first, infringement of a vassal's rights by the denial of justice or by arbitrary imprisonment, disseisin or exile on the

1. See Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.481.
2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.'31-2.
part of a lord or his agent meant that that lord was at fault; 1 secondly, the vassals had a sense of cohesion which could in theory be directed against a lord either by the withdrawal of services or by the forcible reversal of the lord's action. 2 The problem was that the jurists' sanctions were inadequate; the kings of Cyprus were too strong and the vassals' ability to act in concert not strong enough for them to be effective.

Originally the Assise sur la Ligue had been designed to strengthen the crown by creating a bond of liege homage between the king and the rear vassal, the intention of which was that the king could diminish the power of his tenants-in-chief by pre-empting the loyalty of their vassals. 3 By the jurists' interpretation, following the celebrated dispute between Aimery of Lusignan and Ralph of Tiberias, the purpose of the Assise was extended to provide sanctions that could be applied by the tenants-in-chief against the crown in the event of the arbitrary infringement of a vassal's rights. 4 It has been suggested that in Cyprus the effect of the Assise was entirely to the detriment of the power of the crown, for the absence of great lordships in the island meant that there were few rear vassals to whom the kings could appeal for help against the tenant-in-chief whereas there were plenty of tenants-in-chief who could benefit by using

2. For details, see Riley-Smith, 'The Assise Sur La Ligece', pp.182-3; Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.150-51.
the Assise to their advantage. This hypothesis breaks down on a number of grounds; the number of rear vassals in Cyprus must remain an open question, but there can be no doubt that under normal circumstances the crown was strong enough to resist the combined strength of the vassals and that usually, when constitutional or legal conflicts between crown and nobles arose, the sanctions described in the jurists' account of the Assise were not applied. We have seen that no vassal held a castle as part of his fief, and that, if the only quantitative example can be trusted, the royal income from land probably equalled and may well have far exceeded the total income of the nobles from their estates. The crown thus had the military and financial resources to overawe or render futile any attempt at a withdrawal of services or forcible rescelin; similarly in Jerusalem Richard Filangiari could frustrate John of Beirut's attempt to use the Assise in 1232. The supremacy of the royal resources when confronted by those of the vassals is best illustrated by the ease with which Amaury of Tyre defeated the moves of the royalists knights in 1308.

From the first two centuries of Lusignan rule in Cyprus there are a

2. See above, p. 261.
3. See above, pp. 14-15. Castellans were drawn from the ranks of the nobility. See above, p. 337.
6. See above, pp. 140-41.
number of recorded instances of a king or regent taking action against a
liegeman without esgard. The means of resistance to the crown on these
occasions and their effectiveness give an important insight into the strength
of the crown vis à vis that of the nobility and into the practical limitations
placed upon its privileges. On only two occasions were the sanctions of the
Assise sur la ligece even so much as threatened. Soon after the siege of
Kyrenia (June 1232 - April 1233), a knight named William Raymond, a member
of the Ibella party, wanted to claim the payment of the money fief which,
because of the financial strain of the civil war, had been allowed to fall into
arrears. Evidently arguing that the king's failure to pay was tantamount to
disseisin, William, abetted by John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, initiated
action on the basis of the Assise by conjuring his peers to stand by him in his
requests for payment in the High Court. It would appear that this was the
first use of the Assise in this way in Cyprus since the Cypriots were unsure
of the correct procedure. The precise outcome of the case is not recorded,
but it appears that King Henry gave in before the question of applying sanctions
was raised. The other case, that of Philip of Gibelet, was similar and
probably occurred at about the same time. His money fief was in arrears


1. The circumstances, natural disasters, pestilence or invasion by Muslims,
which excused the king the obligation to pay money fiefs did not apply on
this occasion. See Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.531.


4. John of Ibella, p.326. The case dated from the 'teus le roi Henri'.

2. Philip is also known from a document of 1232. Reg. Hier. no. 1049.
and after repeated requests was paid, though apparently only after his peers had threatened to withdraw services. In neither case were the sanctions described by the jurists as being applicable under the Assise put into effect, for the threat of their use was sufficient to coerce the king. But far from being notable victories over a strong king who had deliberately provoked a conflict, these successful applications of the Assise ring hollow. After the siege of Kyrenia, as the accounts of the case of William Raymond make clear, Henry I was in severe financial difficulties, and so was in a particularly weak position, and the fact that William's fief was in arrears seems to have been solely the result of the strain on the royal finances, and not consequent on any deliberate decision to dispossess him. The ability of the nobles to sustain a withdrawal of services or a forcible rescelina was not put to the test, and as the king seems to have rectified the arrears before they brought about a crisis of major proportions which could have caused a lasting breakdown of mutual trust between crown and vassals, the risk of individuals suffering royal displeasure placed no strain on the vassals' cohesion.

Before 1233 instance of the crown's arbitrary action seem to have passed without protest. Whether Aimer, who persuaded his vassals to return part of their fiefs 'que par force que par amors', seized lands without esgart is not known, but if there was opposition it was evidently ineffective, and Aimer's reputation, despite his quarrel with Ralph of Tiberias, stood high in the estimation of the legal writers of the third quarter of the thirteenth century.  

1. See above, p. 54.
2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p. 155.
Walter of Montbéliard claimed that in 1210 Hugh I 'sine judicio curiae a regno ejus ejectit, et sibi abstulit terram suam', though there is other evidence that he fled into exile and was not expelled, and that his daughter inherited his estates. Whatever the truth of the circumstances of his fall, there is no evidence that his peers in Cyprus stood by him or that he himself regained favour. Apart from the decisive action taken against Walter on his accession, little is known of Hugh I's attitude to his vassals' rights. The later thirteenth-century jurists omit any mention of him, and this might suggest that his reign was not a period in which noble privilege advanced at the expense of royal power. Hugh perhaps acted illegally towards Walter, and it is possible that he did so with the approval of his other vassals; but there is no doubt that in the 1220's the supporters of Philip of Ibelin, then effective governor of Cyprus, lynched, apparently with impunity, a knight who denied the legitimacy of Philip's rule. These examples might seem to indicate that in the first decades of Latin rule in Cyprus, the governament of the day took arbitrary action against the feudatories and met no considerable resistance. Even in the legal dispute over the Gibelet inheritance (between 1197 and 1205), the only Cypriot case recorded in the legal treatises which definitely pre-dated the Ibelin-Longobard war, the outcome was said to have been influenced by a bribe.

1. Innocent III, ccxvi, col. 466.
2. See above, pp. 60-61.
3. 'Eracles', ii, pp.361-2 (ms. 'A').
4. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.545-6. The case was heard after the death of Renier of Gibelet, last heard of in 1197 (Reg. Hier., no. 737), but before the death of King Almery (1205).
In the fourteenth century there are four recorded cases in which the king arguably acted unjustly towards a vassal, and from which the capacity of the vassals to act in defence of their peer in opposition to the king can be illustrated. In 1368 John Viscount died in prison, following a legal procedure which seems to show a lack of concern on the part of both king and vassals for justice. John was accused of making a false statement to the effect that the queen and the count of Edessa were lovers. There are two versions of what happened: according to William of Machaut, John made definite allegations against the queen,¹ whereas in the letter purporting to have been written by him, Leontios Makhairas indicated that John did no more than bring to the king's attention the current rumours, adding that he himself did not believe them.² William described how the king made preliminary enquiries and then brought John before the High Court where he offered to defend himself by battle; the court refused to accept that means of defence, though as the form of pleading is not known it is not clear whether it was right to do so,³ and condemned him. William indicated that the outcome was just, but that rumours of the affair were rise.⁴ Leontios gave a more circumstantial account of the case: the witnesses were bribed;⁵ the High Court seems not to have met formally, but the king's

1. William of Machaut, p.249.
3. For a discussion of the role of the High Court in determining whether cases of treason should proceed to combat, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.487-8; John of Belli, pp.155-7.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 245, 249.
council decided that it would be expedient if the king were assured that John was a liar; John had no opportunity for defence, but was immediately imprisoned.¹ Not only were the knights guilty of failing to ensure that their peer was given a proper trial and that the verdict was based on the evidence, but the king similarly failed to uphold justice, since, as Leontios made clear, he knew what the truth was² and yet did not exercise clemency as the knights had hoped or as a foreign noble had requested; instead he let John starve to death.³ Though William is strongly biased in favour of the king and Leontios against the queen, there is no evidence that one was any better informed than the other.⁴ William gives the impression that John was given a fair trial, but made no attempt to explain why a trusted vassal⁵ should make groundless accusations. On the other hand, if John did no more than draw the king's attention to current rumours, irrespective of whether those rumours were unfounded, condemnation as a traitor seems unjustified. It is difficult to avoid the inference that John was sacrificed by his peers in the hope that by so doing they would put an end to speculation and prevent further trouble, but in view of


2. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 259.


4. William's informant was Walter of Conflans who was in Cyprus at the time. See William of Machaut, p.254. The editor's suggestion (pp. xxiii-xxv, 288, 289) that he was ill informed is based solely on the assumption that Leontios Makhairas was accurate.

5. See Leontios Makhairas, I, paras. 104, 119, 214. William of Machaut (p.249) indicated that he had been in the West, and so it is possible that he had accompanied Peter I on his first visit.
the conflict of evidence it must remain uncertain whether the vassals and the
king allowed themselves to commit a singular act of injustice towards a
feudatory. Certainly the vassals showed no inclination to oppose the king.

As in the case of John Viscount, the sources for the case of John
Lascaris Calopheros fail to give an altogether satisfactory picture of what
happened, consisting as they do solely of papal letters reflecting only John's
version of events. Following the death of Peter I, John had been imprisoned
and his properties seized; released probably in 1372, he appealed to the pope
and secured a judgement at the papal court in his favour; by a series of letters
of 1374-1376 the pope endeavoured to have the judgement implemented, but
eventually it would appear that some form of composition was achieved. John
Lascaris, a Greek knight from Constantinople, had served Peter I with
distinction and had married Maria of Mimars, the widow of John of Soissons,
who then mortgaged her property to John 'by order and authority' of the High
Court — probably a piece of chicanery designed to disinherit Maria's children
by an earlier marriage. At some point in 1369 or 1370 Maria died and her
property was seized by her two daughters and their respective husbands.

1. Jacoby, 'Jean Lascaris Calopheros', pp.194-5. For further discussion,
see above, pp. 218-19.

2. Demetrios Cydones, I, pp.185-6, II, pp.419-24; Gregory XI, Lettres
secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 2990, 3609; Acta Gregorii PP.XI,


Leo of Lusignan and Baldwin of Nores, while John himself was imprisoned; Maria's son by her first marriage seems to have been a minor at the time, though he too ultimately shared in the spoils.\(^1\) John, as a vassal of the Cypriot crown, had various possible grounds for complaint. There is evidence that he was imprisoned and despoiled without judgement. It is true that the one surviving papal letter of the three that were written calling for his release from prison gives no hint that there had been any irregularity;\(^2\) rather it would appear that the initial papal intervention on John's behalf was simply in order to free him to continue his work of promoting the union of the Greek and Latin churches,\(^3\) but it was later alleged that he had been imprisoned and that his property had been seized 'violenter et contra iustitiam',\(^4\) and that he had been denied justice. The pope explained that John had come to him since Leo, Baldwin and their accomplices had no superior who '... facere velit et possit iustitiae completum',\(^5\) which could mean that his attempts to find redress in the High Court had been frustrated. Certainly it would seem that papal letters of June 1373 urging Peter II and the prince of Antioch to do justice were ignored,

---


4. *Acta Gregorii PP. XI*, p.242 (December 1374), compare p.122 (June 1373) where there is no reference to his imprisonment, but where it is stated that his property was seized 'per vim et violentiam'.

for in December 1374 the pope complained that the 'saeculares principes
illarum partium (i.e. Cyprus)' had made no moves in response to his
promptings. On the other hand, a letter of November 1374 refers to
sentences passed in Cyprus on John after the death of Peter I, and this could
indicate that the High Court had given judgement; had due judicial process been
followed at the time of his imprisonment and dispossession, any attempt to
recover his properties after his release would have been in vain as there was
no appellate jurisdiction in Cyprus which could reverse decisions of the High
Court. But it is arguable that the statement that 'quedam sententiae ... late
fuerint' does not imply that those sentences were imposed by extra. The papal
letters contain a further charge: that the king and the prince of Antioch consented
to the seizure of John's assets. As the seizure took place during Peter's
minority, the complicity of the prince of Antioch as regent is signified, and the
fact that the first explicit papal charge against the prince was not made until
late 1374 could be no more than an indication that the pope had previously
avoided antagonising him in the hope that he would make restitution. Thus
according to the papal letters which do little more than reflect the ex parte state-
ments of John himself, as there is no evidence that any defence was offered, the


2. Demetrius Cydones, i, p.185. Jacoby's theory ('Jean Lascaris Calophéros',
p.194) that the properties were seized and judgement against John secured
later is possible, though the evidence is far from conclusive.

3. Acta Gregorii PP. XI, p.246 (December 1374). Compare Demetrius Cydones,
i, p.184 (June 1373), where the pope accused Peter II or his agents of
seizing John's property.
Cypriot authorities either actively supported John's imprisonment and dispossesssion without judgement or had denied John access to the High Court to claim his rights. Though he seems to have enjoyed the support of the queen,¹ there is no evidence that any Cypriot vassal supported him, and it is likely that in the reaction against foreign knights which characterised the minority of Peter II,² the arbitrary disselion of a favourite of the late king, especially if indeed he had tried to deprive members of a distinguished old-established family of their inheritance, would have passed without objection.

The difficulty of having the version of events as recorded by only one party to a dispute reappears in the case of Ferrand of Majorca; here the only account of what happened is provided by a memorandum written by Ferrand himself for his half-brother, the king of Majorca.³ Ferrand was the grandson of Philip of Ibelin, Henry II's seneschal, and step-son of Hugh, count of Jaffa.⁴ In 1337 a dispensation was obtained for him to marry Eschiva, the daughter of King Hugh IV,⁵ and it would appear that he arrived in Cyprus late in 1339⁶ and

---

1. See above, pp. 219, 228.
2. See above, pp. 213-21.
5. Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 4833.
6. The pope commended Ferrand to Hugh in a letter of September 1339. Benedict XII, Lettres closes ... autres que la France, no. 2568. Earlier that year Ferrand had obtained various papal privileges. Benedict XII, Lettres communes, nos. 7088, 7330-32.
that he and Eschiva were married in 1340. 1 Apart from Ferrand's memorandum there is no information as to the causes or development of his dispute with King Hugh, though there are several pieces of independent evidence that a quarrel took place. 2 Ferrand's memorandum consists of a catalogue of wrongs inflicted on him and his household by the king or at the king's instigation. He gives the impression that he had in no way offended Hugh and though he had consistently tried to be conciliatory Hugh had continually harassed him. It is possible to suggest the reasons behind some of the royal actions: that the king was reluctant to ratify the arrangements for dower or pay Ferrand's money fief early in 1340 is perhaps explained by the fact that Ferrand had at that time still to do homage; 3 similarly it is possible that the king's objection to Ferrand's patronage of the Franciscans was connected with the suppression of the Fraticelli. 4 The chief charge laid against Ferrand, however, was treason, 5 but it is not clear whether this was well founded. The nature of the treachery, real or imagined, can only be guessed: possibly it was thought that Ferrand was hoping to gain the throne through his marriage, just as

1. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.185.
2. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.204-6; Beadlot XII, Lettres closes... autres que la France, nos. 3220-21. See also J. Zurita, Anales de la corona de Aragon, tom. vii, chapter 55 (vol. ii, fo. 148 of the Saragossa edition of 1610). Zurita's information appears to be based on that supplied by the letters published or noted by Mas Latrie.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.183-4, see p.190. Homage was performed at Advent.
4. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.185-8. Hugh condemned the Franciscans as 'paternal'.
James II of Aragon had hoped in the 1310's; 1 If Ferrand were plotting to become king, Hugh's evident fear that he was trying to kill him, 2 his idea that he and his wife were responsible for the deaths of two of his children, 3 and his attempt to cast doubt on the validity of his marriage 4 are understandable. Alternatively, it is possible that Ferrand was undermining Cypriot diplomacy. In 1338 Hugh had come to an agreement over outstanding differences with the Genoese; 5 an increase in the influence of the Catalans, Genoa's rivals in the western Mediterranean, on Cypriot policy could well have endangered this rapprochement at a time when Cyprus was pressed by the Turks and joint action against them was being planned; 6 By 1343 Cyprus and Genoa had quarrelled and the pope was restraining the Genoese from hostile acts. 7 Hugh seems to have restricted the Catalan merchant community, 8 though this may have been no more than reprisals for the actions of Catalan pirates in Cypriot waters, 9 and intercepted all correspondence between Ferrand and his relatives in Aragon.

2. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp. 188, 189, 190.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp. 188-9, 190.
7. Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, nos. 360, 575.
Majorca and Sicily. On the other hand, Hugh seems to have been equally insistent that Ferrand should not leave Cyprus; perhaps he feared the consequences if the Aragonese powers should find out the extent of the indignities to which he had subjected him. Included among Ferrand's charges against Hugh are a number which show the king possibly acting in breach of feudal convention: the dower and money fief were not paid, apparently even after Ferrand had done homage; his fief was confiscated and his chattels seized as well as those of his step-father; on one occasion Hugh attacked him and at least once incited others to murder him; he was separated from his wife, and his servants were harassed or imprisoned. By inciting Ferrand's death, Hugh would appear to have been in breach of faith; the forcible separation of a vassal from his wife is not specifically condemned by the jurists, but in view of their opposition to arbitrary imprisonment or exile would certainly appear to be contrary to their principles; probably the imprisonment of the servants of a feudatory was not regarded as a breach of

---

9. For another example of the forcible separation of husband and wife, see below, p.456.
faith, but in any case Ferrand does not make it clear whether they were put
on trial. The attitude of the vassals, however, is significant: they joined the
king in insulting Ferrand, but when Hugh tried to have him convicted of
treason in the High Court, they demurred. They seem not to have made any
other move on Ferrand's behalf, but on that occasion they clearly opposed the
royal will and would not pass a sentence which carried the death penalty. This
check from the vassals seems not to have stopped Hugh from continuing to
villify Ferrand, but it is nevertheless of importance as it shows that the High
Court was not necessarily subservient to the king.

The most important example of knightly opposition to royal breaches of
the feudal contract is the case of Henry of Gibelet which led directly to the
murder of King Peter I. The king imprisoned Henry and his son James without
judgement and attempted to disparage his daughter by marrying her to an artisan;
at the same time John Gorap was sentenced to death without reference to the High
Court on a trivial excuse. The knights were clearly disturbed by this attack
on their peers, and, reasoning that if the king could behave in this manner
towards the Gibelet family he might well treat other knights similarly, they
resolved to resist. The problem lay in knowing how to restrain the king;
first they tried to remind him of his coronation oath and pointed out that he had

3. William of Machaut, pp. 255-61; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 261-8, 279.
   For the wider issues surrounding Peter's murder, see above, pp. 200-207.
4. For the knights' response, see Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 268-78.
infringed it; since this only caused him to become angry, they swore together to support one another and resolved to force him to renew his oath; whether this expedient would have been successful is not known, for the knights then decided that the only way to stop the king effectively was by killing him. It is not clear whether at any point in their deliberations they were thinking in terms of the Assise sur la ligece: they undertook to support one another and they applied one of the sanctions provided by Assise by freeing Henry of Gibelet and his children and John Gorap from prison; there is no indication, however, that the injured parties had requested their help and offered to stand trial, and whereas the Assise carefully avoided the necessity of the knights' breaking faith with their lord, Leontios Makhairas indicated that they regarded their contract of homage as being at an end; by the terms of the Assise as explained by the jurists, they could not attack their lord in person in an attempt to release a peer wrongfully imprisoned; the murder of their lord was completely contrary to its spirit.

The murder of Peter I underlines the inability of the vassals to protect their interests in disputes with the king by judicial means. As in Jerusalem,

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 269.
2. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 270-72, 277.
3. Leontios Makhairas, 1, paras. 278, 280-81.
5. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.150.
7. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.150.
the machinery of resistance to the crown provided in the jurists' interpretation of the Assise sur la ligece was not practical. In the 1230's the Assise was made to work against a weak king, but at other times it would appear that the feudatories had neither the desire nor the capacity to apply it. When the king or regent victimised an unpopular vassal and especially when political circumstances dictated submission to the royal will, the vassals did not support their peer. Thus it would appear that they deliberately condemned John Viscount to appease the king, and made no attempt to assist John Lascaris Calopheros. Though they refused to condemn Ferrand of Majorca, only the count of Jaffa came to his aid. In 1369 they evidently believed that the only real alternatives were to allow the king to have his will or murder him. The reason they took decisive action then seems to have been determined by the fact that whereas they felt limited sympathy with foreigners such as Ferrand or John Lascaris, Henry of Gibelet's interests were undeniably bound up with their own. This raises the question of the extent to which the vassals were bound together: all owed liege homage to the king; when the duty to support him conflicted with their obligations towards their peer, it did not necessarily follow that the latter consideration triumphed. In 1368, when the vassals were debating the accusations of John Viscount, a chronicler put these words into the mouths of the knights:

And our king is one body with ourselves; he is an eagle and we are his wings; as the bird can do nothing apart from its wings, so the king can do nothing by himself without us, nor can we do anything without him.  

1. Leontios Makairas, i, para. 255.
They concluded that it would serve the common interests of both king and vassals if John were declared to be a liar, and so, on that occasion at least, the common ties that bound the vassals as peers and which formed the basic assumption behind the jurists' interpretation of the Assise sur la ligece were ignored.

The absence of effective restraints on the king meant that a vassal or group of vassals who regarded themselves as having been unjustly treated could seek redress only through violence as in 1369 or by appealing to an outside authority or arbiter. In 1271, when the vassals thought Hugh III was imposing undue military burdens on them, the parties agreed to allow the dispute to be heard by the Lord Edward,¹ although it is not known how much the eventual settlement owed to his opinion. From 1195 until 1247 Cyprus was a vassal state of the Western Empire,² but whereas the opponents of the Delias enlisted imperial support against what was arguably an illegal regime,³ there are no definite examples of legal appeals to the emperor from the Cypriot High Court. Walter of Montbéliard complained to Innocent III about his treatment,⁴ but whether he appealed to him as the guardian of the young Frederick II or as pope is not known. John Lascaris also appealed to the pope, and it has been seen that at about the same time the pope attempted to intervene on behalf of other vassals

---

1. See above, pp. 267-8.
2. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.48-9, 139.
3. See above, pp.82-3.
4. See above, pp.60, 349.
and former vassals of the crown as well; but there is no evidence that any king of Cyprus admitted the jurisdiction of the pope in matters relating to his feudal relationship with his vassals.

Whereas the breaches of feudal convention as described by the jurists seem to have been commonly accepted as breaches, it is clear that the remedies they prescribed were impractical. Their picture of a king limited by carefully defined legal procedures is misleading, for in practice royal power was more extensive than a reading of their descriptions of the Assise sur la ligece would indicate. Partly this power arose from the superior resources of the crown, but partly from the support given it by the vassals. Kings would break their feudal obligations with individual vassals if they were assured of the support of the bulk of their liegemen, and they could do this since for many vassals the desire to please and work with the king would in normal circumstances outweigh their feeling of loyalty to a peer. Despite the examples of arbitrary royal action against vassals, it would appear that normally the king enjoyed the trust of his men and that the history of relations between crown and knights was not that of continual tension. Though there were crises of confidence as in 1389 or, under very different circumstances, in 1306, these would seem to stand out as isolated cases. The mutual trust on which good relations depended must have required a common respect for rights and property, and so, though examples of arrest or dispossession without esgard can be found, it is likely that they were unusual and that normally the privileges of the vassals, as guaranteed by the ceremony of homage and the oaths taken by the king on his accession, were respected.

1. See above, p. 214.
Closely related to the legal guarantees afforded the vassals were certain constitutional rights. The feudal relationship between king and knight concerned not only land tenure, but also royal government. Just as the High Court had the duty to make esparg and conoissance in matters relating to the succession to fiefs or, in the event of a minor heir, to the bailliage, so it had the right to determine the heir of the 'chef seignor' and make provision when necessary for his minority. The conventions governing the succession to the throne were essentially similar to those for the succession to fiefs:¹ the eldest son of the late king inherited the throne; if there were no son, the eldest daughter; if no heir of the body the closest collateral heir. For a regency, rules similar to those for the bailliage of a fief² determined who should be regent: a surviving parent had priority; then the plus drott heir apparent; but whereas in the absence of a plus drott heir the lord held the bailliage, since there could be no superior in a royal minority, the vassals themselves elected a regent. The procedure at the accession of a new king was simple: the liegemen were assembled, and the claimant, or his counsel, explained his claim to be heir; the liegemen withdrew, and after due deliberation announced their conoissance recognising the claimant's right; the royal oath at the accession was then sworn and homage performed.³ In a minority it was necessary also

1. For the rules of succession to fiefs, see below, pp. 380-83.
2. See above, pp. 292-3.
3. James of Ibelin, pp.453-4. For the procedure at the accession of Hugh IV, see 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.419-22.
to establish who should be regent, and later, when the king reached majority, that he was of age; the best examples of these procedures are given in the accounts of the accession and majority of Peter II in 1269 and 1271.

In practice the role of the vassals at the accession of a king or during a minority could be of great significance, as on a number of occasions there were disputes or uncertainties over who should be king or regent. On only two occasions before 1400, in 1265 at the accession of the short-lived John I, and in 1398 at the accession of King Janus, did a son who had himself already reached his majority mount the throne. Hugh I, Henry I, Hugh II, Peter II and perhaps Henry II were minors at their accession. Guy of Lusignan, Hugh II, John I, Henry II and Peter II all died without an heir of the body, and the accessions of Hugh III, Hugh IV, Peter I and James I were disputed.

The earliest dynastic crisis in Cyprus occurred on the death of Guy of Lusignan. Guy had designated his brother Geoffrey to succeed him, but Geoffrey, who was not in Cyprus at the time, would not come to claim the lordship.

1. John of Ibelin, pp.3-5; Leontios Makairas, I, paras. 282, 318-23.
2. 'Gestes', p.791.
3. According to an unsupported statement by L. de Mas Latrie ('Généalogie des rois de Chypre de la famille de Lusignan', Archivio Veneto, xxl (1881), p.321), Henry was born in 1271, in which case he may have been fourteen at the time of his accession in May 1285. 'Gestes', p.792. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.179. Nothing is known of any regency.
4. 'Etacles', ii, p.192 (ms. 'A'), pp.203, 211 (ms. 'D'). It is not clear whether Geoffrey had returned to the West by the time of Guy's death; he is first known back in Europe in 1106. See Painter, 'The Lords of Lusignan', p.42.
Frustrated in their attempts to follow Guy's intention, 'claus de l'Isle de Chypre esleurent Heymeri'.  

Strictly speaking, as both Geoffrey and Aimery were older than Guy, they had no rights to Guy's feudal eritage.  

In the absence of an heir of the body or a collateral heir, the Cypriots were electing the nearest suitable relation to their previous lord to claim the lordship.  

All disputed claims to the throne concerned people who could trace their descent from a previous king. In 1267 Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan was challenged by his cousin, Hugh of Brienne, both of whom were in the same degree of relationship to the previous king. Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan had already been accepted as King Hugh II's heir when he had been given the regency in 1261, and the outcome of the cousins' dispute in 1264 over the regency of Jerusalem would have reinforced his case. However clear the issue may have seemed, a chronicler thought it necessary to make the point that Hugh of Brienne departed leaving his opponent 'saissi et tenant par esgarl de court'; the decision in the dispute lay with the feudatories. The disputes in the fourteenth century similarly were argued from the point of view of the degree of relationship to the previous king, but it seems that frequently legal principle was adapted to favour the more suitable candidate.

1. 'Eracles', ii, p.203 (ms. 'D').

2. The chroniclers speak of Cyprus 'escheating' to Aimery ('Eracles', ii, p.189 (ms. 'C'), 'G'), p.209 (ms. 'A'); Ernoul, p.287), but the term is probably not used precisely. See 'Abrége', p.284.

3. For evidence that Aimery made a claim, see 'Eracles', ii, p.209 (ms. 'A').


5. 'Gestes', p.769.
The most striking example of the way in which the High Court was prepared to allow considerations of suitability to override strict application of the laws of succession is provided by the accession of King Hugh IV in 1324. Henry II died on the night of 30 March and the next morning his nephew, Hugh, constable of Cyprus, was appointed 'guardian' of the kingdom. On 2 April the High Court was summoned to recognise Hugh as king and he was crowned later that month. The detailed account of the hearing of 2 April, and in particular, of the speech of Hugh's counsel, Bartholomew of Montoliff, is of paramount importance for the constitutional history of Cyprus. In several respects the hearing proceeded as might be expected: Bartholomew explained that the king was dead, why Hugh was his nearest heir, that Hugh was prepared to show proof of the relationship between Henry and himself, and that he was prepared to swear the customary oaths; formal connaissance of Hugh's right was then given subject to the provision of proof of parentage which was then furnished; Hugh swore the oath to the vassals, and then he was invested with the kingdom and homage was performed. The vassals gave Hugh formal recognition at a meeting of the High Court, but only after accepting, apparently without question, an extraordinary exposition of his claim to be Henry's nearest heir. Hugh was the son of Guy of Lusignan, one of Henry's brothers, who had died several

1. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.419; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.401-2.
2. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.419-22.
3. For the procedure which was presumably followed, see Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.492; John of Delia, pp.112-13.
4. For this procedure, see above, pp. 262-3.
years earlier. 1 Henry had no children, but was survived by two of his sisters, Alice and Helvis, the one the widow of the prince of Galilee, the other apparently a spinster. 2 By the normal rules of inheritance a brother or sister was one degree closer to the last in seisin than a nephew, so arguably Henry's sisters had priority over Hugh. Bartholomew, however, dismissed this as being the view of 'aucunes simples gens', 3 and proceeded to explain that the rules of inheritance for the crown of Jerusalem and Cyprus were not the same as those for fiefs. Three precedents were adduced to support this view: in 1185 Baldwin V had succeeded his uncle, Baldwin IV, although his uncle was survived by his two sisters; in 1261 Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan was given the bailliage of Cyprus in preference to his mother and his cousin, and in 1269, as Hugh III, he had been accepted as king of Jerusalem even though Maria of Antioch was closer by one degree to the last in seisin. Bartholomew's conclusion was that male heirs to the throne should take precedence over females even if the females were in a closer relationship to the previous king. But whereas his first precedent had certain points in its favour, 4 his others show either that he deliberately distorted the documents at his disposal, or that he failed to understand them. It appears that he was basing his remarks on the accounts of the pleading in the 1264 bailliage dispute and the 1269 dispute for the throne of

1. 'Gestes', pp.856-7. 3 \text{ La successibilité}. 2. \text{ Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.699; John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 7538; John of Ibelin, p.3; 'Formules', p.383; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.320. See 'Lignages', p.444.}

3. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.420.

4. There was an added complication in that Baldwin V was crowned in his father's life-time. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.107.
Jerusalem. It is explicitly stated that in 1261 Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan held the bailliage of Cyprus saving the rights of his mother who had waived them for his benefit, and that Hugh of Briene had not claimed the bailliage at that time; if Isabella, Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan's mother, had claimed the bailliage of Cyprus unsuccessfully in 1261, it is surprising that she should have been accepted in Jerusalem in 1263. In 1260 Maria conducted her case badly, and Hugh his dishonestly; though Bartholomew's conclusion is understandable, the legal principle which he maintained was upheld in 1269 was then unknown; he appears to have formed it himself in his attempt to rationalise the erroneous treatment of the law of succession preserved in the account of the pleading on that occasion. Alice and Helvis were apparently not represented and made no counter claim. Perhaps the proceedings were rushed through before they could prepare their arguments, but it is likely that neither wished to rule and were content to let their nephew ascend the throne, especially since, as in 1269, a young king was probably preferable to a middle-aged, unmarried queen.

Before turning to the effect of the connaissance of 1324 on a later fourteenth-century dispute, the possible claims of Hugh's cousin, Guy son of Amaury of Tyre, should be mentioned. John Dardel, writing towards the end of the century, asserted that Henry II had named Amaury's eldest son, Hugh, as

1. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp. 401-19.
2. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p. 406, see p. 408.
4. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp. 221-2.
his heir, and that the only reason Hugh IV was chosen in 1324 was that none of Amaury's sons were in Cyprus at that time. 1 Hugh, son of Amaury, had been killed about 1323, and so the senior member of that branch of the family would have been Guy, later, as Constantine II, king of Armenia. 2 It is not clear how strong Guy's claim would have been in law, 3 but the Cypriot vassals, many of whom had supported Henry against Amaury, would have had good reason to exclude him from the throne. The fear of an attempted return by the descendants of Amaury may have led King Hugh to secure his position still further in 1325 by disinheritting the heirs of the Kormakiti rebels. 4 It is possible that the awareness of the claims of Amaury's sons may have led to the speedy recognition of Hugh as king before the news of Henry's death could have reached them, 5 and also that Hugh was preferred to his aunts partly because Alice, who seems to have been older than Helvis, 6 as the widow of Amaury's leading supporter, Ballian of Galilee, might have favoured Amaury's branch of the family.


3. Amaury was older than Hugh IV's father, but it is not certain whether Hugh IV was older than Guy, and so the theoretical outcome of a dispute following the precedent of 1264 cannot be known.

4. See above, p.170.

5. Guy had been living in Constantinople since 1318. See Binon, 'Guy d'Arménie', p.126 see pp.132-4. His surviving brothers were apparently in Rhodes in 1324. John Dardel, p.19.

6. The only evidence for Alice's seniority is the fact that she is mentioned before her sister in the 'Lignages' (p.444).
The connaissance of 1324 was the first occasion on which the principle that the rules for the transmission of the crown were not the same as those for the transmission of fiefs was asserted. Nowhere do the jurists of the thirteenth century hint that this was so, and in 1264 the protagonists for the bailliage of Jerusalem had been content to argue from precedents concerning the inheritance of fiefs. The decision of 1324 clearly affected the succession on the death of Peter II in 1382. The vassals chose Peter's uncle, James I, to succeed and not his sister, Margaret; since a sister was a closer relation than an uncle, it would appear that the principle established in 1324 was upheld. James's accession, however, did not command universal approval: he was in exile at Genoa at the time of Peter's death and the terms for his release were harsh; during the delay caused by the negotiations a knight, Perot of Montolif, supported by his brother Wilmot, tried to gain the kingdom for himself. First he is reported to have urged Peter's widow, who was said to be in love with him, to seize power. He then seems to have revived the principle rejected in 1324 and argued that Peter's heir was his sister. Margaret was unmarried, and Perot's scheme was evidently to marry her himself and rule as king-consort. He almost succeeded, but the partisans of James regained the initiative and the

Montolif brothers were eventually executed. The choice of successor to Peter II clearly rested with the feudatories, and it would seem that on that occasion they were prepared to base their choice on whichever legal principles would support the more popular candidate.

The issues in the disputed accession of King Peter I again concern closeness to the last in seisin of the kingdom. Hugh IV had four sons who lived to maturity, Guy, Peter I, John, prince of Antioch, and James, later James I. In 1330 Guy married Maria of Bourbon, a descendant of St. Louis. He died in 1343 leaving a son, Hugh, who after his father's death seems to have lived in the West. On Hugh IV's death in October 1359, Peter, his second son, mounted the throne. The following year, when his ambassadors arrived at the papal court to announce his accession, Hugh, Peter's nephew, disputed his right, alleging that his parents' marriage agreement included a clause stating that even if his father predeceased his grandfather, he should

1. For details, see Leontios Makairas, i, paras. 603-11.


3. See Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, nos. 422-3.

4. See Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, no. 825.

5. On the basis of Leontios Makairas's statement (i, para. 86) that Peter was crowned on 24 November 1358 in Hugh's lifetime, it has been assumed that Hugh IV abdicated in his favour. Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp. 162-4; Hill, History of Cyprus, II, pp.304, 308. Leontios Makairas then states (i, para. 90) that he was crowned king of Cyprus on Sunday, 24 November 1359, i.e. six weeks after Hugh's death. Since Leontios admits that his evidence is conflicting and since 24 November 1359 was indeed a Sunday, the latter date seems preferable, and so the abdication of King Hugh can be rejected.
Inherit the throne. The ambassadors argued on the basis of the assises that, by analogy with the rules of succession to fiefs, the son as a closer relative inherited in preference to a grandson. The pope rejected this defence and Peter was told to make his reply.¹ Hugh was supported by the king of France and Pope Innocent VI who was sufficiently impressed by him to appoint him Senator of Rome.² Roman law principles and opinion in the West favoured him: indeed, in 1377 Edward III of England was succeeded by his grandson instead of by his younger son. The assertion that his parents' marriage contract had foreseen the eventuality of such a dispute, however, is at odds with the surviving text of the contract.³ On the other hand, Peter had been crowned twice, as king of both Cyprus and Jerusalem, and on the latter occasion the papal legate had officiated.⁴ Furthermore he was supported by the Cypriot knights. The Cypriots' attitude is significant: according to Leontios Makhairas they recognised the justice of Hugh's case, but far from turning against Peter,

¹ Annales Ecclesiastici, 1360 paras. 12-16; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 102, 105-7. See Chronographia Regum Francorum, i, p.276. Leontios's dates for this and a subsequent embassy are impossible. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, p.117 note 4.


³ See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.309.

⁴ Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 90, 104; Phillip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, pp.91-2. For Matis of Bourbon's consequent animosity towards the legate, see Phillip of Mézières, op. cit., p.94.
urged him to offer a financial settlement. 1 Presumably they accepted Hugh on the grounds of the alleged clause in the marriage contract, since the speech of the ambassadors to the pope in 1360 had shown that the principle of the closest heir to the last in seisin would otherwise have been regarded as applicable. 2 In 1361 the Cypriot ambassadors, John of Morf and Thomas of Montolif, negotiated a settlement, and John betrothed his daughter to Hugh and received a pension from his supporter, the king of France. 3 Evidently the arrangement still required ratification, as Hugh seems to have attempted to obtain more favourable terms; in 1362 Peter confirmed the settlement when he arrived in Avignon on his first visit to the West. 4 The vassals had accepted Peter as king, but instead of insisting on his legitimacy, they supported him by counselling him to come to terms. Peter was presumably more attractive to the Cypriot vassals than Hugh who had lived most of his life in the West, but just as a lord could not force a vassal who already had seisin of a fief by esgant to give way to another who was a closer heir of the previous holder, 5

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 108.
2. Assuming that the vassals accepted the alleged clause, the argument from feudal convention would have been inadmissible. John of Bellin (p. 183) gives the dictum, 'Covenant vaino let'.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p. 741; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 108. For Hugh's apanage in Cyprus, see above, pp. 186-81.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 129, 131. Peter was said to have been summoned to the West specifically for that purpose, but it is clear from papal letters written at about the time of his departure that the pope had accepted the principle of the settlement. See Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 119, 120.
so the vassals on this occasion seem not to have contemplated custing the
king to whom they had given homage when confronted with a claimant with a
better right to the throne.

There were fewer disputes over who should hold the regency in a
minority. It was accepted that the surviving parent had the first claim: thus
Alice of Champagne was regent during Henry I's minority (1218-1232) and
Plaisance of Antioch during that of Hugh II until her death in 1261.¹ Peter II's
mother, Eleanor of Aragon, however was excluded.² If there was no surviving
parent, the plus droit heir apparent had the regency, but here the pattern was
less distinct: in 1205, Hugh I's closest heir was his sister, Bourgogne, but it
was her husband, Walter of Montbéliard, who held the title of bailli;³ in 1261
Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan held the regency only because his mother, who was a
closer heir, waived her rights to it;⁴ in 1369 John, prince of Antioch, was
Peter II's closest heir, but Peter's mother was still alive.⁵ The idea applied
in 1205 that if a married woman stood to hold the regency her husband should
exercise it, seems to have remained current: there is evidence that in 1218
Alice only appointed Phillip of Ibelin her lieutenant until she should marry again
when her husband would take control,⁶ and that in the 1250's Plaisance of

1. 'Nouvelles preuves', BÉG, xxxiv (1873), p.55; 'Documents relatifs à la

2. See above, p.222.

3. Innocent III, ccxxv, cols. 829-30; 'Eracles', ii, pp.305, 315-16 (ms. 'A').


5. See above, p.222.

6. See above, p.69.
Antioch's husband, Ballian of Arsuf, had taken over the government of the kingdom. 1

The vassals had to give *connoissance* as to who should hold the regency, 2 and if necessary choose one of their own number to fill the post. Though vassal regents were frequent in thirteenth-century Jerusalem, 3 the only clear Cypriot example dates from 1362 when the feudatories chose John of Brie to be governor (κουβερνούμενος) of the kingdom for the duration of the interregnum caused by James I's delay in returning to the East. 4 The term 'governor' (gubernator) was used interchangeably with 'bailli' in the fourteenth century, 5 but John himself used the title of 'lieutenant seneschal'. 6 Perhaps its use indicates that he was regarded as having limited executive power beyond that of


2. This can only be illustrated for 1218 and 1369. 'Eracles', ii, pp.360-61 (ms. 'A'); 'Gestes', p.670; John of Ibelin, pp.3-5.

3. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.318.

4. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 599.

5. The prince of Antioch was described as *gubernator* by the pope. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, p.156; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes... autres que la France, nos. 259, 518; Acta Gregorii PP. XI, pp.42, 45. See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.427. He is described in other sources as bailli. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.425; 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxv (1874), p.105; John of Ibelin, pp.4-6.

convening the High Court, but it should be remembered that the king-elect had himself been seneschal of Cyprus and so perhaps John used the term to stress the fact that he was his deputy.

Regencies were normally caused by minorities, though in 1382 the king was of age but had not yet come to Cyprus. In 1306 the presence of a king who was inefficient and ill resulted in a species of regency, though the established legal procedure was not followed. Amaury of Tyre was Henry II's heir and took the title of governor, but he was not formally recognised at a meeting of the High Court, and, if the king's incapacity meant that he was being regarded as a minor, his mother rather than his brother should have held the regency. Subsequently Amaury tried to persuade Henry to confirm him in office by appointing him his lieutenant for life, but though Henry acceded to his demands under duress, it was always clear that he opposed him and so Amaury never exercised power to everyone's satisfaction. In the confusion following Amaury's murder in 1310, Aimer of Lusignan was elected governor by his supporters, but he failed to gain control of the island; Aygue of Bethsan was made Henry's lieutenant in the island, together with the Hospitaller Commander of Cyprus, but the initiative for his authority came from the vassals and burgesses rather than from the king.

1. For the powers of a vassal regent in Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp. 190-91.
2. See below, p. 418.
3. See above, pp. 128, 130, 141, 143.
4. See above, p. 151.
5. See above, pp. 153-4.
Throughout the first two centuries of Lusignan rule the kings and regents of Cyprus depended on the initial recognition of their vassals. With the exception of Amaury of Tyre, no king or regent sought to rule without first seeking the connaissance of the High Court and without swearing to maintain the assises and receiving homage. The only occasion on which the legal formalities were not followed was the crisis of 1306-1310 and then there was continuous tension within the ruling class. On no occasion did the High Court refuse to recognise a claimant to the throne, but when there was more than one candidate it had the power to choose between them. Of the disputes concerning the throne, only those of 1267 and 1359 had any long-term effect. The Brienne claim is last heard of in the early fourteenth century, but it is unlikely to have had any influence on the internal politics of Cyprus after Hugh of Brienne's departure from the East in the late 1260's.\(^1\) Hugh of Lusignan's claim may have had more far reaching effects: allegedly the Genoese were able to use his rights to persuade his father-in-law to betray Famagusta,\(^2\) and, according to Jean Froissart, his claim and that of his heir, who was not a blood-relative of the Lusignan's, conditioned the diplomatic relations between Cyprus and France in the reign of James I.\(^3\) Once having accepted a man as king, the vassals did not normally oppose him, though they expected their legal privileges to be respected. There is no indication that they exacted additional rights as

---

1. See above, pp.107-9. Hugh seems to have been in the West by July 1269. *Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne*, no. 186.
2. Leontios Makikalas, i, paras. 409-12.
3. Jean Froissart, xvi, pp.31-2, 34.
the price of recognition or took advantage of disputed accessions to weaken the crown. Minorities, however, could weaken the crown: the ascendancy of the Lellin family in the thirteenth century was established partly as a result of the long minority of Henry I and the civil war at its close, and James I had to bribe his support to remain faithful to him before his return from exile. The principles applied by the vassals in recognising a new king or regent did not always follow the theorising of the thirteenth-century jurists, but there is no example of their choosing someone who was self-evidently less suited to rule than his opponent. Despite the repeated succession disputes and minorities, the crown did not cease to be effective, and the number of political crises before 1400 were few. Only those of 1228–1233, 1306–1310, and 1369–1374 were of major importance, and of these only the last had a crippling effect on the kingdom. The political stability which was characteristic of Cyprus in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is a tribute to both the personalities of the kings and the political wisdom of the nobility on whose support they depended.

1. Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 609, see para. 620.
Chapter 6

THE FIEF

The most important right held by a vassal against his lord was the enjoyment of his fief. We have seen that without a fief the bond of vassalage was impossible, and that the peaceable occupation of the fief, provided service was given and fealty observed, was guaranteed by the king's undertakings at his accession and when homage was performed. This guarantee was strengthened by the participation of the vassals in the recognition of the king at the beginning of his reign.¹

Normally fiefs were heritable by the heirs of the first occupant and his espoused wife for as long as their descendants continued. In Jerusalem some fiefs could be inherited by all heirs, including collaterals of the first occupant, but the jurists were careful to explain that this was unknown in Cyprus.² Philip of Novara makes it clear that more restricted grants were known, including grants which were to last for only three generations.³ From a

---

1. See above, pp. 257-9, 342.
2. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.504, 537; John of Ibelin, p.235. It would seem from John of Ibelin's description of the rules of inheritance that the practice of granting fiefs to all heirs in Jerusalem had ceased by the time of the settlement of Cyprus. The granting of fiefs heritable only by the heirs of the first occupant and his espoused wife was known to the author of the 'Livre au Roi' (p.643).
specimen privilege included at the end of one manuscript of his treatise, it
would seem that fiefs could be granted with specific entails governing
succession to them. Fiefs could also be granted for the life of the recipient
only: in the reign of Hugh III, Mia Milea (Enlamellae) was held for life by
Philip of Scandellon, and Philip himself witnessed a royal grant whereby a rent
should be paid from the returns of the casal to Nicosia cathedral after his
death. 2

Except when such entails existed, on the death of a fief holder the fief
passed to his heir. In the first instance his heir would be his eldest son,
and irrespective of the number and seniority of daughters a son took precedence. 3
Fiefs passed undivided 4 unless a fief holder had only daughters when the fief was
divided among them with the services divided proportionately and the younger
daughters holding their share in fief from the eldest. 5 If a fief holder inherited
two separate fiefs, these had to be divided among his heirs on his death. 6 The
minority of an heir was no bar to his right, 7 but in the event of a minority a
bailliage occurred. 8 As the fief could not be inherited by the surviving parent,

4. See 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.402.
   Since a fief owing the service of only one knight could not be divided,
   presumably an eldest daughter would inherit it undivided. See above, pp.2-3.
7. See Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.537.
8. See above, pp.292-3.
he or she had custody of the heir as well as possession of the fief, but if the bailli was the plus droit heir apparent, a friend or relative who could not inherit had to bring up the heir; on coming of age the heir claimed the fief not from the bailli but from the lord to whom he would then owe homage.¹

If a vassal had no heir of his body, the fief passed to the plus droit heir apparent. The heir had to claim the fief in the High Court, showing that his ancestor had had seisin and that he himself was his descendant. Proof of seisin could be furnished either by producing the original privilege, or by record that the ancestor had been seen enjoying the profits of the fief or performing homage or services for it. Preferably the ancestor from whom descent was alleged should be the original holder of the fief, but evidence of any former holder from whom the claimant could show descent was admissible. It was equally important to prove evidence of the relationship to the ancestor as John of Jaffa emphasised in an anecdote about his uncle; evidence of the relationship was presented as hearsay, and not as fact, and so no witness could be challenged for perjury.²

The first holder of a fief had two rights not allowed subsequent holders. He could divide it among his children or bestow it on a younger child so that on his death the fief did not pass in its entirety to his eldest son; Philip of Novara could think of only one example of a vassal using his right and that dating from the beginning of the thirteenth century.³ Secondly, the first holder

could renounce his fief by returning it to his lord and his heirs would have no right to it.¹ Subsequent holders of a fief could endow their younger children by subinfeudation during their own life-time, subject to the normal restrictions,² and they could commend their fiefs to their lord on a temporary basis, though, as services could not be demanded while the fief was commended, the lord could refuse to accept a fief in commendation at times of military necessity.³

The widow of a vassal was entitled to a dower of half her husband's fief.⁴ The fiefs and the services attached to them were divided on the vassal's death, and this was the only circumstance in which a fief owing the service of only one knight could be divided.⁵ John of Ibelin stated that the widows of the king and of the four barons of Jerusalem did not receive half their husbands' holding.⁶

We have seen that there was no restricted peerage in Cyprus,⁷ but there is evidence that the widow's dower for the queens was considerable though not fixed. Alice of Champagne's dower may have been particularly large: a chronicler states laconically that in 1246,

2. See above, pp.2-3.
7. See above, pp. 23-33.
... Alice of Champagne, the mother of King Henry  
the fat, passed from this world, and left the whole  
kingdom of Cyprus to the said King Henry ... 1

Constance, widow of Henry II, was said to have had a dower worth 70,000  
white besants; 2 Maria of Bourbon's dower was fixed at 5,000 florins when  
she married Guy of Lusignan, the heir to the throne, 3 and Hugh IV's widow  
is reported to have given her dower lands to her son, James I, presumably to  
help him solve the kingdom's financial difficulties at his accession. 4

Cypriot law recognised three principle categories of landed property:

church property held in frankalmoign, 5 burgess property held by burgess tenure  
and justiciable in the cour des bourgeois, and fiefs. Feudal property fell into  
two distinct groups, fief rents and landed estates. 6 Fief rents consisted of a  
fixed sum of money or quantity of produce assigned by the lord against a  
particular source of revenue belonging to him, and so were, in theory, more  
stable than the returns on landed estates which fluctuated according to the harvest

1. 'Gestes', p.741.
2. John Dardel, p.20.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, pp.147-8, 163. The non-payment of her  
dower was a source of much trouble, even after her death. Mas Latrie,  
op. cit., ll, pp.253, 289-91, 374-6, 408, 423-7; Clement VI, Lettres closes  
... France, no. 825; Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, nos. 119-20;  
Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 166, 3191,  
3203-4.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 614.
5. I have found no evidence for Cypriot churches owing military or other  
services.
6. For fiefs in Jerusalem, see Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.5-7.
and other economic conditions. It was not uncommon for fiefs to be made up of a combination of both rents and land: thus, in the mid-fourteenth century, Walter of Brienne held the casalia of Omorphita and Knodhara and a rent of sugar from the royal casal of Sivouri, 1 and, at the end of the fourteenth century, John Cornaro held his casal of Epiakopi and a rent in cash from the revenues of Morphou. 2 Legally there was no distinction between a fief rent and a fief in land; the terms under which they were held were identical, and the same rules of inheritance applied. 3 Except in that the vassals held their fiefs by feudal contract and so were subject to feudal services and incidents, and ecclesiastical institutions held their endowments as eleemosynary grants, there was no difference in the way that lay and spiritual lords exploited their estates or received their assignations. Consequently, in describing estate-management and the variety of forms that rents could take, it is safe to use materials relating to the sources of income of religious institutions to supplement the slender sources for lay fiefs.

Rents were frequently assessed in cash, 4 though rents paid in cereals,

1. 'Compte du domaine', pp.15-28 passim.


3. Thus a fief in land could be exchange for a fief rent. 'Formules', p.387.

wine, sugar or salt were not unusual. The abbey of St. Mary and All Saints at Acre owned rents assigned on the royal revenues in the Paphos region in cereals, wine, cheese, vegetables, rice, oil, sugar, candles, soap and wood together with a sum of money. Combinations of rents partly in cash and partly in foodstuffs were sometimes specified, and examples can be found of cash rents being paid in kind, and the deficit on a payment in kind being made up with cash. Payments could be due annually, or every three, four or six months, and, in the case of rents in kind, after the appropriate harvest. The sources of royal revenue against which rents were assigned varied: often they were simply paid from the general revenues at the secrète, but frequently from the returns of specified casalia. Other sources included

2. Gregory IX, no. 4013.
the royal salines, the commerce of Nicosia, baths, gardens, dye works
and the fees for attaching the bulla to cloths. Rents were either paid at
the source of the return - in the case of rents on casalia by the local bailli
or farmer (apsator) - or at the secrète. Walter of Brienne's rent of sugar
for Silivri, however, was on one occasion paid from the returns of another
casal.

If a casal on which a rent had been assigned was later granted in its
entirety to an ecclesiastical or lay lord, it would appear that the lord took over
the responsibility for the payment of the rents. In 1217 the rents payable to the
Teutonic knights at Lefkara were specifically guaranteed should the casal be
alienated from the royal domain. In the fifteenth century James II confiscated
several of the fief rents at the Cornaro family's casal of Episkopi and regranted
them, and this would seem to indicate that, for assignments made before an
estate was alienated by the crown, homage and services continued to be owed to

---

1. 'A register of Santa Sophia', pp.495-8; 'Formules', p.386. See 'Bans et
Ordonnances', p.379.
361-3, 365, 367. For a rent on the 'testaria' of Nicosia, see Mas Latrie,
op. cit., ii, p.643.
7. 'Compte du domaine', p.28.
the king as the original donor and not to the lord of the casal. ¹

There was always a danger that because it was overburdened or because of fluctuating trade or bad harvests, a particular source of revenues would be insufficient to pay the rents charged upon it. ² Frequently grants of rents allowed for alternative sources in this eventuality, ³ and Leonípios Makhairas spoke of grants from the 'best revenues' in the kingdom by which he meant the sources least likely to fail. ⁴ Ferrand of Majorca was allowed to inspect the casal against which his wife's dower was to be paid, presumably with a view to ensuring that it was financially viable, ⁵ but it is not known whether the opportunity to examine the source of one's fief before it was assigned was normal. In the event of crop failure or Muslim invasion, the lord was not obliged to pay fief rents if the sources were insufficient, ⁶ but if the lord deliberately withheld a rent or made innovations affecting the source of the revenue so that the rent could no longer be paid in full, then this was regarded as dissielia and, in theory, the legal procedures based on the assise sur la ligece could apply. ⁷

¹ Mas Latrifique, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.264.
² For a discussion of some problems this could raise, see John of Ibelin, pp.270-74.
³ Mas Latrifique, Hist. de Chypre, II, pp.643, 660, 670; 'Texte officiel', p.538; 'A register of Santa Sophia', p.496.
⁴ Leonípios Makhairas, I, paras. 84, 526.
⁵ Mas Latrifique, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.183.
⁶ 'Livre au Roi', p.625; Philìp of Novara, 'Livre', p.531.
⁷ John of Ibelin, pp.373-80, see pp.370-72, 381-2.
It was customary to think of landed property as falling into two categories, rural and urban. Normally rural properties in lay ownership were held by feudal tenure, though it seems that the 'vignes franches' mentioned in 1367 at Killani and Silikou were not. Urban properties, including gardens outside the towns, were mostly bourgesies under the jurisdiction of the local burgess court, but they could also be part of a noble's fief in which case they were under the jurisdiction of the High Court. The laws governing the division and sale of bourgesies were less restrictive than those for fiefs which limited division and subinfeudation and forbade sale except when the vassal could not otherwise satisfy his creditors. As the nobility were town dwellers, and so between them owned substantial urban property, confusion could develop as to whether a particular property owned by a knight was part of his fief or a bourgesie, and in consequence it was possible for a vassal to dispose of urban feudal possessions fraudulently by claiming that they were held by burgess tenure. In 1297 Henry II sought to prevent this abuse by compiling a register of all urban properties held as fiefs, which could be referred to in the courts, but his solution failed as he seems only to have envisaged a compilation based on existing written evidence for urban fiefs instead of making a systematic inquest.

2. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp. 82-3.
3. 'Abregé', p. 251.
into the tenurial status of each individual property. Hugh IV had to issue a further ordinance on the subject.

Rural fiefs varied considerably in size and value. In 1367 the tithe payable on the casal of Lefkara was 2,500 besants, whereas that on the part of Anglisidhes owned by Matthew of Villiers consisted only of 10 besants and small quantities of produce. The tithe account of that year provides an important insight into the feudal geography of the diocese. 58 localities are mentioned in the account of which 41 were held by lay vassals. Of these, 28 were held undivided and 13 were shared by two or more vassals. There is no evidence that owners of shared localities divided the total profits between them in a fixed ratio: rather it appears that specific lands and properties within

1. 'Abrégé', p.315. Prawer ('The Assise de Tenure', p.87) probably overestimated the effectiveness of this ordinance. 2. 'Bans et Ordonnances', pp.371-2. 3. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.80. Though 2,500 besants was said to be the total payable, it was stated that 1,400 had been paid but that only 700 were outstanding. 4. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp.85, 89. 5. The boundaries of the Latin diocese seem to have coincided with those of the Turkish administrative districts of Limassol, Kullani and Episkopi and the western half of the Larnaca district bounded by the Pousis River. For the Turkish districts, see L. de Mas Latrie, 'Notice sur la construction d'une carte de l'Ile de Chypre', Béc, sér. 5, iv (1883), pp.29-23. The subdivision of the Larnaca district was probably the area known in the sixteenth century as the 'contrada di Massoto (Mazotos)'. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, pp.494, 561; Florio Bustron, pp.30, 45. 6. A fourteenth, Pendasino, was shared between the canons of the Holy Sepulchre and Almery of Beirut.
the village belonged to a particular lord. At Anglisiudhes John of Morf held Pano Anglisiudhes and James Bedula, Hugh of Mimars and Matthew of Villiers held varying shares of Kato Anglisiudhes. Two lords held Kivdhes, another settlement having two distinct parts, Kato and Pano Kivdhes; it can be assumed that each lord held one part though it is not stated who held which. Pendasino was shared by Aimer of Beirut and the canons of the Holy Sepulchre; in 1201, when the canons received their lands there, specified lands in the village were held by the Teutonic knights, but it is not clear whether it was the Order's lands that Aimer now occupied. Further evidence that knights holding a share of a village held specific lands is furnished by the text of a grant of 1234 by which Henry I gave William son of Acharie a clearly defined piece of land at Maratha in the Mesaorea. Small parcels of land or urban properties could be granted to supplement existing fiefs, and Philip of Novara indicated that some fiefs consisting of fragmented holdings originated as grants

5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.638.
of the former properties '... des yglises et des abales et des artondes ...'.

Whereas the boundary and possession of villages could be established by an appeal to the knowledge of the local peasantry by means of a formal devise, this procedure was not possible in disputes over fragmentary fiefs.

The total of 58 localities for an area the size of the Limassol diocese is unquestionably small, and even if the 30-odd places in the diocese known to have been held by the Hospitallers are added, the number is still considerably lower than the figure of 168 'casali' given for the 'contrada di Limisso' and the 'contrada di Massotto' by a statistical survey of the early sixteenth century.

It is therefore likely that many localities were regarded as the dependencies of neighbouring villages owned by the same lord and so were not quoted separately in the tithe account. These dependencies or presteries were the outlying hamlets of a more important village or casali. Thus Dhymes is the only identifiable locality of the four presteries called 'li prastil de Sateni' which were dependencies of Pelandria but which in the fifteenth century became detached; probably Dhymes and the others were held by the prince of Antioch in 1367 as

1. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', p.536. I have been unable to find a satisfactory explanation of 'artondes' - perhaps a corrupt rendering of archontes. Principal Butler suggests on the analogy of examples found in the Aegean that the passage refers to the former lands of Greek charitable trusts administered by the local dignatories.


4. For the Hospitaller properties, see Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp.67-8. For the statistical account, see Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.494. Also see above, p.390 note 5.
part of his fief of Pelendria since they are not mentioned in the title account. 1

Similarly it is likely that the prince of Galilee who held Lefkara also holds its
dependencies of Kato Dhrys and Tokhali, neither of which appear in the account;2
Tokhali, about seven miles to the south, was regarded as a dependency of
Lefkara in the fifteenth century, though it is unlikely to have been contiguous
with it in view of the Hospitaller possession of Khirokitia. 3

These examples give an impression of the territorial extent of the more valuable holdings in the
diocese, and suggest that estates covering a wide area and including several
hamlets were designated by the name of the principal settlement only. Soon
after the original Latin settlement, Renier of Gibelet held Pyla, Avgorou and
Pistaki which may have constituted a block of territory to the north of Larnaca
Bay,4 and the reference in that period to 'Xindas (Sinda) et feodum'5 seems to
indicate that the fief which took its name from a village could be larger than
the village itself with its lands. When Henry I granted 'Mandia' 'cum omnibus ...

1. 'Documents nouveaux', p.445; Florio Bustron, p.423. See Documents
chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.80. Richard's identification of another of the
presteries, 'Cuthrumbos' otherwise 'Cutrebu', with Kyperounda is
questionable in view of the form 'Chperonda' found in the early sixteenth
century. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.505. In the mid-fifteenth
century the presteries may have belonged to a George Sateni. Florio
Bustron, p.401.

2. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.80. 'Catochorlo de Levarca' (Florio
Bustron, pp.417-18, 419) was probably Kato Lefkara and not Kato Dhrys as
indicated by Richard.


pertinentia' to the archbishop of Nicosia in 1233, the archbishop claimed the presterie of 'Cavallari' as its dependency and the lay lord there had to be expelled and compensated by the king elsewhere. Other noble estates would have consisted solely of a village and its surrounding land, and others of a fraction of a village. How common large estates would have been is not known, but there are several localities in the Limassol diocese known from other mediaeval sources which are not mentioned in the tithe account and the tithes of which were presumably included in the returns of the principal village of the estate; a good example would be Limunatis, held in the thirteenth century by a certain Manassier. Despite the laws limiting the division and acquisition of fiefs, estates were subject to division and re-grouping; presteries could be detached and formed into casalia. In the sixteenth century, Mamonia and its three presteries were regarded as two separate casalia. Alona, Khandria, Platanistassa and Phterikoudi are all described as presteries of the 'Mountain of Peristerona' (evidently Mount Adhelphi); here there seems to have been no

1. 'A register of Santa Sophia', pp.494-5. See Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.634.

2. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.638. See 'A register of Santa Sophia', no. 42. The lands given in compensation amounted to ten carrucates which was the same area as another presterie held by the church of Nicosia. Mas Latrie, op. cit., iii, p.637 see p.598.


Central casal and the hamlets took their name from the mountain on whose slopes they are situated. The precise distinction between a presterie and a casal was not always apparent: thus in 1232 there was clearly uncertainty as to how to describe 'Mandia'. A twelfth-century Byzantine treatise on taxation distinguished an ἄγρος from a πρωγετεῖον in that the latter did not contain a residence of the owner, and there is evidence that many nobles maintained residences or hunting lodges on their estates. Among the rural centres for which there are indications from documentary sources for country houses belonging to knights were Alaminos, Episkopi, Lapithos, Korakou, Lefkoniko and Mamonia.

The existence of rural residences in Cyprus and their comparative absence in Jerusalem is perhaps symptomatic of a fundamental difference in the system of agrarian exploitation in the two kingdoms. In Cyprus, unlike Jerusalem, demesae farming with the peasantry burdened with labour services

---

1. There are three possible explanations of the name 'Mountain of Peristerona': the area was a dependency of Peristerona in Morphou, 16 miles to the north; the river of the same name which flows through Peristerona had its source there; or it owed it to the presence of pigeons there. For the etymology, see A. and J. Stylianou, *Peristerona (Morphou)* (Nicosia, 1964), p.3.

2. Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, III, p.634. '... rex casale sive prestriam quod vel que Mendias vulgariter appellatur cum omnibus juribus ... eidem casali vel prestrie pertinentibus ... donet ...'.


4. 'Gestes', p.692.


was common.¹ James of Ibelin in the thirteenth century and Francesco Attar
in the sixteenth speak of serfs working two days a week on their lord's
demesne,² but Phillip of Mézières indicates that three days' work a week was
the rule.³ Demesne land was not present in every settlement: thus on the
estates of the bishop of Limassol there was demesne at Phnikarĩa and Amathus
but not at Akrounda.⁴ At Psomolophou there is evidence for corvées at harvest
time.⁵ From the lands farmed by the peasantry for themselves, the lords were
owed a proportion of the crop, a third from the unfree serfs or paroikol and a
fourth or fifth from the francomati.⁶ In 1367 at Phnikaria, the principal crop
was wheat and at Amathus, barley; in each case the returns on the demesne
land approximately equalled the total produce from the peasants' land, and so
presumably the demesne accounted for about half the arable.⁷ At Psomolophou,
the returns from the demesne were far exceeded by the proportion of the peasants'

1. For the comparative absence of labour services in Jerusalem, see
Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.45-6.
2. 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.430; Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre,
III, p.520. There is an example from 1463 of a serf being exempted from
labour services (angaria) owed on 104 days annually (i.e. two days each week).
Mas Latrie, op. cit., III, p.125.
3. Phillip of Mézières, Le Songe du Viell Pelerin, II, p.143. It is not
certain from the context that Phillip was referring to conditions in Cyprus.
produce owed to the lord, and so presumably the demesne represented a small fraction of the arable; at its dependency of 'Tripi', the demesne probably totalled half the arable, and at the other dependent presteries there appears to have been no demesne at all. In addition to labour services and the levy on produce, the lord also took tallages on the beasts and persons of the peasants.

Landowners could either administer their estates in person, employ agents or baillis, or let their estates at farm. Substantial land owners such as Baldwin of Ibelin in the early fourteenth century or Philip of Arsuf and Alice of Ibelin, widow of Hugh IV, later in that century employed baillis, as did those who were permanently or temporarily non-resident including Ballian of Ibelin, lord of Beirut in the mid-thirteenth century, the patriarch of Jerusalem in the 1310's, Walter of Brienne in the 1350's and Queen Eleanor after her return to Aragon in the reign of Peter II. Known baillis included members of distinguished noble

1. Richard, 'Le casal de Psimolofo', pp. 140-43 passim. These conclusions are based on the returns for wheat, barley and legumes; the only returns of oats and gum (galbanum) were from the demesne, but these only accounted for comparatively small amounts; indeed, the oats harvest was clearly a failure in 1317-1318 and the crop was discontinued.

2. See Richard, 'Le casal de Psimolofo', pp.133-4. It is not necessary here to discuss the precise legal and economic burdens of the different classes of peasants, for which see Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.8-10; Richard, op. cit., pp.132-4.


families such as John of Brie, members of the Military Orders, and Greeks.

The duties of Raouche of Monteron, bailiff of Walter of Brienne, ranged from the supervision of the administration of his landed estates, the collecting of fief rents and the sale of produce to the payment of ecclesiastical tithes, and the giving of gifts to important persons presumably to ensure their good will. Raouche's account for the mid-1350's is the only surviving record of the returns and expenditure of a lay fief known from Cyprus before the fifteenth century.

The tithe account for the diocese of Limassol of 1367 shows that the leasing of estates to farmers or apautours was in use at that time among the largest land holders. The royal estates, those of the prince of Galilee, one of those of the prince of Antioch, and also the tiny estate of Matthew of Villiers were all administered in this way. At the same period, the lord of Arsur's estate at 'Cameno Prastio' was let at farm, the apautour being the lord's brother, Guy bishop of Limassol, who was also the apautour of the royal estate of Ayios Yeorylos near Xilotymbou. The apautours included nobles, churchmen and Greeks, and so seem to have been drawn from the same range

1. Innocent IV, nos. 3149-50.
5. The apautours of the royal estates included a member of the Cornaro family and the Cistercian abbot of Beaulieu who administered Pyrgos. In the early thirteenth century the abbot of the cistercian house of Bellmont in Syria had disputed ownership of this estate with William of Rivel. Honorius III, no. 5108; Gregory IX, no. 1064. It is possible that the apaut of the abbot of Beaulieu, a daughter house of Bellmont, arose from a composition reached with William's heirs or with the king to whom the estate and William's claim had presumably escheated.
of society as the bailiis. It is possible that the use of leases at this period was a response to a decline in the profits from agriculture following the Black Death, which would have resulted in the lessening of the incentive for direct exploitation, but the evidence is too slender to be conclusive.

Answerable to the baili or apautour were various villagers who had the daily oversight of the economic life of their community. Chief among them was the catepan who was the village head-man and evidently responsible for gathering the dues from the peasantry known collectively as the catepanage. On the three estates of the bishopric of Limassol there was only one catepan, a situation made possible by their proximity; Walter of Brienne had two catepans, one on each of his casalia of Omorphita and Knodhara, but at Psomolophou the duties were carried out, together with those of the greneterius, by the bailli.¹

All known catepans were Greeks: at 'Cameno Prastio' the chastellain, apparently an alternative name for this officer, in 1367 was an unfree serf,² and on the estates of the bishopric of Limassol that same year and at Knodhara in the 1350's the post was held by a Greek priest. Besides the catepan were jurors whose precise duties are unclear,³ a scribe, and a host of minor officers and servants concerned with the day to day running of the estate and whose


number and function doubtless varied according to the local circumstances.  

Vassals were not only burdened at certain periods with feudal aids, but also, from the beginning of Lusignan rule in Cyprus, with ecclesiastical tithes. From the time of the organisation of the Latin church in the 1190's, the Latin bishops had a claim to the tithes from the whole of their respective dioceses. Thus the archbishop of Nicosia had the tithes of the 'regiones' - evidently the Greek dioceses - of Nicosia, Kiti, Kyrenia, Kythrea, Lapithos, Soli, Tamassos and Tremetousha, and from a strip of territory in the Mesaorea including Milea, Maratha, Sivouri, Sinda, Asha, Piyi and Peristerona. All this area together constituted his Latin diocese. Little is known of tithes in Cyprus until 1220, when in an agreement between Alice of Champagne, the Cypriot vassals and the bishops chiefly concerned with the status of the Greek church, Alice granted the bishops the tithes '... of all the revenues of the kingdom of Cyprus and the aforesaid barons, knights and vassals ... in

1. See Richard, 'Le casal de Psimolofo', pp.130-31, 141-52 passim; and also 'Compte du domaine', pp.17, 26; Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, p.106.

2. See above, pp. 297-300.

3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, pp.601-2. The significance of the provisions in this bull of Celestine III relating to tithes have been hitherto misunderstood. See for example Hackett, History of the Orthodox Church, pp.479-80; Hill, History of Cyprus, II, p.46.

4. In 1200 King Aimery was threatened with excommunication and interdict if he failed to pay tithes. Regesta pontificum Romanorum, no. 956. In 1203 the Hospitallers agreed on an annual payment of 120 saracen bezants to cover the tithes on their properties in the Limassol diocese. Cartulaire général des Hospitallers, no. 1176.
accordance with the use and custom of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. 1 Exactly how this changed the existing arrangements is not clear, but it was presumably to the advantage of the church as the agreement was confirmed by both the pope and papal legate, 2 and there is a reference in December 1221 to people excommunicated for withholding tithes. 3 A modification of the agreement of 1220 made in September 1222 specified that tithes were to be paid on lands, animals, leases and other revenues, 4 and a papal letter of earlier that year makes it clear that animal food-stuffs were also subject to tithe. 5 The agreements of 1220 and 1222 seem to have been the basis of subsequent practice, though there were frequent difficulties in enforcing payment, 6 and the Limassol tithe-account of 1367 seems to show that many lords had defaulted. 7 Besides the problem of non-payment, bishops also had difficulty with lords who claimed to be entitled to pay their tithes to ecclesiastical institutions outside the diocese. 8 It is not until the fourteenth century that any clear picture emerges


3. Honorius III, no. 3664.


5. Honorius III, no. 3831.


8. Gregory IX, nos. 2985, 4551.
of how the system of tithes worked. Tithes were levied on the produce of
the land, the profits of industry and commercial taxation, but not on commerce
or fief rents. Holders of fief rents did not owe tithes as they had already
been levied on the source of income against which the rents themselves were
assigned. At Psomolophou tithes were paid on cereals, legumes, galbanum,
and cheese; the payments were calculated as a tenth of the revenues of the
lord of the casal and not as a tenth of the total produce, which means that the
proportion of the crops retained by the peasantry was not subject to tithe. In
the diocese of Limassol the lords owed either a tithe based on their actual
returns and paid partly in cash and partly in kind, or owed an agreed sum
presumably assessed on the average returns of the estates.

The income from the fief was the basic source of revenue for the
nobility in Cyprus. Much of their income came from the profits of agriculture,
either in the form of fief rents assigned on agricultural returns or through
direct exploitation, and in consequence the well-being of the nobility depended
on agricultural prosperity to a large extent. How debilitating the Black Death

2. By the 1222 agreement tithes were payable on livestock, but none were paid
at Psomolophou in 1317 (Richard, 'Le casal de Pismolofo', p.140), and
there is no indication that they were paid in the diocese of Limassol in 1367.
4. Documents chypriotes, ed. Richard, pp. 80-91 passim. See Diplomatarium
Veneto-Levantinum, ii, pp.252-3.
and subsequent plagues in the later fourteenth century would have been is not known, but they almost certainly led to a contraction which, coupled with the commercial crises brought about by Peter II's wars and the Genoese invasion, must have weakened the nobility. The sources of income and their means of exploitation may not have changed, but a lower return from them would have depressed the standard of living for some nobles and perhaps resulted in a reduction of the total membership of the feudal class. But despite all vicissitudes there is little evidence to suggest that the fief ceased to be the principal form of knightly wealth.

1. See above, p.177.
CONCLUSION

Frankish noble society in Cyprus in the first two centuries of Latin rule was essentially conservative. The feudal institutions, largely imported from Jerusalem at the end of the twelfth century, remained the basic legal framework of society. The nobility continued to owe military service and their sources of income were normally held in feudal tenure. The ceremony of homage was retained, though it seems to have signified the acceptance by the contracting parties of the vassal's legal rights to his fief rather than the vassal's subservience to his lord. The comparatively light burdens on the fief arising from feudal incidents were an element in the continuing vitality of the feudal system. But feudal law was not immutable and society was not immune to change; indeed it appears that culturally the knights kept abreast of their counterparts in the West. There were no great territorial lordships in Cyprus, and though there was no pretence at equality of wealth, all vassals enjoyed legal equality. The service of consilium and their own self interest gave the feudatories a developed sense of legal awareness. The noble class was exclusive in that it seems not to have assimilated any survivors of the former Byzantine landowning class and recruited its new members from foreign knights rather than from the Cypriot non-nobles, though there are signs that by the late fourteenth century this was no longer true. The nobility was subject to pressures from inflation and the fluctuation in the profits from agriculture and commerce, but these pressures are difficult to trace and impossible to quantify and so the effect of economic change on the social structure and legal institutions is hard
to evaluate.

Although there were on occasion tensions between the feudatories and the crown, it would be wrong to conceive of the history of their relations in terms of persistent conflict. There are clear examples of the knights joining the king in taking arbitrary action against members of their own class instead of supporting their peer as the legal theories of the thirteenth century had pre-supposed that they would. The harmony and common interest of kings and knights contributed to the maintenance of Latin rule in the island after it had become an outpost of western Christianity. Cyprus was fortunate in its ruling dynasty, and the strength of the crown and the relative weakness of the nobility which had no direct control over any of the island's fortresses led not to tyranny and resentment but to mutual respect and loyalty. The more powerful lords could build up personal followings, partly by subinfeudation and partly by maintaining mercenaries, but at no time did any such group pose a threat to the crown. Cypriot noble society could produce adventurers like Thibaut Belfarage, but at critical periods it could also produce men of undoubted gifts of leadership: John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut in the thirteenth century, Aygue of Bethsan in 1310, and John of Brie in the late fourteenth century. The sense of political responsibility shared by the nobility is made clear by the willingness and loyalty with which its members served the crown and by its evident conscientiousness at times of dynastic crisis. Generally the nobility acted wisely in determining the royal succession even when this necessitated setting aside legal principles, and their behaviour in the political upheaval of 1306-1310 is ample indication of their desire for good government.
The original leaders of Frankish noble society in Cyprus were drawn from the followers of Guy of Lusignan. They were soon overshadowed by the Ibelins, descendants of one of Guy's leading opponents, and their emergence at the expense of heirs of Guy's supporters can be seen as a feature of the civil war of 1229-1233. In the thirteenth century it is perhaps possible to trace a change of attitude towards the Kingdom of Jerusalem; as the fortunes of the Christian states on the mainland declined, the Cypriot feudatories became less ready to bring assistance. In the fourteenth century the older families proved to be insufficient by themselves to sustain Peter I's expansionist policies, but no sooner had the threat to their pre-eminence been removed by Peter's murder and the policies of the prince of Antioch, than they were seriously weakened by the Genoese invasion. This war was the first major political crisis to strike at the nobility as a whole; in the fifteenth century the Mamluke invasion and then civil war were to destroy the old feudal families and prepare the way for Venetian control.

This study has been concerned with the activities and institutions of a feudal class in a non-western environment. In its detailed analysis it has served to correct some previous views, emphasise others and to raise new questions of its own. If there is one theme which has emerged, it is that the Cypriot feudal class was buoyant and articulate, conservative but not obstructionist. The knights did not necessarily act with great foresight, but the political stability made possible by their co-operation with their kings gave Cyprus a long period of relative peace and considerable prosperity.
APPENDICES
The legal texts attributed to Geoffrey Le Tor exist in two completely different forms. The Venice manuscript, the basis of Beugnot's ms. 'A', contains 32 chapters 'd'usages et d'assises de la haute court dou relaume de Jerusalem, que Mesire Jofre le Tor, qui estoit tenus à moult bon plaideor et anciens chevalier, mist en un sien livre...'. The Paris manuscript, Beugnot's ms. 'B', contains 19 chapters of which chapters 7 and 8 are identical to 'A' s chapters 9, 10 and 11. These are the only chapters in common. Ms. 'B' begins with a formal introductory chapter and then continues with a systematized discussion of the nature and implications of homage. At first sight it is difficult to see any plan to the 'A' version; for example, the laws governing the bailliage are discussed in the first chapter and again in chapter 18. Grandclaudie thought that the 'A' version comprised extracts from a larger work, but it is more likely that it is simply a collection of

2. Geoffrey Le Tor, p.435.
4. Geoffrey Le Tor, pp.437-8, 446.
5. See Le Tor, p.460.
miscellaneous notes on feudal law. Geoffrey's two books were not directly connected with one another and make no pretence to be comprehensive.

Chapters 6 and 7 of ms. 'A'

are evidently related to two chapters appended to one manuscript of Philip of Novara's legal treatise. These were edited by Beugnot as chapters 54 and 55 of Philip's work; chapter 54 is particularly close to Geoffrey's chapter 6, although Geoffrey's version is longer, containing a number of phrases absent from the other. Chapter 55 is less closely related to Geoffrey's chapter 7; in the second part they diverge in their wording and content. It is significant that two chapters with totally unrelated subject-matter should follow one another in these two manuscripts. Whereas it is possible that the author of the chapters at the end of the manuscript of Philip's 'Livre' may have taken Geoffrey's version and copied leaving out phrases which he felt were unnecessary, it is unlikely that Geoffrey had taken the other version and expanded it. Alternatively, both writers could have drawn on a common original.

It appears that ten of the final eleven chapters of ms. 'A' are derived from Philip of Novara. Here Geoffrey's phrasing is more concise than Philip's and his dependence on Philip can be convincingly demonstrated by comparing his chapters 30 and 31 with Philip's 52 and 53. If Philip had had Geoffrey's work

---


2. Philip of Novara, 'Livre', pp.529-30. See Grandclaude, 'Classement sommaire', pp.431-2. (Grandclaude's comments on these chapters are misleading.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geoffrey Le Tor</th>
<th>Phillip of Novara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ms. 'A'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 21-2</td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 23-6</td>
<td>Chapter 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 27</td>
<td>Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 29</td>
<td>Chapter 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 30-31</td>
<td>Chapters 52-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 32</td>
<td>Chapter 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. **Related chapters from Geoffrey Le Tor ms. 'A' and the 'Livre' of Philip of Novara.**

In front of him, it is unlikely that he would have allowed his own work to take its looser form. In these chapters Philip of Novara was summarising what had gone before in the context of his discussion of the vassals' advantages from the Assise sur la higece.¹ But in chapters 52 and 53 he missed an important application of the Assise - action by peers when a vassal was imprisoned without esgart - although he had discussed this earlier.² In chapter 30 Geoffrey listed six cases in which the Assise could be applied, including the application missed by Philip; in all the other cases his wording was similar to Philip's.³ In chapter 31 Geoffrey described how the Assise was to be applied and again the wording is close.⁴ In this chapter Geoffrey, by adding the phrase 'ou c'il ne

3. Clause 1 = Phillip of Novara, 'Livre', chapter 52, p. 527 lines 1-4; clause 2 = chapter 52, p. 527 line 4 - p. 528 line 1; clause 3 = chapter 52, p. 528 line 9; clause 4 = chapter 52, p. 528 lines 10-14; clause 6 = chapter 53, p. 528 lines 1-3.
peut venir', had allowed for the possibility of the vassal's being prevented from conjuring his peers himself which would happen if he were in prison, and so that aspect of the Assise which was omitted by Philip was taken into account. Of Geoffrey's six cases, five are described by Philip earlier in his book, and the fact that these five follow in the same sequence both earlier and in chapters 52 and 53 is further evidence that Geoffrey had a version of Phillip's work before him and was improving upon it.

But Geoffrey's ms. 'A' contains material which is not in Phillip's treatise and so it would be wrong to regard the whole work as derivative. In particular Geoffrey stated that the bailliage was not heritable and described the penalties for failure to perform homage. The disorganised catalogue of legal statements which comprises the ms. 'A' seem more like a collection of notes in preparation for writing a legal treatise than a treatise itself. If so Geoffrey would appear to have obtained a copy of Phillip's work and copied or rephrase those chapters in it which caught his fancy. It has been suggested that the opening chapters of the 'A' ms. form a commentary on the bailliage dispute of 1264. It is therefore probable that the treatise was written after Phillip of Novara's, at least in its earliest form, and after 1264. On the other hand, it may predate the additions to one manuscript of Phillip's work. These cannot be dated though

1. Clauses 1 and 2 = Phillip of Novara 'Livre', chapter 39, p.516; clause 4 = chapter 40, p.517; clause 5 = chapter 41, p.517; clause 6 = chapter 42, p.518.
other additional chapters in the same manuscript refer to events of the 1270's. It is perhaps also significant that there is no direct evidence that Geoffrey knew John of Jaffa's legal writings.

The 'B' ms. is better organised than the other. In addition to the two chapters which are the same as the three in ms. 'A', there are six which also deal with subjects covered in it. But their treatment is less comprehensive than that of their counterparts in ms. 'A', and this is perhaps evidence that ms. 'B' is earlier. This can best be seen by comparing chapter 19 of ms. 'B' with chapter 22 of ms. 'A'; had Geoffrey already written chapter 22, it is unlikely that he would have dealt subsequently with the same subject so inadequately. A terminus ante quem for ms. 'B' is provided by the fact that five chapters appear to have been used by James of Della whose work can be dated to 1276.

It would seem therefore that Geoffrey wrote the 'B' ms. before 1276 and that this was earlier than the 'A' ms. which was apparently written after 1264. This discussion of the date of composition proves that the Geoffrey Le Tor who wrote these texts was the chamberlain of Cyprus and not his grandson.

2. Geoffrey Le Tor, pp.440-41, 450; compare also ms. 'B' chapters 3, 11, 12 (pp.446, 447-8) with ms. 'A' chapter 30 (p.442), ms. 'B' chapter 13 (p.448) with ms. 'A' chapter 12 (pp.438-9), ms. 'B' chapter 17 (p.449) with ms. 'A' chapter 5 (p.436).
3. Geoffrey Le Tor, ms. 'B' chapters 14, 16-19 (pp.448-50). See James of Della, chapters 47-50, 68 (pp.463-5, 467).
4. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.127.
6. As believed by Grandclaude (Étude critique, p.148).
The chamberlain is not found after 1257, though there is no reason to suppose that he did not live for several years after that date. As Geoffrey's son John was able to go as an ambassador to the papal court as late as 1318-1319, he was unlikely to have been born before 1250 at the earliest and so John's son Geoffrey would not have reached maturity until the early years of the fourteenth century. As the evidence points to the 1260's - 1270's for the date of the composition of the treatises, they cannot have been written by the younger Geoffrey, whereas they could well have been written by the chamberlain in his old age. Except for the entry in the 'Lignages', the younger Geoffrey, although the eldest son of a leading member of Cypriot noble society, has left no trace in the surviving records, and this might suggest that he died young or was singularly undistinguished. Geoffrey the chamberlain however, a contemporary of Philip of Novara and John of Jaffa, was an important figure, and it is to him that the treatises should be ascribed.

1. See below, p.477.
3. See Geoffrey Le Tor, p.435.
4. 'Lignages', p.464.
(1) The Seneschals of Cyprus

Aimery of Rivet (before Nov. 1197 - after Nov. 1210).

Aimery of Rivet, the first known seneschal of Cyprus, 1 witnessed charters in this capacity in 1197, 1201 and 1210. 2 Since he appears without the title of seneschal in 1194, 1195 and 1196, 3 his appointment can probably be dated to coincide with Aimery of Lusignan's coronation in September 1197.

Baldwin of Ibellin (before 1247 - Feb. 1267).

Baldwin of Ibellin, second son of John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, played an active role in the war against the imperialists, 4 and in the 1230's seems to have been in regular attendance at the Cypriot High Court. 5 He is first named

1. According to the sixteenth-century writer, Stephen of Lusignan, Guy, son of Aimery of Lusignan, was seneschal under his father, but there is no contemporary evidence for this. See Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.687.
4. 'Gestes', pp.691-2, 705, 709, 715, 716.
5. See above table 7 (p.100).
as seneschal of Cyprus in 1247, and in that year was a leader of the expedition to the relief of Ascalon. The circumstances and precise date of Baldwin's appointment are not known; possibly he was made seneschal at the same time as Henry I gave lands in Jerusalem to some of the magnates there. John of Joinville described his role as a Cypriot commander on St. Louis's first crusade, and mentioned that he knew Arabic; he was captured and released at the same time as the French king. Baldwin appears to have remained seneschal until his death early in 1267.

Ballian of Ibelin (before Jan. 1287 - Feb. 1301).

Ballian of Ibelin, son of Guy, constable of Cyprus and maternal uncle of Henry II, first appears with this title in January 1287 (1286 o.s.). He was referred to as seneschal in documents of 1291, 1292 and 1299, and died in 1301.


2. 'Eracles', ii, p.433; 'Anales de Tierra Santa', p.360; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.198. See 'Anales de Terre Sainte', p.442, where owing to the omission of a phrase he is wrongly called lord of Arsur.


7. Memorias históricas, ii, p.57; Liber iurium, ii, col. 276; Reg. Hier., no. 1518; Boniface VIII, no. 3231. See 'Lignages', p.462. The statement by a fifteenth-century writer, Christopher Cyprius, that a Walter of Gibelet, active in negotiations with the Muslims 1289-1291, was Henry II's seneschal is mistaken. Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa, ii, p.205.

8. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.238.
Philip of Ibelin (1301 - Nov. 1318).

On Ballan's death, his brother Philip was appointed in his place. 1 It was his close relations with the king to the exclusion of all other advisers which was said to have been a cause of the crisis of 1306. 2 From 1306 he was the leading supporter of Henry, and in April 1308 was deported to Armenia where, according to the principal narrative source, he remained until November 1310. It is clear, however, that he was in Cyprus briefly in May 1310 in order to testify in the proceedings against the Templars. 3 After his return to Cyprus and until his death in 1318, 4 he was again prominent in the councils of Henry II. In 1316 he was one of the three men named as being close to the king by Francis of Forn, the Aragonese envoy, 5 and from the diplomatic correspondence which survives in the Aragonese archives, it can be seen that he was given considerable responsibility. 6 In 1315 Philip's daughter married Ferrand, a younger son of the king of Majorca. 7

1. 'Gestes', p.857. For references to him before his appointment as seneschal, see Liber jurium, ii, col. 276; Boniface VIII, no. 366; 'Gestes', pp.828-9.
2. See above, p.122.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.390, 399.
5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.705.
7. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC xxxiv (1873), pp.56-64; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.397.
Balian of Ibelin (1323).

Balian of Ibelin, the seneschal, is known only from a papal dispensation dated 1323 for him to marry a certain Margaret, inhabitant of Nicosia. It has been suggested that he was Balian of Ibelin, lord of Arsur (d. 1333).

Guy of Ibelin (before Jan. 1328 - after c. 1336).

Guy of Ibelin was almost certainly the son of Philip the seneschal. In 1324 he was chosen by the ilége men to act as 'lieutenant dou seneschau' and preside over the proceedings at which Hugh IV was accepted as king. It is not clear whether the office of seneschal was vacant at the time or whether the seneschal was unavailable. Nor is it clear whether Guy was appointed seneschal by Hugh immediately after his accession. He first appears in that office in a document of January 1328 (1327 o.s.) which shows him endowing benefices in Nicosia. In 1334 he was given Venetian citizenship, and is last referred to in a Venetian document of about 1336.

7. *I libri commemorialis*, ii, p.69. This document is undated, but is registered with documents of 1336. For another reference to Guy as seneschal, this time in 1330, see Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, ii, p.162.
Philip of Ibelin, lord of Arsur (Nov. 1359 - before Oct. 1365).

Philip was said to have been appointed seneschal on Peter I's accession, but was superseded by the king's brother, James, in October 1365. In January 1369 he was chosen by the liege men to act as deputy seneschal to preside over the meeting of the High Court which chose John, prince of Antioch, as regent for the minority of Peter II.  

James of Lusignan (Oct. 1365 - after Aug. 1373).

James of Lusignan was appointed seneschal of Cyprus by his brother, Peter I, at Alexandria in 1365. James was normally given his other title, constable of Jerusalem, in the narrative sources, but he was addressed as seneschal of Cyprus by the pope in a series of letters written between March 1371 and August 1373. Possibly, though in exile from 1374, he continued to hold the title until his accession as James I. In a document of 1383, John of Bri is named as lieutenant seneschal.  

1. For a discussion of his career and the problems relating to his position as seneschal, see below, Pp.455-6.

2. John of Ibelin, p.3. Beugnot's reading to the effect that he was the deputy of the seneschal of Jerusalem is corrupt. The Codex Vaticanus latinus 4789 (fo. 19 col. 1) reads '... leuc tenant dou seneschau dou royaume de chipre ...'. James of Lusignan, the seneschal of Cyprus, had apparently gone to Famagusta that day. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 283.

3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 172, see para. 86. Hugh of Lusignan who is said to have been made prince of Galilee at the same time held his title earlier. See above, p.20.

4. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 87, 553, 718, 823, 935, 1417, 1424, 2072.

(11) The Constables of Cyprus

Aimery of Lusignan (1194).

Aimery of Lusignan is named as constable in 1194 in the one surviving grant of his brother, Guy, but it is not clear whether he was constable of Cyprus or of Jerusalem at that time. He had been created constable of Jerusalem in 1179, and despite his quarrel with Henry of Champagne in which Henry is said to have deprived him of his office, he was still styling himself constable of Jerusalem in 1197. It is possible therefore that he was only ever constable of Jerusalem, although, according to Loredano, he had been made constable of Cyprus by his brother in 1193.

Baldwin of Bethsan (1195).

Baldwin of Bethsan witnessed a charter of 1195 as constable. How long he continued to hold that office is not known, though he was still alive in 1200.

2. Runciman, History of the Crusades, ii, p.424, see p.419.
3. 'Eracles', ii, p.203 (ms. 'D').
4. Reg. Hier., no. 737. This document dates from after Henry and Aimery were reconciled. See above, p.41.
5. Cited by Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.678. Loredano is notoriously inaccurate and it would be unwise to accept this statement uncritically. See Hill, History of Cyprus, iii, p.1148.
7. He witnessed grants in Jerusalem in 1198 and 1200. Reg. Hier., nos. 733, 740b, 743, 746, 774, 776. He was not described in these documents as constable but neither Walter of Caesarea nor Ballian of Belin used this title when witnessing charters in Jerusalem. According to Stephen of Lusignan, Aimery's son John was constable during his father's reign, but there is no contemporary evidence for this statement. See Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.678.
Walter, lord of Caesarea (before Sept. 1210 - July 1229).

Walter of Caesarea was constable of Cyprus by September 1210. He was a commander of the Cypriot forces on the Fifth Crusade, and a supporter of John and Philip of Ibelin, his brothers-in-law, during the 1220's. He died fighting the Imperialists at the battle of Nicosia in 1229. He inherited Caesarea a few years after becoming constable of Cyprus.

Ballan of Ibelin, lord of Beirut (before March 1236 - after Dec. 1239).

Ballan of Ibelin, eldest son of John, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, appears as constable of Cyprus in charters issued between 1236 and 1239. He probably continued to hold this office until his death in September 1247.

Guy of Ibelin (1247 - after 1250).

Ballan was succeeded by his brother Guy, who first appears as constable in a document of 1247. Guy was the youngest member of the family, and

2. 'Eracles', ii, pp.322, 339-40 (ms. 'A').
4. See above, pp.17, 68. In documents relating to Jerusalem he did not use his title of constable. See Reg. Hier., nos. 892, 1003.
5. See below, p.456.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.198. There are no surviving documents from Cyprus between 1239 and 1247 in which Ballan is mentioned.
8. 'Lignages', pp.448-9, see pp.444, 451, 457, 458, 468.
played a comparatively minor role in the events of the 1230's. John of
Joinville referred to him as a Cypriot commander and constable of Cyprus on
St. Louis's first crusade. He was last referred to, though not as
constable, in a document of 1255 when he was named as an executor for the
late Henry I.

**Philip of Ibelin (second half of the thirteenth century).**

Philip of Ibelin, son of Baldwin the seneschal, is named as constable
in the 'Lignages' and by a chronicler in 1362, though at that time either Guy
or Almery of Lusignan held this office. The precise period in which he was
exercising the constableship is not known.

**Baldwin of Ibelin (1286).**

Baldwin of Ibelin, son of Guy, constable of Cyprus and uncle of Henry II,
was constable of Cyprus by 1286 when he came with Henry to Palestine for his
coronation as king of Jerusalem; he then remained there as royal baili.

---

1. *Reg. Hier.*, nos. 1078, 1092; 'A register of Santa Sophia', no. 45;
   'Gestes', pp. 708-9, 729.

2. John of Joinville, pp. 148, 184, 188, 194. See *Reg. Hier.*, no. 1190;


4. 'Lignages', pp. 455, 457, 463.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 238.

6. He is mentioned in documents of 1253, 1269, and 1271, but in none is he
   entitled constable. For further discussion see below, p. 472.

7. 'Gestes', pp. 792-3.
He was dead by January 1287 (1286 o.s.) when Henry II endowed masses on his behalf.¹ It is probable that he was the Baldwin of Ibelin who killed Nicholas of Caesarea in 1277 in revenge for the murder of his brother John.²

**Guy of Lusignan (1292).**

Guy of Lusignan, a younger brother of Henry II, appears as constable of Cyprus in a document of 1292.³ The date of his death is not known though the chronicles agree that he died soon after his appointment.⁴

**Aimery of Lusignan (before April 1306 - 1316).**

Aimery, the youngest of Henry II's brothers, was made constable on the death of Guy.⁵ He was a leading supporter of his other brother, Amaury of Tyre, from 1306, and after his murder in 1310 had himself proclaimed governor and continued to oppose the royal restoration. Following his surrender he was imprisoned. The date of his death is not known, but it was apparently not long before May 1316.⁶

---

¹ Mas Latrè, Hist. de Chypre, III, pp.669-70. He is here described as '... constable des roys jadis des royaumes de Jherusalem et de Cipre...' which would seem to suggest that he was appointed by Hugh III.

² 'Fracles', II, p.479. Baldwin was the only member of the Ibelin family alive at the time who is known to have had a brother named John. See Rüdt de Colenberg, Rupealides, table XI (I).

³ Liber jurium, II, col. 276.

⁴ 'Gestes', pp.856-7; Florio Bustron, p.135. The 'Chronique d'Amadé' (p.240) states that he lived only a year after his appointment.

⁵ 'Gestes', p.857. The earliest documentary reference to him as constable is in April 1306. 'Documents chypriotes', ed. Kohler, p.442.

⁶ See above, pp.131, 151-2, 155-9, 170.
Hugh of Lusignan (before June 1318 - 1324).

Hugh, later Hugh IV, was the son of Guy of Lusignan, the constable, and nephew of Henry II. He was named as constable of Cyprus in a letter of June 1318,¹ and in the document of 1324 which records his claim to the throne.²

Humphrey of Montfort (1326).

According to the 'Chronique d'Amadi', Humphrey of Montfort who died in June 1326 was constable of Cyprus.³ It is not clear whether he had been appointed by Hugh IV at the time of his accession since he is not named as constable in the documents of the intervening period.⁴

Guy of Lusignan (before Feb. 1338 - 1343).

Guy of Lusignan, eldest son of Hugh IV, held the office of constable by February 1338;⁵ probably he continued to exercise it until his death in 1343.⁶

1. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 7534.

2. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.419. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.401-2. See also John XXII, Lettres secrètes, no. 2001; 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.399.

3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.403.


5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.178. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.404. It is probable that a Venetian document of c. 1336 which gives Guy as marshal is in error and that he was already constable at that time. I libri commemoriali, II, p.69.

6. In September 1343 the pope was sending his condolences to his widow. Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, no. 423, see no. 422.
John of Lusignan, prince of Antioch (before Aug. 1360 - c. 1374).

John of Lusignan, prince of Antioch, was the second of the three sons of Hugh IV who survived their father. The date of his appointment is difficult to determine as Leontios Makairas made conflicting statements: first that he was appointed by Hugh IV, then that he was appointed by Peter I at his coronation, and then on the seventeenth of October 1360 together with other appoints to vacant offices. Peter was said to have been crowned king of Cyprus on the twenty-fourth of November 1358 or the twenty-fourth of November 1359, and crowned king of Jerusalem on the fifth of April 1360. ¹ John was certainly constable of Cyprus by August 1360 when he witnessed the confirmation of the Venetian privileges. ² He was normally referred to simple as prince of Antioch, though there are several documents, the last of which is dated October 1374, in which he was given his title of constable. ³ He was murdered after the Genoese war. ⁴

¹ Leontios Makairas, i, paras. 86, 100, 233. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.408. For the date of his coronation, see above, p.372 note 5.

² Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, p.64.

³ Liber jurium, ii, cols. 805, 810; Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.250; Documenti sulle relazione della città toscane, p.123; John of Ibelin, p.4.

⁴ Leontios Makairas, i, paras. 551-4; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.478-9.
(iii) The Marshals of Cyprus

Hugh Martin (1192 - after Sept. 1195).

Hugh Martin was appointed by Guy of Lusignan to be his marshal before his purchase of Cyprus in 1192. He accompanied Guy to Cyprus, and witnessed two documents there as marshal, in 1194 and 1195.

Adam of Antioch (early thirteenth century).

Adam of Antioch is described as marshal both in the 'Lignages' and on his tomb stone which has survived at Palouriotissa near Nicosia. Unfortunately the date on the tomb is partly effaced, and as he never appears in any document with the title of marshal exactly when he held this office is unknown. Adam witnessed charters, though not as marshal, in 1196 and 1197, and this would seem to suggest that he was active at about this time. He was probably therefore marshal at about the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Raynald of Soissons (before Sept. 1210 - after July 1217).

Raynald of Soissons held a fief in the kingdom of Jerusalem in the lordship of Nablus in the 1180's, and appears to have been among the earliest settlers of Cyprus. He witnessed charters issued by Almery of Lusignan in the

5. See above, pp.50-51.
island in 1197 and 1201, and was marshal from before 1210 until after 1217.

John of Antioch (1247).

John of Antioch, the son of Adam, was a witness to a document of 1232. He witnessed another in 1247 as marshal and was several times given this title in the 'Lignages'.

Anseau (second half of the thirteenth century).

Anseau the marshal is known only from the 'Lignages'. A general idea of the period at which he held his office can be gained from the fact that the husband of one of his daughters was brother-in-law to Balian Malgarny, active in the first decade of the fourteenth century.

Simon of Montolif (1291).

Simon of Montolif, marshal of Cyprus, was said to have been killed at the fall of Acre in 1291. That he held that office is confirmed by a papal


5. 'Lignages', pp.459, 460.

6. 'Lignages', p.459. See 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 263, 264, 312, 316. His full name was Balian of Iselin 'Malgaray' or 'Malguaralto'. It is not possible to identify him as a member of any of the principal branches of the Iselin family.

7. 'Lignages', p.463.
marriage dispensation issued a few years later for his son.\(^1\) In 1284 he had brought the body of Hugh III from Tyre to Cyprus. At that time he was described by a chronicler as the constable, but this is probably an error.\(^2\)

**Raynald of Soissons (1310).**

That Raynald of Soissons was marshal of Cyprus is known only from the text of the Templar process; he testified on the first day of the hearing immediately after Philipp and Baldwin of Ebela.\(^3\) He was a staunch supporter of the king during the crisis of 1306-1310, and after the murder of Amaury was one of the leaders at Famagusta.\(^4\) He was probably a direct descendant of the other Raynald of Soissons, marshal of Cyprus a century earlier.\(^5\)

**Thomas of Montolif (1324 - after Jan. 1336).**

According to the *Chronique d'Amadi*, Thomas of Montolif was appointed marshal of Cyprus at the time of Hugh IV's accession in 1324; he was the son of the Simon of Montolif who had been marshal in the late thirteenth century.\(^6\) In 1328 he was one of the Cypriot negotiators who agreed to a re-issue of the Venetian privileges, and at the same time was given Venetian citizenship.\(^7\)

---

1. Boniface VIII, no. 2659.
2. *'Gestes',* p.791. Baldwin of Ebela may have been constable at that time. See above, p .421.
5. See *'Lignages',* p.461.
6. *'Chronique d'Amadi',* p.402.
after this he was again a Cypriot negotiator, this time with the Genoese.  

He is last found mentioned in a document of 1336.  

Baldwin of Nores 'Marescalcus hospitii regii' (before March 1328 - after Jan. 1330), Marshal of Cyprus (c. 1336 - after 1341).

Baldwin of Nores first appears in a document of 1328 when he was described as 'marescalcus curie regalis' and in which his name followed that of Thomas of Montolif, 'marescalcus regni Cypri'. Later that year he appeared again, this time as 'marescalcus hospitii regii', and again Thomas of Montolif appeared as marshal. He is also found with this title, 'marescalcus hospitii regii' in documents of 1329 and 1330. In a Venetian list of Cypriot dignitaries dating to circa 1336 he was described as marshal of the kingdom, and this title is confirmed by a document of 1338. It would appear from this that he succeeded Thomas of Montolif as marshal of Cyprus. Ferrand of Majorca mentioned him in his account of the indignities he had suffered in Cyprus between 1340 and 1342, and described him simply as marshal. It has been suggested

1. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.150, see also p.141.
2. Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 3619.
8. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, pp.183-4, see pp.189, 192, 194, 199.
that Baldwin was the marshal of Cyprus reported to have been killed at
Smyrna in 1345.\(^1\)

**John of Morf, count of Edessa** (before Aug. 1360 - after 1364).

John of Morf was marshal of Cyprus by August 1360.\(^2\) There are various
references to him as marshal in the following years, the last being in 1364.\(^3\) It
is not known whether he continued to be marshal of Cyprus after being made
count of Edessa.\(^4\)

**Odo of Mirmars (1374).**

Odo of Mirmars was named as marshal of Cyprus in Leontios Makhairas's
list of the hostages taken to Genoa.\(^5\) It was presumably he who had been present
on the Tripoli raid in 1367.\(^6\)

**Raynald of Mirmars** (c. 1385 - after Aug. 1395).

This man, called Arnold of Mirmars by Leontios Makhairas, witnessed a
document as marshal of Cyprus in 1395.\(^7\) He had been appointed by James I

---


2. *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, ii, p. 64....

3. Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, ii, p.233, iii, p.741; Leontios Makhairas, i,
paras. 108, 147.

4. For an account of his career, see below, *Pp. 469-70*.

5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542. Thomas of Montolif was named as
marshal of Cyprus on Hugh of Montolif's lists of prisoners, but this is
See below, *Pp.442-3*.


after his return from exile. 1 Earlier he had been present at the siege of
Kyrenia (1373-4), had been in exile in Chios, and, after the death of Peter II,
had been active on James's behalf to secure his accession. 2

(iv) The Chamberlains of Cyprus 3

Amaury (1220)

'Amalricus Cipri camarius' witnessed a charter issued by Alice of
Champagne in 1220. 4

Geoffrey Le Tor (1247)

Geoffrey Le Tor was named as chamberlain in a document of 1247. 5

1. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494. The list of appointments and grants provided
by this source is generally better than that given by Leontios Makhairas
(i, para. 620) where Guy of La Baume is said to have been made marshal
of both Jerusalem and Cyprus. See above, p.245 note 2.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 500, 542, 609.

3. In this section I shall deal only with the holders of the grand serjeantry,
and not with the holders of the distinct household office which appeared in

4. Mas Latrle, Hist. de Chypre, lii, p.611. Mas Latrle suggested he was
Amaury of Bethsan, though there are no grounds for this assumption.
The chamberlain was apparently the brother-in-law of Geoffrey Le Tor.
'Liagnes', p.464.

5. Reg. Hier., no. 1154. See 'Excules', ii, p.406. For his career and
writings see above, pp. 408-13; below, pp. 476-7.
Walter of Antioch (1287)

Walter of Antioch 'chambrelain' of Cyprus witnessed a document of 1287 (1286 o.s.).\(^1\) He was a son of John of Antioch, marshal of Cyprus.\(^2\)

Bartholomew of Montolif (before April 1327 - after Feb. 1338)

Bartholomew of Montolif was described as chamberlain of Cyprus in documents of 1327 and 1338.\(^3\) He was probably the supporter of Henry II mentioned in the accounts of 1308 and 1310, who brought Henry II's wife, Constance, to Cyprus in 1317 and who represented Hugh IV in his claim to the throne in 1324.\(^4\)

Peter of Nefin (1352)

The tombstone survives of Peter of Nefin 'chamberlain' who died 4 October 1332.\(^5\) It is not clear whether he was chamberlain of Jerusalem or of Cyprus. He is not otherwise known.

Simon of Montolif (1360)

Simon of Montolif witnessed the 1360 confirmation of the Venetian privileges as 'camerarius Cypri'.\(^6\) He is probably the man who in 1355 was

---

2. 'Lignages', p.473.
4. 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', pp.419, 421; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.269, 362, 397, 398, 402. See also John XXII, _Lettres communes_, no. 62662; Acta Ioannis XXII, no. 36.
6. _Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum_, ii, p.64.
described as 'bailly de la seigneurie'.

Peter Malocello (Oct. 1360 - after Nov. 1372)

According to Leontios Makhairas, Peter Malocello, a Genoese, was appointed chamberlain of Cyprus in October 1360. He was on the expeditions to Adalia (1361), Alexandria (1365), Tripoli (1367) and Adalia again (1367), and on both Peter I's visits to the West. On the earlier visit he entertained the king at the Malocello country house near Genoa, and later seems to have had a mission to the papal court. In 1368 he was again in the West with the king and while there witnessed three documents as chamberlain of Cyprus. After his return to Cyprus in 1369 he continued to occupy that office until after the coronation of Peter II as king of Jerusalem, at the time of which he was attacked in the anti-Genoese riot.

Hodrade Provane (before Aug. 1395 - after June 1399)

Hodrade Provane witnessed documents as 'chamberlain of the kingdom of Cyprus' in 1395 and 1399.

---

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 100, see para. 233.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 167, 190, 200.
5. Urban V, Lettres secrètes ... France, no. 1700.
6. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.291 ('cambellanus dicti regni'); Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, pp.139, 144 ('cambellanus dicti nostri regni').
(v) The Butlers of Cyprus

Peter of Montolff (before Mar. 1328 - after Jan. 1330)

Peter of Montolff, butler of Cyprus, was a procurator for Hugh IV in
the negotiations for the marriage of Hugh's son Guy and Maria of Bourbon in
1328. ¹ By 1330 he was also turcopoliér. ² He died before 1340. ³

Raymond Babin (before June 1360 - after 1373)

Raymond Babin first appears as a witness to the Genoese treaty of
1338. ⁴ According to Leontios Makhairas, he was appointed butler by Peter I
in October 1360, ⁵ but he had already been referred to as butler in a papal
letter of June of that year. ⁶ He served Peter I at Adalia, Alexandria and
Tripoli, ⁷ and in 1369 was among the knights made responsible for placing
John of Jaffa's law book in Nicosia cathedral. ⁸ He was an important figure in
the years 1369 - 1373, being on at least two occasions the recipient of circular

¹ See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 100.
² Annales ecclesiastici, 1360 para. 13. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 102.
³ Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 163, 190.
⁴ John of Ibella, p.6.
letters addressed to the most prominent Cypriot leaders. Allegedly he was responsible, with John of Morf, for the loss of Famagusta in 1373. A Raymond Babin appears both in the list of those who were taken as hostages to Chios in 1374 and in the list of those who remained in Cyprus, and so it is uncertain what happened to him. Phillip of Mézières claimed in his *Tragedia* that Raymond was still alive although aged about a hundred at the time of writing (c. 1389-1390), and had allowed his house to be used in 1369 by the knights who were plotting the death of Peter I.

N. of Neuville (late fourteenth century)

The tomb stone of a member of the Neuville family 'BOVTOVLER.DOY. ROIAVUM.D'CHPR' has survived in Nicosia. He was married to a Maria of Mimaros who died in 1393.

---

1. 'Nouvelles preuves', *BEC*, xxxv (1874), p.106; Gregory XI, *Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France*, no. 718. In the latter Raymond was addressed by the pope as 'panatterius regni Cypri'.


3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 542, 563.


(vi) **The Seneschals of Jerusalem**

Hugh of Ibelin, count of Jaffa (1338)

Hugh of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, was named as seneschal of Jerusalem in a document of 1338. Ludolf of Sudheim described him as marshal of Jerusalem, but was probably mistaken.

John of Ibelin (March 1360 - after 1367)

There were two Johns of Ibelin in Cyprus during the reign of Peter I: John, count of Jaffa, and John, seneschal of Jerusalem. Possibly John the seneschal was the man mentioned in documents of 1328 and 1330. According to Leontios Makhairas, he was made constable of Jerusalem at the time of Peter I's coronation as king of Jerusalem and at the same time Philip of Brunswick was made seneschal; as these two appear subsequently with their offices reversed, it is to be assumed that the chronicler, who was not always well informed on the early years of the reign, was mistaken here. John accompanied Peter to the West in 1362 and in March 1363 witnessed the treaty

1. In the sections dealing with the holders of the grand sergeaanties of Jerusalem and Armenia, only those who were Cypriots appointed by the king of Cyprus as titular king of Jerusalem or Armenia are discussed.


4. For John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, see below, pp.468-9.


with the Genoese;\textsuperscript{1} in May of the same year he was the recipient of papal privileges.\textsuperscript{2} Much to Peter's annoyance he then took service with Edward III, not returning to Cyprus until 1366.\textsuperscript{3} This meant that he was not present at Alexandria, though he did take part in the relief of Gorhigos and the second expedition to Adalia in 1367.\textsuperscript{4} In 1366 the tithe account for the diocese of Ilmassol mentions a John of Ibelin, lord of 'Velonaca', who was then dead; whether this is the seneschal or his name-sake, the count, is not clear as neither are known to be alive after that date.\textsuperscript{5} It is not certain to which branch of the Ibelin family he belonged. Leontios Makhairas described him in one place as the 'son of Philip', and elsewhere as a cousin of the king.\textsuperscript{6} The only known Philip of Ibelin who was himself closely related to the royal family was Philip, seneschal of Cyprus in the early fourteenth century, and his son John died in 1317.\textsuperscript{7}

**Leo of Lusignan, king of Armenia (1372)**

Leo of Lusignan was made seneschal of Jerusalem by Peter II in 1372.\textsuperscript{8}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, II, p.249.
\item Urban V, *Lettres communes*, nos. 646, 5455.
\item Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 187.
\item William of Machaut, p.138; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 194, 200.
\item *Documents chypriotes*, ed. Richard, pp.85, 90.
\item Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 104, 187.
\item 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.399. See Rüdt de Collenberg, *Rupeaides*, table XI (1). Dawkins suggested that he was a son of Philip of Ibelin, the Younger. Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.119.
\item John Dardel, p.39; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326.
\end{enumerate}
It is not known whether he continued to hold this office until his death in 1393. ¹

(vii) The Constables of Jerusalem

Amaury of Lusignan, lord of Tyre (before March 1289 - June 1310)

Amaury of Lusignan was appointed constable of Jerusalem by his brother, Henry II, and was named as constable in the narrative accounts of the fall of Tripoli (1289) and the raid of 1300. ² He was more commonly referred to as the lord of Tyre, only once (in 1306) being given the title of constable in a non-narrative source. ³

Odo of Dampierre (before Sept. 1328 - after Jan. 1340)

Odo of Dampierre, the son of John of Dampierre, a supporter of Henry II in the crisis of 1306, married the sister of Hugh IV. ⁴ He was mentioned as constable of Jerusalem between 1328 and 1340. ⁵ Probably Odo was the unnamed

---

¹ For his career, see John Dardel, pp.32, 35-109 passim; Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, p.76.
² 'Gestes', pp.803, 804, 849.
³ Clement V, no. 632.
⁴ Dispensation dated 1322. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 15871.
⁵ Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, pp.157-8; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.214; I libri commemorall, ii, p.69; John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 42955 (in which he is wrongly named as constable of Cyprus); Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 8059. See 'Formules', pp.383-4; Mas Latrie, op. cit., ii, p.164.
constable of Jerusalem mentioned in a document dated 1343 copied into a formulary; if this is a reference to him it is the last. Odo's wife was addressed 'connestablece dou royaume de Jerusalem' in the same formulary. Ludolf of Sudheim remarked upon her wealth.

Philip of Brunswick (March 1360 - after March 1363)

Philip was the second son of Henry of Brunswick-Grubenhagen and Helvis of Ibelin, the daughter of Philip the seneschal. He was engaged or married three times, in each case to a woman closely linked to the royal family: in 1339 a dispensation was issued for him to marry Margaret, daughter of Hugh IV; in 1352 he married Helvis, daughter of Odo of Dampierre, and in 1359 he married Alice of Ibelin, widow of Hugh IV. A daughter, presumably of the second marriage, married James, later James I. Philip was appointed constable of Jerusalem in March 1360, and witnessed documents of August 1360.

1. 'Formules', p.389.
2. 'Formules', p.383. See also Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.200.
4. For the genealogy, see Rüdt de Colenberg, Rupenides, table VIII (BK) (MF). See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.404.
5. Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 7225. The fact that Philip later married her mother means that this marriage cannot have taken place.
6. For these marriages, see Rüdt de Colenberg, Rupenides, tables VII (C), VIII (BK) (MF). See Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 289, 468.
and March 1363 in this capacity. He evidently accompanied Peter I on his first visit to the West, and served him on at least two of his campaigns. He died in August 1369, though it is not clear whether he remained constable of Jerusalem until his death.

**James of Ibelin (1360's ?)**

According to Leontios Makhairas, a James of Ibelin was constable of Jerusalem and James of Lusignan was given the post after his death. This assertion is included in the account of the expedition of 1361 to Adalia, at which time Philip of Brunswick held the office, but it is possible that the chronicler has applied the title retrospectively. The only other reference to a James of Ibelin in this period is found in 1365.

**James of Lusignan (1372-1382)**

Leontios Makhairas contradicted himself as to when James was given this office: he reported that he was made constable of Jerusalem before the death of Hugh IV, at the coronation of Peter I, in October 1360, after the death of James of Ibelin, and at the coronation of Peter II (1372). As Philip of

---

3. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 289.
4. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 119.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 163.
6. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 86, 100, 119, 233, 326.
Brunswick was constable in the early 1360's, 1372 is the most likely of those dates for his appointment. Whereas the chroniclers frequently referred to James before his accession as constable of Jerusalem, he was only given this title once in the surviving documents.¹ James was addressed by the pope as constable of Cyprus twice in 1371, but this is in error for seneschal of Cyprus or constable of Jerusalem.² James probably held the title until his accession.

Hugh of La Baume (c. 1385 - 1417, 1419, or 1420)

Hugh of La Baume, one of the knights left in Cyprus in 1374, rose to prominence as a member of the council of regency set up in 1382 where he was a leading supporter of James I and opponent of the Montoliff brothers.³ The narrative sources agree that he was made constable of Cyprus by James I, and, referring to his death either in 1417 or in 1419 or 1420, again entitle him constable of Cyprus.⁴ But in 1395 Hugh witnessed a document as constable of Jerusalem.⁵ Either the document, which survives only in a vidimus, is incorrect, or the narratives, though consistent within themselves, are mistaken.

1. Liber lurium, ii, col. 810. For the use of his other title, seneschal of Jerusalem, see above, p.418.
2. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 166, 182.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 563, 593, 610. Owing to Leontios's renderings of the name, Dawkins sometimes translated it 'Hugh' and sometimes 'Eudes'.
In view of the frequent errors committed by the Cypriot chroniclers, it seems more likely that Hugh was constable of Jerusalem.

(viii) **Marshals of Jerusalem**

John Babin (1328)

John Babin was described as marshal of Jerusalem in a document of 1328.¹ He was probably the knight who supported the king during the crisis of 1306 - 1316,² who testified in the Templar process,³ and who witnessed the marriage contract for Ferrand of Majorca and Isabella of Belin in 1315.⁴

John Viscount (1360)

According to Leontios Makhairas, John Viscount was appointed marshal of Jerusalem in 1350.⁵ He was presumably the man whose allegations of the Queen's marital infidelity led to his death.⁶

Simon Tenoury (before Jan. 1365 - after Nov. 1369)

Simon Tenoury is first recorded in a document of 1338.⁷ It is possible

---

2. 'Gestes', p.366; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 58; 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.252, 264, 362, 367, 375.
3. 'Processus Cypricus', pp.164-5.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 104.
that he accompanied Peter and John of Lusignan on their youthful escapade in 1348 when they ran away from Cyprus to the West. 1 He was with Peter I on his first visit to the West as king, 2 and by January 1365 held the title of marshal of Jerusalem. 3 He participated in the crusade to Alexandria and in the campaigns of 1367. 4 He was again with Peter in the West in 1368 - 1369. 5 In 1369 he was one of the knights responsible for placing John of Bella's treatise on feudal law in Nicosia cathedral. 6 Philip of Mézières stated that Simon was a nephew of the Simon of Montolif who murdered the lord of Tyre in 1310 and that he himself was a friend of John II of France. 7

Thomas of Montolif (before 1374 - after March 1383)

Thomas of Montolif was described in a document of 1383 as marshal of Jerusalem and bailli of the secrète. 8 Hugh of Montolif in his list of knights held by the Genoese included a Thomas of Montolif, marshal of Cyprus, but this title is almost certainly erroneous and it is to be assumed that Thomas was

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 79 and note 1.
marshal of Jerusalem. 1 Two Thomases of Montolif were active in the third quarter of the fourteenth century: Thomas of Montolif the auditor, appointed butler of Jerusalem in 1372, 2 and Thomas of Montolif 'of Klirou'. The auditor was unlikely to have been made both butler and marshal, and so it is likely that Thomas of Klirou was the marshal. Thomas of Klirou served Peter I, 3 and is probably the Thomas of Montolif 'the Elder', who, together with the auditor, was among the knights made responsible for the official version of John of Della's law book in 1369. 4 Hugh of Montolif also listed a Thomas of Montolif 'the Younger', 5 and this sobriquet would be particularly suitable if the marshal was also known as Thomas 'the Elder'.

Guy of La Baume (1385 - Sept. 1400)

Guy of La Baume was among the knights exiled to Genoa in 1374, 6 and was on the council of regency set up after Peter II's death. 7 He was given the office of marshal of Jerusalem by James I, 8 and is to be found with this title in

1. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.81.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326.
3. Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 190, 200, 318.
5. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.82.
6. See 'Nouvelles preuves', BEC, xxxiv (1873), p.83; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 548.
7. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 599.
8. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.494. Leontios Makhairas (i, para. 620) wrongly states that he was also made marshal of Cyprus.
a document of 1395.\(^1\) He died in 1400.\(^2\)

(Ix) The Chamberlains of Jerusalem

**John of Montolif (1360)**

According to Leontios Makhairas, John of Montolif was appointed 'in place of the chamberlain' of Jerusalem in 1360.\(^3\) There were at least two and possibly several men of this name in Cyprus during the 1360's: an admiral mentioned in 1361, a viscount of Nicosia in 1363, a counsellor of the king cured at the tomb of the Blessed Peter Thomas; there were two Johns of Montolif on the expedition to Tripoli of 1367, a John of Montolif of Khoulou whose widow was Peter I's mistress, and a John of Montolif who was among those responsible for the official version of John of Ibelin's law book in 1369.\(^4\) It is impossible to know how many different individuals there were, and which of them was the chamberlain.

**Nicholas of Acrolissa (1372)**

Nicholas of Acrolissa was appointed chamberlain of Jerusalem at the time of Peter II's coronation in 1372.\(^5\) Nothing else is known about him except that

\(^1\) Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, ii, p.428.

\(^2\) Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 629.

\(^3\) Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 104.

\(^4\) Urban V, *Lettres communes*, no. 2353, 4166; John of Ibelin, p.6; Phillip of Mézières, *Saint Peter Thomas*, pp.178-80; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 113, 190, 234.

\(^5\) Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326.
he was one of the knights who remained in Cyprus in 1374.¹

(x) The Butlers of Jerusalem

Simon of Montolif (before Sept. 1328 - after Jan. 1330)

Simon of Montolif was butler of Jerusalem by 1328 when he was negotiating on behalf of Hugh IV with the Venetians.² He witnessed two other surviving documents as butler, in 1329 and 1330.³ Possibly he was the Simon of Montolif who appears without a title witnessing another document of 1330, but this could be another man of the same name who in 1328 was described as Simon of Montolif 'the Younger'.⁴

Matthew of Plessia (March 1360 - after Nov. 1369)

Appointed butler by Peter I in 1360, Matthew is mentioned in the inventory of the effects of Guy of Ibelin, bishop of Limassol, who died in 1367.⁵ In 1369 he was one of the knights chosen to be responsible for the official version of John of Ibelin's law book.⁶

¹ Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 563.
² Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantium, 1, pp.210, 214.
³ Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, pp.158, 162.
⁴ Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.164, see p.141. See also John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 24525.
⁵ Richard, 'Un évêque', p.127 note 6; Leontios Makhairas, 1, para. 104.
⁶ John of Ibelin, p.6.
Thomas of Montolif, the auditor (1372)

Thomas of Montolif was appointed butler of Jerusalem in 1372. He had been auditor since before 1355, and he might have been active in the Cypriot High Court as early as 1338. In 1361 he went to the West with John of Morf to settle the claim of Hugh of Lusignan, Peter I's nephew, and while in the West submitted a list of Cypriot demands to Venice. In 1364 he was among the knights who tried to sort out the quarrel with the Genoese. Whether it was the auditor or his namesake, Thomas of Montolif of Kilrou, who was at Alexandria is unclear, as is the identification of the Thomas of Montolif who witnessed a deposition at the canonization process of Peter Thomas given by John of Montolif. In 1369 Thomas made the formal request on behalf of John, prince of Antioch, for the bailiages of Cyprus following the death of Peter I, and later that year was one of the knights made responsible for the law book.

---

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 326.
3. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.179. See Clement VI, Lettres closes ... France, nos. 311, 422; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 81. See also John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 28468.
5. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 147.
7. Philip of Mézières, Saint Peter Thomas, p.179. I find no grounds for supposing that Thomas was John's son as asserted by Smet, p.179 note 11.
8. John of Ibelin, pp.5-6.
In 1372 he made the formal request to the High Court for Peter II to be recognised as king and of age. In July 1372 he was addressed by the pope as auditor and bailli of the secrète, and, wrongly called John of Montolif, was the recipient of a circular letter to the Cypriot leaders from the commune of Pisa in May of the same year. He is last heard of in August 1373 when he was addressed as 'auditor generalis causarum regni Cipri' in a letter from the pope.

(xi) The Marshals of Armenia

John of Tiberias (before Aug. 1395 - Aug. 1402)

John of Tiberias appears as marshal of Armenia in documents of 1395 and 1397. From his tomb stone, on which he was also given this title, it is known that he died in 1402. Earlier in James I's reign he had been active in negotiations with the Genoese.

1. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 320.
2. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 849.
3. 'Nouvelles preuves', BEG, xxxv (1874), p.106.
4. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2073.
6. Chamberlayne, Lacrimae Nicossienses, p.86, see plate XVIII.
(xii) The Chamberlains of Armenia

John Babin (1395)

John Babin appears as chamberlain of Armenia in a document of 1395. ¹ He had been tutor to Janus, and had been given Apalestra by James I. ²

---

2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p. 494; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 619, 620.
GENEALOGIES

(1) The Bethsan Family in Cyprus

Among the fiefs of the kingdom of Jerusalem never in Christian hands after 1187 was the lordship of Bethsan. The descendants of the twelfth-century lords were important in Cyprus from the time of the settlement until the fourteenth century. In 1192 the titular lord of Bethsan was Gremont II and he and his uncles, Walter, Baldwin and Philip, all subsequently held fiefs in Cyprus. Walter, Baldwin, and another brother, Amaury, were also vassals of Henry of Champagne and later of Aimery of Lusignan as king of Jerusalem. In the 1190's Baldwin was constable of Cyprus and at this time Philip was also a Cypriot feudatory. Gremont was known in Jerusalem before he is found in Cyprus, witnessing documents of 1198 and 1206, but from 1210 he and Walter, the only one of his uncles who is known to have survived until that date, figured

1. See La Monte and Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan', p.57.
2. See La Monte and Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan', p.66.
prominently as Cypriot vassals. Neither are to be found after 1220, though it is possible that Gremont was still alive when Philip of Novara was composing his legal treatise.  

After Gremont the senior line of the family is known only from the 'Lignages'. Because the titular lords married into Cypriot noble houses it can be assumed that they were present in Cyprus. It was the junior members of the family who distinguished themselves. Amaury of Bethsan, son of Walter the uncle of Gremont, was one of the leading opponents of the Ibelins in the Ibelin-Longobard war. After 1233 he went into exile in Apulia where he served the Hohenstaufen. Thibaut of Bethsan, the younger son of Gremont, was active in Syria during the third quarter of the thirteenth century. He owned a house in Acre, and was apparently still alive at the time the earlier recension of the 'Lignages' took shape (c. 1270). By his wife, Isabella of La Mandeléc, he had two sons, Baldwin who was killed at the fall of Tripoli (1289) and Walter. It

1. Reg. Hier., nos. 844, 846, 900, 912, 938; 'Eracles', ii, p.322 (ms. 'A').
3. 'Lignages', p.463.
4. See above, pp.72-5, 77, 89. See also Reg. Hier., nos. 1437a, 1437b.
7. 'Lignages', p.454.
8. Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4789, fo. cclxxvii col. 2. This corrects the printed edition of the 'Lignages' (p.463).
may be that the Bethsan inheritance had been divided between Gremont's sons, with Baldwin, the titular lord, having the Cypriot fiefs and Thibaut taking those in Palestine. ¹ Walter married Alice of Ibelin, the sister of Ballan, prince of Galilee,² and throughout the political crisis of 1306-1310 supported the opposition to the crown.³ He died in Kyrenia castle in 1315,⁴ and his daughter Maria died in 1322 aged 28.⁵

Aygue of Bethsan, the second son of Walter, titular lord of Bethsan and Margaret Babin,⁶ supported Amaury of Tyre in the initial stages of his rule,⁷ but after Amaury's murder in 1310 emerged as leader of the royalist knights at Famagusta.⁸ He is not known after 1312.⁹ In 1325 Aygue's son Baldwin

---

1. Thibaut certainly held part of the ancestral lands in the kingdom of Jerusalem. 'Lignages', p.454.


4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.397.


6. Walter the father of Aygue and Walter the prominent anti-royalist have previously been confused. See Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, pp.254-5; La Monte and Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan', p.72. They were in fact cousins.

7. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.42; Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 59 (see La Monte and Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan'; pp.72-3).

8. See above, pp. 152-4.

Gremont

Adam | Baldwin | Walter | Amaury | Phillip | X | X | X | X
| (flourished 1193-1200) | (flourished 1192-1220) | (flourished 1194-5) | (1195) |

= (1) Douce Porcelet
= (2) Theodora Lathoumena

Gremont II
(fl. 1198-1220)
= (1) Juliana of Solissons
= (2) N.N.

Baldwin | Thibaut | X
| (fl. 1251-c.1270) | (fl. 1228-55) |

= Maria Viscount
= Isabella of La Mandelée

Walter | X | X | X | X | Baldwin | Walter (d. 1289) | (fl. 1306-15)
= Margaret Babin
= Alice of Ibelin

Thibaut | Aygue | X | Maria (d. 1322)
= (1) Nichola of Ibelin
= Alice of Montolif
= (2) Alice of La Mandelée

Baldwin
= (1325) Maria of Ibelin

Table 11. The Betham family in the thirteenth century.
was given a dispensation to marry Maria, daughter of Hugh of Ibelin.  
1  
This is the last reference to a member of the family.  
2

(ii) The Ibelin Lords of Arsur in Cyprus

John of Ibelin, son of John the 'Old Lord' of Beirut, received his mother's lordship of Arsur apparently as part of a family compact.  
3  
It is possible that he did not hold fiefs in Cyprus, for despite the fact that he had a distinguished career as constable and baili of Jerusalem, he is not found involved in internal Cypriot politics.  
4

His son Ballan married Plaisance, widow of Henry I and regent of Cyprus, in 1254, but a few years later at Plaisance's insistence the marriage was dissolved on the grounds of consanguinity.  
5  
After this he was active in

1. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 23432.
2. The man whose name Dawkins translates on one occasion (s.a. 1373) as 'Sir Eustace de Bessan' was in fact a Genoese, Eustace Passaato. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 367, see para. 318.
4. The John of Ibelin who appears as a witness to Cypriot charters between 1232 and 1239 was probably John, later count of Jaffa; his name normally comes before Ballan, Baldwin and Hugh of Ibelin who were apparently older than their brother, John of Arsur (see 'Lignages', p.448), and who therefore might be expected to have taken precedence over him. See above, table 7 (p.100).
5. See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, p.149; Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.216.
Jerusalem until his death in 1277, but is not mentioned in connection with Cyprus.¹

Ballian's son John is virtually unknown before 1306² when he appears as a leading supporter of the lord of Tyre; he continued to be a member of his party until his death in 1309.³ He was the first member of the family to have been established definitely in Cyprus. It has been suggested that he inherited the fiefs of Gauvain of Chenichl, the pro-imperialist bailiff of 1229, through his mother, Gauvain's grand-daughter.⁴

Ballian of Ibelin, lord of Arsur, was John II's heir.⁵ Little is known

---

1. See Mas Latrïe, 'Les seigneurs d'Arsur', p.594. For the lease of the lordship to the Hospitallers, its loss in 1265, and the subsequent recovery of theoretical rights to it from the Order by Ballian, see Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, pp.133-4.

2. The statement ('Fracles', ii, p.463) that John was made constable of Jerusalem in 1272 is questionable as his father appears in that office c. 1275. Reg. Hèr., no. 1465. See 'Fracles', ii, p.478. William of Canet who is said to have been made marshal of Jerusalem at the same time as John's appointment was already enjoying that office in 1269 (Reg. Hèr., no. 1370) and this is further evidence for questioning the authority of the statement. Furthermore, as John was the son of Ballian's marriage to Lucia, daughter of John Gauvain, he must have been still young in 1272 as Ballian did not separate from Plaisance until about 1258. See 'Lignages', p.449.


4. Richard, 'Palsire', p.83. Gauvain's heirs were not dispossessed after the Ibelin-Longobard war. 'Gestes', p.695.

5. 'Lignages', p.449.
of him except that he died in 1333. He was married to a Margaret of Ibelin who later married Balian of Ibelin, son of the count of Jaffa, and who was apparently still active in the late 1360's. It is possible that a papal dispensation for marriage within prohibited degrees of 1323 relates to Balian of Arsou and Margaret, in which case Balian was at that time seneschal of Cyprus. Of John II's other children, the only one known to have survived infancy is Lucia.

Balian and Margaret had at least three children, Philip, Guy, bishop of Limassol from 1357 to 1367, and Maria. Philip is thought to have been the Philip of Ibelin for whom a dispensation was issued in 1340 to marry Eschiva of Dampierre. Later he married Alice of Majorca, daughter of the Ferrand of Majorca who quarrelled with Hugh IV. At the beginning of Peter I's reign

---

2. See below, p.458.
7. Richard, 'Un évêque', pp.100-102 et passim. For Maria see Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 8059.
8. Benedict XII, Lettres communes, no. 8061 (issued the same day as the dispensation for Maria and Hugh of Dampierre, see previous note). See Richard, 'Un évêque', p.101 note 1.
he was made seneschal of Cyprus, but appears to have been dismissed by 1365 when James of Lusignan, later James I, was appointed to that office. Perhaps this was because of the serious quarrel which took place between Philip and the king at about this time, which led Peter to exile Philip and forbid his wife to join him. Apparently the animosity was allayed for the time being, for Philip served on the campaigns of 1367 and accompanied Peter on his second visit to the West, but in 1369 he was one of the king's murderers. For the next few years he continued to be prominent until in 1373 he was captured by the Genoese and executed for his part in the murder, a papal attempt to save him being too late. This branch of the Ibelin family seems then to have died out.

1. According to Leontios Makhairas (i, paras. 100, 233) an otherwise unknown Thomas of Ibelin, lord of Arsur, was appointed to that office; this is almost certainly an error. See Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, p.103 and note 1; Leontios Makhairas, ii, p.94.

2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 172.


4. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.291; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 190, 194. He had already served on the 1361 campaign (Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 119), but is not known to have served in 1365.


6. Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, no. 2905. The letter is dated 16 April 1374. Phillip had been executed the previous November.
(iii) The Belin and Montfort Lords of Beirut in Cyprus

The career of John of Belin, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut is well known; he and his brother were well established in Cyprus by 1217 and from then until his death in 1236 he was a dominant figure in the island. 1 His eldest son, Ballian, inherited some of his fiefs in Cyprus 2 and the lordship of Beirut, and presumably acquired the estates once held by Walter of Montbéliard when he married Walter's daughter, Eschiva. 3 According to Philip of Novara, John of Belin on his death-bed provided for his younger sons by a division of his fiefs which they were to hold in feudal tenure from Ballian. 4 The form of this division is not known, but it would appear that Ballian had the lordship of Beirut, and John was given his mother's lordship of Arsura; the other brothers, Baldwin, later seneschal, Guy, later constable, 5 and probably Hugh, who died at some time before April 1239, 6 evidently received fiefs in Cyprus. Possibly as a result, the senior branch of the family, as represented by the lords of Beirut, did not have extensive lands in the island; certainly they do not seem to have played an active role in Cypriot politics from the 1240's until after the

2. John's fiefs were said to be extensive though exactly what they comprised is not known. See 'Gestes', p.668. Ballian is known to have held 'Magaza', a casal which I have been unable to identify. Thomas 'Bericht', p.167, see also p.155.
3. 'Fracles', ii, p.376 (ms. 'A'). Gerald of Montagu was Eschiva's first husband.
4. 'Gestes', p.725.
6. See 'A register of Santa Sophia', no.45.
fall of Beirut in 1291. There is no other evidence that Ballian's brothers
and their heirs held their fiefs from the lords of Beirut and not direct from
the king. From 1236 Ballian is named as constable of Cyprus,¹ and it was
probably in this capacity that he brought Cypriot knights to the mainland on
various occasions.² Until his death in 1247 he seems to have been more
interested in affairs in Jerusalem.³

Ballian's son John, who died in 1264,⁴ also seems to have spent most of
his time on the mainland. Little is known of him expect that he was captured
by the Turcomans in 1260 and was obliged to pay a large ransom.⁵ Allegedly,
like his father and grandfather, he had commanded Cypriot knights on the
mainland.⁶ He was buried in Nicosia cathedral and was evidently held in
sufficient esteem by Hugh III for him to endow masses for him there at the

¹ Reg. Hier., nos. 1071, 1078, 1092; 'A register of Santa Sophia', no. 45.
The fact that Ballian first appears as constable at the same time as his
first appearance as lord of Beirut is perhaps coincidental. He is not named
as constable in documents connected with the lordship of Beirut or the
kingdom of Jerusalem.

² 'Document relatif au service militaire', p.431.

³ See Hill, History of Cyprus, ii, pp.132, 133-5, 139; Riley-Smith, Feudal
Nobility, pp.212, 214, 215.

⁴ 'Fracles', ii, pp.447-8. See 'Gestes' (p.758) where the date is given as
1263. His death was not known at the papal court before July 1264. Reg.
Hier., no. 1332a.

⁵ 'Fracles', ii, p.445; 'Gestes', pp.752-3; 'Annales de Terre Sainte', p.449.
The alienations to the Teutonic knights in 1261 perhaps resulted from his
having to find the ransom money. Reg. Hier., nos. 1307, 1309, 1310.

same time as he endowed masses for his own mother. 1

John was succeeded by his two daughters in turn. The elder, Isabella, first married Hugh II of Cyprus. In 1272 she married an English knight, Haimo L'Estrange, who died while in the West. Her third husband was Nicholas L'Aleman, titular lord of Caesarea, whom she married in 1277 and who was killed in Cyprus soon afterwards. Finally she married William Barlais, son of Aimery, the Cypriot bailiff of 1229. 2 She was probably normally resident in Beirut which was then under the protection of Balbars. Balbar's suzerainty which might date from the time of her father, was made clear by his objection when Hugh III summoned Isabella to Cyprus on the death of Haimo L'Estrange. The origins and outcome of this incident are rather obscure, but it is possible that Hugh was demanding service de mariage and Balbars was trying to prevent Beirut coming under the control of a wealthy magnate. 3

Isabella died childless at an unknown date before November 1283, for at that time we are told that Humphrey of Montfort was lord of Beirut by virtue of his marriage to Eschiva, Isabella's younger sister. 4 Humphrey died early in 1284; in 1291 a papal dispensation was issued for Eschiva to marry Guy of Lusignan, a younger son of Hugh III, who in turn died at an unknown date before

---

4. 'Gestes', p.790; Rüdt de Collenberg (Rupenides, table XI(I)) stated that Isabella died in 1284, but his grounds for giving this date are not known.
1306. Eschiva held the village of Lapithos, but it is not clear whether this was a part of the Cypriot ancestral fiefs of the lords of Beirut or whether it was her dower from the lands held by her second husband. In the years 1309 and 1310 she was occupied in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the duchy of Athens which she claimed through her mother, a member of the ducal family. The date of Eschiva's death is not known, but it is likely to have been early in 1310 for by May of that year her eldest surviving son, Rupert of Montfort, was entitled lord of Beirut. Rupert had been an important supporter of the king in his dispute with the lord of Tyre. He died in 1313, and was succeeded by his son Humphrey, who was made constable of Cyprus by Hugh IV. Little is known about Humphrey except that the possibility of his marrying Henry II's widow was mooted.

On Humphrey's death in 1326 the direct male line was again interrupted,

1. Nicholas IV, no. 6276, see no. 4026; 'Gestes', pp. 790–91, 856–7.
2. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp. 297, 295.
4. 'Processus Cyprius', p. 158. For the other children of Eschiva's first marriage, see 'Gestes', p. 791.
7. See above, p. 423.
and there are no references to any descendant of his as lord or lady of Beirut. Eschiva of Montfort, described by the pope in 1338 as the 'sole heiress of her noble house' was perhaps Rupen's daughter. A dispensation was granted in 1342 for her to marry Peter, later Peter I, but apparently she died without issue. Assuming she was indeed the last member of her family, the titular lordship of Beirut would have passed on her death to King Hugh IV, the son of Eschiva of Ibelin's marriage to Guy of Lusignan.¹

(iv) The Ibelin Counts of Jaffa

The circumstances in which John of Ibelin received the county of Jaffa are obscure, but he was using the title 'count of Jaffa and lord of Ramleh' by June 1247.² Walter of Brienne, the previous occupant of the county, had been captured at Gaza in 1244 and died in captivity some time afterwards.³ Two problems are posed: why did Walter's heirs not inherit, and by what rights did John hold the county? If, as seems possible, Walter never held Jaffa as a fief but only had custody of it on a temporary basis, his sons would have had no right of inheritance.⁴ It has also been suggested that Walter's

3. Hunciman, *History of the Crusades*, III, p.227. It was not known for certain in the West that he had died by July 1247. See 'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne', no. 174. The 'Chronique d'Amadi' (pp.201-2) seems to indicate that his death was in 1250.
4. See above, pp.105-6.
heir let his rights go by default through failing to put in a claim for it;\textsuperscript{1} In the mid 1240's Walter's eldest son, John, was still a minor,\textsuperscript{2} but this is no reason why his mother, a sister of Henry I of Cyprus, or, if she were already dead, his aunt who is known to have brought up Hugh, John's younger brother,\textsuperscript{3} should not have asserted his rights. But it was Henry of Cyprus, as regent of Jerusalem, who presumably made the grant of Jaffa to John of Belin. Jaffa was a valuable fief in a strategic situation and Henry doubtless wanted it held by a man who could defend it, and at the same time probably wanted to buy the support of an important feudatory. At about the same time he made other large grants to prominent Jerusalemite nobles, including the gift of Tyre to Philip of Montfort.\textsuperscript{4} A regent's grant was only valid for the duration of the regency, and, much later, during the reign of Hugh III, it was accepted that Philip's title to Tyre had lapsed, apparently for this reason.\textsuperscript{5} There does not appear to have been any challenge after Henry's death in 1253 to the rights of John and his descendants to Jaffa, and even after its fall in 1268 the family continued to use the title. It is likely that the papal confirmation which John obtained shortly before Henry's death is significant here.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1] L. de Mas Latrie, 'Les comtes de Jaffa et d'Ascalon du XII\textsuperscript{e} au XIX\textsuperscript{e} siècle', Revue des questions historiques, xxvi (1879), p.195.
\item[2] His parents married c. 1235. See above, p.105.
\item[3] 'Documents relatifs à la successibilité', p.408.
\item[5] See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.188, 224-5.
\item[6] See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, p.125.
\end{footnotes}
John of Ibelin was count of Jaffa until his death. According to the
chronicles this was in December 1266, but their dating has been questioned.
There exist two documents in a collection of papal letters made at the end of
the thirteenth century by a papal chancery official, Berard of Naples, to
illustrate chancery style in which an un-named pope rebuked 'Count J.' and
a widowed queen of Cyprus for adultery. We are further told that the count
was married to the sister of the king of Armenia. The only 'Count J.' who
fits this description was John of Jaffa. Leopold Delisle, the first to comment
on these documents, assumed that the queen must be Isabella of Ibelin whose
husband, Hugh II died in December 1267. Following Delisle, F. Jordan made
the assumption that because of the date of Hugh's death, the letters date from
between December 1267 and November 1269, the date of Pope Clement IV's
death; he then concluded that the chronicles must be wrong and that John died
during or after 1268. Jordan's view was accepted by Hill, and further
elaborated by Runciman who accepted that the queen was Isabella, but, to

1. 'Eracles', ii, p.455; 'Gestes', p.766; Marino Sanuto, p.222.

2. See L. Delisle, 'Notice sur cinq manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et
sur un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de Bordeaux contenant des recueils
d'epistolaires de Berard de Naples', Notices et extraits des Manuscrits de la
Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques, xxvii part 2 (1873).

3. Urban IV, nos. 2807-8; Clement IV, nos. 865-6.

4. See Rüdt de Collegenberg, Rupenides, table IIIa (H3).


obviate the problem of John's death, suggested that the man was not John at all, but Julian of Sidon. Julian's wife was a member of the Armenian royal family and her brother was king, though from 1269-1289. But Julian was not a count. An alternative suggestion which won the approval of Maurice Grandclauade was that the queen was Plaisance of Antioch, widow of Henry I, and the letters concerned Ballan of Ibelin, son of John of Arsurn, to whom she had been married for a while during the 1250's. None of the other letters in Berard's collection date from before the pontificate of Urban IV, but there is no reason to suppose that the two in question do not date from between August 1261, the date of Urban IV's election, and whenever Plaisance's death (22 September 1261) was known in Rome. Urban IV, James Panteleon, had been in the East immediately before his election and so would have personal knowledge of any public scandals in Acre, and might have wanted to do something about it at once.

If the letters date to 1261 there is no reason to question that 'Count J.' was John of Jaffa; though the chronicles contain nothing about an adulterous relationship between Plaisance and John, it has been shown that in 1258 they acted together to get the vassals to switch sides in the war of St. Sabas. December 1266 is therefore the probable date for John of Jaffa's death.

3. 'Eracles', ii, p.446.
5. See Riley-Smith, Feudal Nobility, pp.216-17.
It has long been assumed that John was succeeded as count of Jaffa by his son Guy.\(^1\) This view is based on the impression given by the chapter on the counts of Jaffa in the earlier recension of the 'Lignages' that John of Jaffa's only child was 'cestul Gulotin',\(^2\) and on the activities of a Guy of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, at the end of the century. But from a hitherto unknown passage from the later recension of the 'Lignages' it is clear that Guy had an elder brother James,\(^3\) and though this new passage does not say so, there is evidence that James was count of Jaffa before him. One manuscript of the 'Annales de Terre Sainte' records the death of '... le comte de Jaffa, Jaques d'Ybelin ...' in 1276,\(^4\) and the contemporary Arab historian, Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, states that John of Ibelin was succeeded by his son Jāk (i.e. Jacques).\(^5\)

James was almost certainly the author of the treatise on feudal law, and the knight who in 1271 represented the Cypriot feudatories in their dispute with

---


2. 'Lignages', p.452.

3. *Codex Vaticanus Latinus* 4789, fo. cclxxxii\(^v\) col. 2.


5. The extant manuscripts of Ibn al-Furat (writing in the early fifteenth century) as well as those of al-Nūwayrī (writing in the fourteenth century) read Ḫāl which Ibn al-Furat's editors have emended to Jāy (i.e. Guy) even though an emendation to Jāk would have been simpler. Both authors depend directly or indirectly for their account on Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir whose version of this incident has not been published. See Ibn al-Furat, i, p.135 and note. I thank Mr. R.G. Irwin for drawing this to my attention.
King Hugh III over their obligations to perform military services on the Syrian mainland. Apart from his legal activities, not much is known about him; he witnessed charters of John II of Beirut in 1256 and of Hugh III in 1269. Neither in the 1269 charter, nor in the account of his pleading in 1271 is he described as count of Jaffa, but perhaps this can be explained by the recent loss of the county to the Mamlukes.

It is possible that Guy of Ibelin was still young at the time of his brother's death, since in the recension of the 'Lignages' dating to the 1270's his name is given in the diminutive form, and his recorded activities do not begin until 1299. From that date he was prominent in the moves by the Cypriots to join the Mongols in an offensive league against the Mamlukes. He died in 1304 and was clearly held in high esteem.

Guy was succeeded by his son Philip who appears not to have reached

1. Beugnot (James of Ibelin, p.453 note a) thought that James was the son of Ballan of Ibelin, prince of Galilee, the only member of the Ibelin family hitherto known from the 'Lignages' with that name. Rey (Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, p.369) rightly pointed out that as James son of Ballan was a minor in the 1310's, the lawyer was someone else. The new passage from the 'Lignages' confirms the supposition as to his identity made by Rüdt de Collenberg (Rupeades, table IIIa (H3)) and Riley-Smith (Feudal Nobility, pp.22, 127).


3. 'Lignages', p.452.

4. 'Gestes', pp.848, 850; Marino Sanuto, pp.241-2; 'Chronique d'Amadl', p.237, see also p.238. In addition, see John of St. Victor, p.640.

5. 'Chronique d'Amadl', pp.239-40.

6. For confirmation that Philip was Guy's son, see Clement V, no. 2143.
his majority until about 1309. In 1310 he emerged as a supporter of Amaury of Tyre, and after his murder was one of those members of his party who continued to back Amaury of Lusignan and Ballian, prince of Galilee, at Kormakiti. According to the chronicles he died in prison in Kyrenia in 1316. The family remained out of favour for the remainder of Henry II's reign; Guy's widow, Maria of Ibelin, a sister of Ballian of Galilee, was imprisoned in 1318 with her two sisters, but was released by Hugh IV on his accession. Maria had evidently been regarded as an important figure for she was included in a Venetian list of Cypriot dignitaries of about 1310.

After Philip, the next count of Jaffa was Hugh, his younger brother. He married Isabella of Ibelin, daughter of Philip the seneschal and widow of Ferrand of Majorca, and rose to prominence during the reign of Hugh IV. By 1338 he was seneschal of Jerusalem, and his extravagance on the chase

1. Philip was knighted early in 1309; how long this would have been after his majority at the age of 15 is not known. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.385.
3. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.396. The John of Ibelin who died at about the same time was a brother of Philip of Ibelin the Younger and not brother of the count as stated in the chronicle.
4. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.399-400, 401-2. For Maria, described as lady of Ascalon and 'Naumachia', see Délégations des assemblées vénitiennes, no. 147.
5. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.136. The list was apparently drawn up as a guide for clerks engaged in diplomatic correspondence. For another reference to Maria, see Richard, 'La révolution de 1369', p.122 note 1.
7. See above, P.435.
was commented on by Ludolf of Suedhelm. The most interesting period of his career came in the years 1340-42 when he sided with his step-son, Ferrand of Majorca the younger, against Hugh IV. According to Ferrand, Hugh IV seized Hugh of Jaffa's beasts of burden, his 'falcons, leporarii et canes', and all his other goods and sold them. Hugh is not heard of again.

Another son of Guy of Jaffa who was active at this period was Ballian. Nothing is known of him except that he was given dispensation to marry Margaret For, and later Margaret of Ibelin, Lady of Arsuf, and possibly Joanna of Montfort. He was dead by 1363.

A John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, participated in at least two of Peter I's campaigns, in 1365 and in 1367. Whether the line became extinct on his death, and Renier Le Petit, count of Jaffa in 1375, received the title by royal grant, or whether Renier inherited the title by descent through an heiress is not

1. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.215 and note 3. For other references to Hugh see I libri commemorall, ii, p.69; John XII, Lettres communes, no. 54162.


4. A dispensation was issued in 1322 for a Ballian of Ibelin to marry Joanna of Montfort despite their fourth degree relationship. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 15870. This could refer to Ballian son of Guy, though not necessarily so: both he and Joanna had a common great-great-grandfather in John of Ibelin, the 'Old Lord' of Beirut. See Rüdt de Collenberg, Rupenides, tables IIIa (H3), VIII (BK/ME), XI (I).

5. See Urban V, Lettres communes, no. 845.

clear. The end of this branch of the Della family is obscure.

(v) The Morf Counts of Edessa

John of Morf was created counted of Edessa (or Rohais) at Alexandria in 1365. First mentioned in 1338, he was marshal of Cyprus by 1360. In 1360, together with Thomas of Montoliff, the auditor, he was engaged in a diplomatic mission to the West for Peter I which included reaching an agreement with Hugh of Lusignan, the claimant to the throne to whom he betrothed his daughter, negotiating with the Venetians and recruiting mercenaries. During the next few years he served on the campaign of 1361 to Adalia, received a gift from the king of France, and participated in an enquiry into a riot in Famagusta involving the Genoese. He was thus a notable royal servant by the time of the crusade to Alexandria on which he served with distinction, and the title which had been in abeyance since the

1. See above, pp.20,22.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 172.
5. Mas Latirle, Hist. de Chypre, ii, p.233; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 106-9, see para. 214.
6. Mas Latirle, Hist. de Chypre, iii, p.741; Leontios Makhairas, i, paras. 119, 147.
7. William of Machaut, p.74. See Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 163.
late twelfth century was revived for him as a reward. He participated in three expeditions in 1367 and led a raid in 1369. While Peter I was on his second visit to the West, he was said to have had an adulterous affair with Queen Eleanor which led to the death of William Viscount. It is not clear how far he was implicated in the murder of Peter, but he was evidently a leading figure during the regency of the prince of Antioch, and at the time of the coronation of Peter II he was sent to restore order following the riot. He was accused by a chronicler of having been instrumental in the Genoese seizure of Famagusta in 1373, and in 1374 was taken into exile to Chios by the Genoese. After this he disappears from view.

John of Morf had two daughters, one of whom married Hugh, prince of Galilee, and the other, John of Lusignan, lord of Beirut. Not much is known about his male descendants: in 1373 there are references to a Thomas of Morf, described on one occasion as count of Edessa. John was still alive at the time

2. See above, pp. 350-52.
3. William of Machaut (p.262) stated that he was implicated.
4. 'Nouvelles preuves', EFC, xxxv (1874), p.106; Gregory XI, Lettres secrètes ... autres que la France, nos. 87, 553, 718, see no. 1417; John of Delia, p.6.
5. Leontios Makhairas, I, para. 331.
but the chronicler could have been using the title retrospectively. In 1374 a Thomas of Morf, described as the son of the count of Edessa, was banished from Cyprus for his part in the murder of Peter I at the same time as John was sent to Chios. 1 A Thomas of Morf was on the council of regency of 1382. 2 In 1389 there is a reference to a Philip of Morf, count of Edessa, 3 and there is a possible reference to a countess of Edessa in 1423. 4

(vi) The Lords of Tiberias and Princes of Galilee in Cyprus

The first member of this family known in Cyprus is Oste (Otto) of Tiberias who witnessed a charter issued by Alice of Champagne in 1218. 5 Eschiva, lady of Tiberias, the daughter of Oste's brother Ralph was married to Odo of Montbéliard, who, though primarily concerned with Jerusalem, also held lands in Cyprus; in 1238 we hear of a fief of his called 'Tarsis' in the diocese of Paphos; 6 on the only other occasions on which he is mentioned in

1. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 542; Florio Bustron (p. 295) stated that the Thomas mentioned in 1373 was the count's brother.
2. Leontios Makhairas, i, para. 599. He was not given the title of count of Edessa.
6. Gregory IX, no. 4551. For the genealogy of the family, see 'Lignages', p. 455. See also Du Cange, Les familles d'Outremer, pp. 456-61.
documents relating to Cyprus he was not acting as a member of the Cypriot High Court. According to the 'Lignages', Cdo and Eschiva had three daughters, Maria who married Hugh, younger son of Ballan of Ibelin, lord of Beirut, and who died without issue, Joanna who died young and Simonetta who married Philip of Ibelin, son of Baldwin, seneschal of Cyprus. Tiberias itself was lost by the Christians in 1247, and it might be significant that when in 1253 the pope issued a dispensation for the marriage of Philip and Simonetta, they were both described as citizens of Nicosia. Eschiva, lady of Tiberias, was still alive in 1265.

Philip of Ibelin is an elusive figure: he was described as constable of Cyprus by the 'Lignages', but he apparently did not hold that office at the time of the only occasions - in 1253, 1269 and 1271 - on which he is referred to in the documentary sources. He was still alive in 1302, but was dead by 1306.

2. 'Lignages', p.455. Hugh of Ibelin is unknown except from the 'Lignages'.
4. Innocent IV, no. 7006.
5. Reg. Hier., no. 1336a. She was apparently still alive when the earlier recension of the 'Lignages' was made. 'Lignages', p.455 note 3.
6. See above, p.421.
8. 'Chronique d'Amadî', p.238. Despite the statement of the chronicler, he cannot have been constable at that time. See above, p.421. It is possible that the chronicler had confused Philip of Ibelin the constable and Philip of Ibelin the seneschal.
9. 'Cestes', p.858.
Philip and Simonetta had several children,¹ of whom the eldest to survive was Ballian, prince of Galilee and lord of Tiberias,² who married a daughter of Hugh III. Ballian was a leading supporter of the lord of Tyre in the crisis of 1306-1310,³ and after Amaury's death was prominent among those knights who continued to oppose the king.⁴ After his surrender he was sent to Kyrenia castle where he died in 1316.⁵ Among his fiefs was the casal of Akaki.⁶ Ballian had a son named James, but there is nothing to suggest that he or any of his collateral heirs held the title of prince of Galilee.⁷

1. 'Lignages', pp.449, 455. On p.449 the text is corrupt: Philip is wrongly called Ballian. See Codex Vaticanus latinus 479 fo.ccxxxv col. 2 - fo. ccxxxvii col. 1.

2. This title, though commonly used in the twelfth century is found only once in the thirteenth. Reg. Hier., no. 1336a. For Ballian's use of the title, see for example, Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, II, p.138; Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, p.42; Délibérations des assemblées réaliennes, no. 147. See also 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.238, 362.


5. 'Chronique d'Amadi', pp.384, 385-6, 393, 397, 398.


7. James is referred to in a document of 1316 or 1322. Mas Latrie, Hist. de Chypre, III, p.699. See 'Lignages', p.444. Dawkins's assertion (Leontios Makhairas, II, pp.99-100) that he was identical with a James of Ibelin who is mentioned in the 1360's has no foundation.
(vii) **The Le Tor Family**

The Le Tor family were present in the East from the early twelfth century, the earliest known member being a Geoffrey Le Tor who witnessed documents of Baldwin II in 1125 and 1128.¹ In 1169 another Geoffrey Le Tor with his wife, Flandrina, made a grant in the presence of Baldwin III.² In 1169 this Geoffrey made another grant, this time from the revenues of Manueth which proves that he was a member of the family described in the *Lignages*.³ In 1183 Baldwin IV confirmed a sale by Geoffrey with the consent of Flandrina and their son, also named Geoffrey, of a group of *casalia*, not including Manueth, to Joscelin III of Edessa.⁴ The two Geoffreys, father and son, also witnessed a grant by Guy of Lusignan made during the siege of Acre in 1189.⁵ The elder Geoffrey had appeared as a witness to a series of documents between 1161 and 1168,⁶ and then he or his son appeared regularly as a supporter of Guy of Lusignan during and after the siege of Acre, last being heard of in October 1191.⁷ In the list of services due from fiefs in Jerusalem dating to

---

Geoffrey Le Tor (flourished 1125-1128)

Geoffrey Le Tor (fl. 1159-1189/91) = Flandrina

Geoffrey Le Tor (fl. 1183-1189/91)

John Le Tor, lord of Manueth (fl. 1200-1215)
= Beatrice of Beirut

Geoffrey the chamberlain (fl. 1222-1237)
= (1) Alice d. of John of Troyes
= (2) Benvenue of Caffran, former wife of Bernard of La Baume

N. (drowned at Mansourah, 1249)

John Le Tor, lord of Pera (fl. 1286-1319)
= Stephanie, d. of John of Scisson

John Le Tor, lord of Pera (fl. 1286-1319)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geoffrey</th>
<th>Ballan</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Benvenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= Stephanie</td>
<td>= Joanna</td>
<td>= William</td>
<td>= (1) Lawrence of Morf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. of John of Plessia</td>
<td>d. of Paul of Nablus</td>
<td>Viscount</td>
<td>= (2) Baldwin of Piquigny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Eschiva</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>= (3) (1318) Philip Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= (1) (1295)</td>
<td>= (1) Nicholas of Montgisard</td>
<td>= (1328)</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Chappe</td>
<td>= Robert of Montolif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= (2) Hugh of Béla</td>
<td></td>
<td>= (1326)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isabella</th>
<th>Eschiva</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= (1) Nicholas</td>
<td>= Robert of Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= (2) (1326)</td>
<td>Montgisard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gibelet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

The Le Tor family

(Note: dotted lines conjectural)
the mid 1180's, Geoffrey Le Tor appeared as a vassal of Count Joscelin, \(^1\) and in 1200 and 1208 a John Le Tor witnessed documents as a vassal of William of La Manelië and Otto of Henneburg respectively, the husbands of Joscelin's daughters. \(^2\) In 1212 John Le Tor was viscount of Acre, \(^3\) and in 1215 he was sent by John of Brienne to the Fourth Lateran Council. \(^4\) In 1212 John of Brienne had sold Manueth to the Hospitallers. \(^5\)

This John Le Tor is the first member of the family mentioned in the 'Liganages'. Peter of Beirut who is said to have been his father-in-law is generally agreed to be non-existent and the most recent study of the Beirut family suggests that John's father-in-law was Guy II of Beirut (flourished c. 1147-1158). \(^6\) If this is correct, it is likely that John's wife was much older than John as her father was dead by 1157 and her brothers, Walter and Guy, by the end of the twelfth century. \(^7\)

John's son Geoffrey is first to be found in 1222 as a witness to a document of John of Brienne. \(^8\) Following the return of Frederick II to the West he was

\(^1\) John of Ibelin, p.422.
\(^2\) Reg. Hier., nos. 777, 829.
\(^3\) Reg. Hier., no. 857.
\(^4\) 'Eacles', II, p.319 (ms. 'A').
\(^5\) Reg. Hier., no. 858a.
\(^6\) M.F. Nickerson, 'The seigneury of Beirut in the twelfth century and the Brisebarre family of Beirut-Blanchegarde', Byzantion, xix (1949), pp.155, 160-64.
\(^7\) Nickerson, 'Beirut', pp.162, 168, 169.
\(^8\) Reg. Hier., no. 953.
sent to tell him of Alice of Champagne's claim to the bailiwick of Jerusalem and to request that Conrad come East. He showed himself to be a staunch supporter of the Belin cause at the time of John of Belin's attempt to relieve Beirut in 1232, and is first known in connection with Cyprus in that same year when he was among the signatories to the treaty with Genoa.

Immediately following the return to Palestine of Henry of Nazareth and Philip of Troyes in 1236, he was sent to the pope by the Commune of Acre. At that time he was said to be living in Cyprus since, though born in Jerusalem, Henry I had given him a large fief there; and the chronicler adds that later he became chamberlain of Cyprus. In 1247 he witnessed a document of Henry I as chamberlain. The last reference to him is to be found in 1257 when he was named as a member of a three-man arbitration tribunal set up to decide differences between Bohemond VI and the Master of the Hospital.

Geoffrey was clearly an able man, for not only did he go on two embassies to the West and become chamberlain of Cyprus, but was the author of the law books which are known by his name.

A Guy Le Tor appears among the signatories to the Cypriot treaty of

1. 'Fracles', ii, p.380.
2. 'Fracles', ii, p.394.
6. 'Inventaire de pièces de l'ordre de l'Hospital', no. 305.
1232 with the Genoese, but it is not possible to know how, if at all, he was related to the other members of the family.

John Le Tor, son of Geoffrey and his second wife, Benvenute of Caffran, first appeared as a witness to a document of Henry II in 1287 (1286 o.s.), and then as witness to two others in 1291. In 1306 he supported Amaury of Tyre, and was apparently still a member of his party in 1309. After Amaury's murder he was a member of the royalist group, being chosen to act as a counsellor of the queen; he was active in the negotiations between the parties, and in July 1310 was appointed by Aygue of Bethsan to be captain of Nicosia. On this occasion he was described as a 'prode homo et vechio cavaller', and this reference to his age is an indication that he was probably the man who first appeared in 1287. In 1315 he witnessed the marriage contract of Isabella of Bellev and Ferrand of Majorca. In 1318 and 1319 he was an

2. According to the 'Lignages', Geoffrey married first Alice of Troyes and then Benvenute of Caffran. See Codex Vaticanus latinus 4789, fo. coixxxxix col. 2 which corrects the reading in the printed edition in 'Lignages', p.464.
6. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.303.
8. 'Chronique d'Amadi', p.369.
9. 'Nouvelles preuves', REC, xxxiv (1873), p.63.
emissary to the papal court; he died before 1326. In July 1298 Boniface VIII issued a dispensation for the marriage within prohibited degrees for Alice daughter of John Le Tor, here described as lord of Pera, and Peter Chappe. In 1318 his daughter, Bevenue was given a dispensation to marry Philip Costa. There are references in 1326 and 1328 to an Agnes and John Le Tor, children of the late John Le Tor and also in 1326 to an Isabella Le Tor who is not further identified but who is probably the Isabella mentioned in the 'Lignages' as the daughter of John and sister of Alice and Bevenue.

According to the 'Lignages', John Le Tor had an elder half-brother who was drowned at Mansourah, presumably in 1249. There is no record of any member of the Le Tor family alive after 1328.

1. John XXII, Lettres communes, nos. 7966, 7967, 7974, 8532, 9947.
2. See John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 24525.
4. John XXII, Lettres communes, no. 8532, see no. 24971.
5. John XXII, Lettres communes, nos. 24525, 26589, 43150.
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Note: These maps are designed to show the location of villages mentioned in the text. The places shown were not necessarily the most important during the two centuries under consideration.
1. Western Cyprus
2. **Central Cyprus**
3. Eastern Cyprus
Bibliography of Manuscripts and Works cited

I. Manuscripts

Bodleian Library: Ms. Selden Supra 69 (Selden’s ms. no. 3457). ¹

Vatican Library: Codex Vaticanus latinus 4789. ²

1. For description see Grandclaude, 'Classement sommaire', pp.456-8.

II. Printed works

1. Documents and collections of materials


'Actes passés à Famagouste de 1299 à 1301 par devant le notaire génois Lamberto di ambuceto', ed. C. Desimoni, AGL, ii (1884), continued in ROL, i (1893).


'Bans et Ordonnances des roi de Chypre, 1286-1362', RHC Lois, ii.


Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Notre-Dame de la Merci-Dieu, autrement dit de Bécheron au diocèse de Poitiers, ed. F. Clouzot (Archives historiques du Poitou, 34) (Poitiers, 1905).


'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne, 950-1356', compiled by H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, BEC, xxxii (1872).


Deux projets de croisade en Terre-Sainte, composés à la fin du XIIIᵉ siècle et au début de XIVᵉ, ed. C. Kohler, RCL, x (1903-4).


'Document gênois concernant l'histoire de Chypre', ed. L. de Mas Latrèie, ACL, ii (1884).

Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi fino all'anno MDXXXI, ed. G. Müller (Florence, 1879).

'Documents chypriotes du début du XIVᵉ siècle', ed. C. Kohler, RCL, xi (1907-8).

'Documents nouveaux servant de preuves à l'histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de lusignan', ed. L. de Mas Latrèie, CDI. Mélanges historiques, iv (1882).

'Documents relatifs à la successibilité au trône et à la régence', RHC Lois, ii.


Pope Innocent III, 'Opera Omnia', PL, ccxiv-cxxvii.


Pope John XXI: see Popes Gregory X and John XXI.


'Lettre inédite d'Innocent III de l'an 1206', ed. L. de Mas Latrie, BFC, xxxvi (1875).

Liber iurium reipublicae Genuensis, (Historiae patriae monumenta, 7, 9), 2 vols. (Turin, 1854-7).


Memorias históricas sobre la marina, comercio y artes de la antigua ciudad de Barcelona, ed. A. de Capmany y de Montpalau, 4 vols. (Madrid, 1779-92).


'Nouvelles preuves de l'histoire de Chypre', ed. L. de Mas Latrie, BFC, xxxii, xxxiv, xxxv (1871, 1873, 1874).

'Processus Cyricus', ed. K. Schottmüller, in Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens, II (Berlin, 1887).

Regesta pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV, compiled by A. Potthast, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1874-5).


'A register of the cartulary of the cathedral of Santa Sophia of Nicosia', compiled by J.L. La Mothe, Byzantion, v (1930).

Tabulae ordinis Theutonicî, ed. E. Strehlke (Berlin, 1869).
'Texte officiel de l'allocution adressée par les barons de Chypre au roi Henri II pour lui notifier sa déchéance', ed. L. de Mas Latrie, Revue des questions historiques, xlii (1888).


(See also books and articles marked with asterisks and listed under Secondary Works.)
2. Legal Texts and Narrative Sources.

' Abrégé du Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois', RIC Lois, ii.

Alberic of Trois Fontaines, 'Chronica', MGHs, xvi.


'Anales de Tierra Santa', ed. A. Sánchez Candeira, in 'Las Cruzadas en la Historiografía española de la época. Traducción castellana de una redacción desconocida de los "Anales de Tierra Santa"', Hispania, xx (1960).

Andrea Gutarri, 'Chronicon Patavinum', RIS, xvii.

Andrea of Redusis de Quero, 'Chronicon Tarvisianum', RIS, xix.


Bartolomeo Sacchi called 'il Platina', 'Platynaee historici Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum', ed. G. Galdio, RISNS, iii, 1.


Chronique d’Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (SHF) (Paris, 1871).

Chronique des Quatre Premiers Valois (1327-93), ed. S. Luce (SHF) (Paris, 1862).

'La Clef des Assises de la Haute Cour du royaume de Jérusalem et de Chypre', RHC Lois, 1.

'Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, de 1229 à 1261, dite du manuscrit de Rothelin', RHC Occ., ii.


'Document relatif au service militaire', RHC Lois, ii.

'L'histoire d'Eraclès empereur et la conquête de la Terre d'Oultremer', RHC Occ., 1, ii.


'Formules', RHC Lois, ii.


Geoffrey Le Tor, 'Livre', RHC Lois, 1.

George Stella, 'Annales Genuenses', RIS, xvii.

'Les Gesta des Chiprols', RHC Arm., ii. Reference has also been made to the following edition of the second section of this compilation: Philip of Novara, Mémoires, 1218-1243, ed. C. Kohler (Les classiques français du moyen âge, 10) (Paris, 1913).

Gislebert of Mons, 'Chronicon Hannoniae', RHF, xviii.

Hayton of Gorhigos, 'La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient ou Flos historiarum terre Orientis', RHC Arm., ii.


James of Ibelin, 'Livre', RHC Lois, 1.

John Dardel, 'Chronique d'Arménie', *RHC Arm.*, ii.

John of Belin, 'Livre', *RHC Lois*, i.


'Les Lignages d'Outremer', *RHC Lois*, ii.

'Le Livre au Roy', *RHC Lois*, i.


Marino Sanudo the Elder, 'Liber secretorum fidelium crucis', ed. J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611), ii.

Marino Sanudo the Younger, 'Vitae ducum Venetorum', *RIS*, xxii.


Peter Dubois, 'Opinio cuiusdam suadentis regi Francie ut regnum Jerosolimitanum et Cipri acquireret pro altero fillorum suorum, ac de invasione regni Egipti', ed. C.-V. Langlois in Peter Dubois, *De recuperatione Terre Sancte* (Collection des textes pour servir à l'étude et l'enseignement de l'histoire, 9) (Paris, 1891).


Philip of Mézières, "Épistre lamentable et consolatoire sur le fait de la desconsidture lacrimable du noble at vaillant roy de Honguerie par les Turcs devant la ville de Nicopoli", ed. J.M.B.C. Kervyn de Lettenhove in Jean Froissart, Oeuvres, xvi.

Philip of Novara, Mémoires: see 'Les Gestes des Chiprois'.

Philip of Novara, 'Livre', RHC Lois, 1.


Raphaynus de Caresiais, 'Chronica', ed. F. Pastorello, RISNS, xii, 2.

Stephen of Lusignan, Description de toute l'île de Cypre, des roys, princes et seigneurs tant Payens que Chrestiens, qui ont commandé en icelle (Paris, 1580).


(Books and articles marked with asterisks contain printed documents to which reference has been made.)


Bion, S., 'Guy de Arménie et Guy de Chypre. Isabelle de Lusignan à la court de Mistra', *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, v (= *Mélanges Émile Boisacq*, i) (1937).

Blanchet, A.: see Shlumberger, G., Chalandon, F. and Blanchet, A.


Chalandon, F., see Schlumberger, G., Chalandon, F., and Blanchet, A.

Chandon de Briailles, F., 'Lignages d'Outre-Mer, les seigneurs de Margat', Syria, xxv (1946-8).

Clermont-Ganneau, C., 'Nouveaux monuments des croisés en Terre Sainte', AOL, ii (1884).


Downs, N., see La Monte, J.L. and Downs, N.


Eubel, C. et al., Hierarchia catholica medii aevi sive summorum Pontificum, S.R.F. Cardinalium, ecclesiærum antistitum, 7 vols., 2nd ed. (Munster, 1913-68). (Volumes iii-vii are entitled Hierarchia catholica medii et recentioris aevi ...)


Hackett, J., A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus from the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45-1678) together with some Account of the Latin and Other Churches existing in the Island (London, 1901).


Kohler, C., *Introduction to Hayton of Gorhigoz 'Le Flor des Fstoiries'*, RHC Arm., i.


La Monte, J.L., 'John d'Ibelin, the old Lord of Beirut, 1177-1236', *Byzantion*, xii (1937).

La Monte, J.L., 'The Lords of Sidon in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Byzantion*, xvii (1944-5).


La Monte, J.L. and Downs, N., 'The Lords of Bethsan in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, vi (1960).

Laurent, V.: see Brayer, F., Lemerle, P. and Laurent, V.

Lemerle, P.: see Brayer, F., Lemerle, P. and Laurent, V.


Löher, F.v., 'Kaiser Friedrich II. Kampf um Cypem', Abhandlungen der historischen Classe de Königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, xiv (1879).


Luttrell, A.T., 'The Hospitaliers in Cyprus after 1291', Praktika tou protou diethnous kypriologikou sunedriou (Nicosia, 1972), II.


Mas Latrie, L. de, 'Notice sur la construction d’une carte de l’île de Chypre', BEC, sér. 5, iv (1883).


Mas Latrie, L. de, 'Les comtes de Carpass', BEC, xli (1889).

Mas Latrie, L. de, 'Généalogie des rois de Chypre de la famille de Lusignan', Archivio Veneto, xxi (1881).
Mas Latrīe, L. de, 'Le fief de la Chamberlaine et les chambellans de Jérusalem', BFC, xliii (1882).

Mas Latrīe, L. de, 'Histoire des archevêques latins de l'île de Chypre', AOL, ii (1884).

Mas Latrīe, L. de, Trésor de chronologie, d'histoire et de géographie pour l'étude et l'emploi des documents du moyen âge (Paris, 1889).

Mas Latrīe, L. de, 'Les seigneurs de Ars sur Terre Sainte', Revue des questions historiques, Iv (1894).


Müller, H., Der Longebardenkrieg auf Cypern 1229-1233. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gestes des Chiprois des Philippe de Novaire (Halle, 1890).


*Richard, J., 'Le casal de Psimolofo et la vie rurale en Chypre au XIVe siècle', Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome, llix (1947).*


Richard, J., *'Paire d'Orient latin: Les quatre baronnies des royaumes de Jérusalem et de Chypre', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, ser. 4, xxviii (1950).*

Richard, J., *'La révolution de 1369 dans le royaume de Chypre', BEG, cx (1952).*


Richard, J., *'Le statut de la femme dans l'Orient Latin', Recueils de la société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparatives des Institutions, xii, 2 (1962).*

Richard, J., *'La Fauconnerie de Jean de Francièrè et ses sources', Le moyen âge, lxix (1963).*

Richard, J., *'Le royaume de Chypre et le grand schisme à propos d'un document recemment découvert', Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (1965).*

*Richard, J., 'L'ordonnance de décembre 1296 sur le prix du pain à Chypre', *Epêteria tou Kentrou Epistemonikou Erevnoi*, i (1967-8).*


Richard, J., *'La situation juridique de Famagouste dans le Roayme des Lusignans', Praktika tou protou dieithnos kuprologikou sonedriou (Nicosia, 1972), ii.*


* Sperone, C., Real Grandeza de la serenissima República de Genova, escrita en lengua Española por Don Luis de Gongora Alcasar et Pempicleon, y despues añadida y traducida en lengua italiana por Carlos Esperon, noble Ginoves ... (Genoa, 1669).


Zurita, J., *Anales de la corona de Aragon*, ed. A. Canellas Lopez, 2 vols. so far (Saragossa, 1967- ). (For the sections which have not yet appeared in the new edition, the Saragossa edition of 1610 has been consulted.)