THE KINGDOM OF CYPRUS

1191–1291

From the moment when Richard the Lionhearted arrived with his fleet off Limassol on May 6, 1191, the island of Cyprus was destined to take an increasingly large place in crusading history.


For modern works, in addition to Mas Latrie’s and Hill’s histories cited above, see: N. Iorga, France de Chypre (Paris, 1931) (interesting viewpoints, though many inaccuracies); J. Hackett, A History of the Orthodox Church in Cyprus (London, 1901; Greek translation by C. I. Papaioannou, 3 vols., Athens and Peiraeus, 1923–1927); Sir Ronald Storrs, A Chronology of Cyprus (Nicosia, 1930) (useful, though a few inaccuracies); M. Grandclaudé, Étude critique sur les livres des Assistances de Jérusalem (Paris, 1923); C. Enlart, L’Art gothique et de la renaissance en Chypre (2 vols., Paris, 1899); and G. Jeffery, A Description of the Historic Monuments of Cyprus (Nicosia, 1918).
Whether one holds with Iorga that the conquest of Cyprus was an integral part of Richard’s grand strategy for the crusade, or with Hill that the conquest was only a “side-issue”, which later developed into a major operation, still the position and resources of the island were obviously bound to involve it eventually in the fortunes of the crusader states on the mainland.¹ Cape Andreas, the easternmost tip of the island, lies only a day’s sail, with favoring winds, from the coast of Syria less than seventy miles distant; and the northern coast of the island approaches to within forty miles of the coast of Anatolia. In clear weather from the height of Stavrovouni one can see Mt. Lebanon, and from the peaks of the northern range of mountains, the summits of the Taurus range eighty miles away. For centuries a way-station for pilgrim traffic to the Holy Land, Cyprus, since the First Crusade, had intermittently provided ships and supplies to the crusaders. In 1155 or 1156, it suffered from a devastating raid, condemned alike by Greeks and Latins, at the hands of the freebooting Reginald of Châtillon.

In 1191 Cyprus had been subject for almost seven years to the tyranny of a great-nephew of emperor Manuel I, Isaac Ducas Comnenus, who had assumed the title basileus and had thwarted all efforts of the emperors Andronicus I Comnenus and Isaac II Angelus to dislodge him. An enemy of the Latins and an ally of Saladin, Isaac Comnenus of Cyprus prevented the Franks in Syria from procuring provisions, and gave orders that no ship of the crusaders was to be allowed to enter any port of the island.² Toward the end of April 1191, two of the ships accompanying that in which Richard’s sister, Joan of Sicily, and his betrothed, Berengaria, had sailed from Messina, were wrecked on the southern coast near Limassol. Isaac robbed and mistreated the survivors, endeavored to entice the ladies ashore in order to hold them for ransom, and, upon

¹ Iorga, France de Chypre, pp. 16–17; Hill, History of Cyprus, I, 315–316.
² Hill, History of Cyprus, I, 317, cites only English sources for the league with Saladin; cf. Hackett, Orthodox Church in Cyprus, p. 60; R. Grousset, Histoire des croisades, III, 47; and Mas Latrié, Histoire de l’île de Chypre, I, 21 (the last cites also the Continuator of William of Tyre and William the Breton). But see Abū-Shāmāh, Ar-raūdatān (RHC, Or., IV), pp. 508–516, quoting a letter of the qadi al-Fādil, secretary of state under Saladin, who refers to the “liberated king from Cyprus”, his opposition toward the king of England, and his offer of friendship to the sultan. The editors of ar-Raūdatān, p. 510, note 1, say that the phrase “roi affranchi” (Arabic, al-malik al-‘affān) involving a play on words with another meaning of “good” or “precious”) refers to Guy of Lusignan, liberated after Hattin, but this makes little sense since Guy aided Richard in taking Cyprus. It seems probable that it refers to Isaac who, before going to Cyprus, had been taken prisoner and liberated by the Armenians. A reference to a “roi affranchi” at the siege of Acre undoubtedly does refer to Guy: see p. 413 and note 2, with reference to another possible translation: “ancien roi”. The index, s.v. “Chypre” and “Guy de Lusignan”, continues the confusion. Cf. A. Cartellieri, Philipp II. August (4 vols., Leipzig, 1899–1921), II, 189, note 1, who identifies the “liberated king from Cyprus” as Isaac. On the Byzantine situation, see above, chapter IV, pp. 145–148.
their refusal, denied them supplies of fresh water. At this juncture, Richard with the rest of his fleet arrived from Rhodes (May 6).

Within a month the whole island had fallen to Richard. On May 12 he married Berengaria at Limassol and had her crowned queen of England. At Famagusta envoys arrived from Philip Augustus to press Richard to hurry on to Acre, but the latter sent word:

'Twas vain to urge him on to haste;
The words they spake were but a waste.
Himself had made swift action,
And, having with the Greeks begun,
The half of Russia's wealth he'd spurn
Before to Syria he would turn
Till he had crushed the Cypriot
From whose isle rich supplies are got.¹

During the conquest Guy of Lusignan, anxious to gain Richard's support against Philip Augustus and the party of Conrad of Montferrat, arrived with a contingent from the mainland. Familiar with the "passable roads and difficult places" of the island,⁵ he helped in the reduction of the great northern castles of Kyrenia, Kantara, Buffavento, and St. Hilarion (Dieudamour to the Franks).

When Isaac was captured, he asked Richard, according to the popular legend, not to place him in irons. Richard, accordingly, turned him over in silver chains to the custody of the Hospitallers, who imprisoned him in their castle of al-Marqab until shortly before his death, probably in 1195. With all Cyprus in his hands, including enormous booty, Richard sailed for Acre on June 5, after appointing Richard de Camville and Robert of Turnham to administer the island, with orders to send supplies to Syria. Thereafter "the Franks received reinforcements by sea, as well food as soldiers and arms, to such an extent that fresh vegetables and early fruits were sent to them from the island of Cyprus and arrived within forty-eight hours."⁶

The Cypriotes, embittered by the despotic rule of Isaac, had put up little opposition to Richard, but they were speedily disillusioned. Neophytus, the saintly hermit of the Enkleistra, in a

---

³ See Hill, History of Cyprus, I, 317 ff. and notes for variant versions of the conquest, which is discussed in the context of the Third Crusade in chapter II, above, pp. 62-64.
letter to a friend, after describing the misrule of Isaac, writes: “... lo, the Englishman lands in Cyprus, and forthwith all ran unto him! Then the king [Isaac], abandoned by his people, gave himself also unto the hands of the English. Him the English king bound in irons and having seized his vast treasures, and grievously wasted the land, sailed away to Jerusalem, leaving behind him ships to strip the country.... The wicked wretch achieved nought against his fellow wretch Saladin, but achieved this only, that he sold our country to the Latins for two hundred thousand pounds of gold. Whereon great was the wailing.... The hermit took bitter satisfaction in the inconclusive outcome of the Third Crusade, for “Providence was not well pleased to thrust out dogs, and to bring wolves in their room.”

An unsuccessful revolt by the disaffected Greeks led Richard, anxious to avoid further difficulties with his new conquest, to sell Cyprus to the Templars for a down payment of 40,000 dinars, with 60,000 more to follow from the revenues of the island. Having attempted to exploit the island to the limit, the Templars were faced in April 1192 with a new revolt, which they suppressed mercilessly, with much indiscriminate bloodshed. Disgusted with their purchase, they then, possibly at the suggestion of the dispossessed king of Jerusalem, Guy of Lusignan, turned the island over to him. He paid them 40,000 dinars, borrowed either from the burgesses of Tripoli or from the Genoese, and assumed responsibility for the remaining 60,000 still owing to Richard.

Thus by a strange series of chances, Cyprus, permanently separated from the Greek empire, fell under the dynasty of the Lusignans, who ruled it for close on three hundred years. In the thirteenth century it became a “staging area” for crusading operations, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the easternmost outpost of Christendom.

In May 1192, at about the time when Henry of Champagne became ruler of Jerusalem, Guy, having taken possession of the island from Richard I, crossed over to Cyprus. He found vacant lands to be distributed: the ancient public domain, and the lands of those who had fled before or after Richard’s conquest. He found

---

7 Excerpta Cypria (R. Cobham), pp. 12, 10. For dating of this letter about 1196, see Hill, History of Cyprus, I, 309, note 2.
9 The chroniclers of the conquest speak of Greek magnates who, at Nicosia, gave Richard half their lands in return for confirmation of their privileges. Since no further mention of them is found, it is probable that those who submitted kept their lands and the rest lost all. See Mas Latrie, Histoire de l’île de Chypre, I, 46–47.
a terrified population to be reassured, for the ferocity of the Templars had caused inhabitants of both town and country to seek refuge in the mountains. When Guy "had the land, he sent out word to restore confidence to the villeins and he repopulated the cities and the castles; and he sent word to all the countries round about that all knights and Turcopoles and burgesses who wished fiefs and lands should come to him and he would give them to them. So they came from the kingdom of Jerusalem, from Tripoli, from Antioch, and from Armenia. And there were established fiefs worth four hundred white bezants for a knight and worth three hundred for a turcopole with two horses and a coat of mail; and they were assigned lands and he gave burgages in the cities." 10 Guy enfeoffed knights dispossessed by Saladin; widows, whom he dowered and married off; orphans; and even "Greeks, cobblers, masons, and writers of the Saracen tongue." In all he parceled out about three hundred fiefs to knights and two hundred to men-at-arms, besides further grants to burgesses and to the common people, so that he had left scarcely the wherewithal to support twenty knights. 11 The Eracles compares this policy favorably with that of the first Latin emperor at Constantinople a decade later: "And I tell you truly that if count Baldwin had thus peopled the land of Constantinople, when he was emperor, he would never have lost it. But, by bad advice, he coveted all and so lost all, both his body and his land." 12

Having laid the foundations of a new feudal monarchy in Cyprus, Guy died some time after August 18, 1194. 13 He had never assumed the title king of Cyprus, but only that of dominus. His contemporaries judged him weak and lacking in discernment, even simple-minded, yet unquestionably he possessed considerable courage. Though possibly he was too open-handed in his distribution of lands, he showed wisdom and common sense in his arrangements for Cyprus. Richard had granted the island to Guy for life only and, upon quitting the Holy Land, had transferred his rights to Henry of Champagne, but neither Richard nor Henry claimed

10 Eracles (RHC, Occ., II), pp. 191–192.
11 Ibid., pp. 188–189 (MS. G).
12 Ibid., p. 189 (MS. D); Mas Latrie, Histoire de l'ile de Chypre, II, 9. Baldwin I of Constantinople did of course distribute fiefs, but chiefly to Latins, thus alienating many Greeks (see above, chapter VI, pp. 192–193, 199).
13 Until recently the accepted date of Guy's death has been April 1194, but Jean Richard has discovered in the State Archives of Genoa the only known charter of Guy as Lord of Cyprus, dated August 18, 1194: his "Nouveaux documents," Procks-verbaux, p. 261. For varying estimates of Guy, see M. W. Baldwin, Raymond III of Tripoli and the Fall of Jerusalem (1140-1287) (Princeton, 1936), pp. 62 ff., and volume I of the present work, chapter XIX, pp. 603, 611.
the reversion. Guy was succeeded by his younger brother Aimery (1194–1205).

After being duly chosen by the barons of Cyprus, Aimery’s first task was to replenish his treasury, badly depleted by Guy’s generosity. Since his brother had given away almost all the land (and at fixed values, while the lands had appreciated to almost double), Aimery called together the knights and said: “You are my men. You know well that I have so little land that each one of you has more than I. How should it be that I, who am your lord, should be so poor and you so rich? That is not seemly. Therefore, I ask that you take counsel among yourselves and that each man of you surrender to me some of your rents and of your land.” After each had done “what he could”, Aimery took measures “either by force, or by friendship, or by agreement”, so that at his death his revenues in Cyprus had risen to at least 200,000 bezants.14

Since Aimery “feared the emperor of Constantinople, who was a Grifon”,15 he determined to strengthen his position by asking for the crown of Cyprus from emperor Henry VI. The emperor, prevented by illness from leading his projected crusade, appointed the imperial chancellor, bishop Conrad of Hildesheim, to head the expedition, and entrusted the coronation to him. In the autumn of 1197, Aimery did homage to the chancellor in Nicosia and was crowned. This coronation was to bear bitter fruits in the Lombard war of Frederick II.

Meanwhile Henry of Champagne died in September 1197, and the high court of Jerusalem, prompted by the imperial chancellor, offered the crown to Aimery. Aimery accepted, but disappointed Innocent III, who saw the potential advantage to the Holy Land of a king with the resources of Cyprus at his command, by stipulating that the revenues of the kingdom of Cyprus should not be used to bolster up the kingdom of Jerusalem. He married the widowed queen Isabel (his first wife Eschiva of Ibelin had died), and was crowned with her in October 1197. Thenceforth he resided more frequently at Acre than at Nicosia. He proved himself a notable ruler until, in the Lenten season of 1205, he died of overindulgence in the choice dourades which the fisherfolk brought him. “King of the two kingdoms, first of Cyprus and then of Syria,”

14 Eracles (RHC, Occ., II), pp. 190–191 (MS. C gives 300,000 bezants; MS. G, 200,000). Before Henry of Champagne died, he and Aimery, who had been at odds, patched up their differences in an agreement which remitted the 60,000 dinars which Aimery still owed; it also provided that Aimery’s three sons marry Henry’s three daughters, but when the time arrived for this, Hugh (see below, p. 603) was the only surviving son.

15 I.e., a Greek, Alexius III Angelus (1195–1203); Eracles (RHC, Occ., II), p. 209. For the plans of Henry VI, see above, chapter III, pp. 116–120.
wrote John of Ibelin in the Livre des Assises, “he governed both well and wisely until his death.”

Aimery’s heir for the crown of Cyprus was his ten-year-old son by Eschiva, Hugh I (1205–1218). In violation of the rule that the regent to administer the kingdom should be the nearest relative on the side through which the throne escheated, and that the guardian of the minor king should be the nearest relative on the other side, the high court of Nicosia appointed Walter of Montbéliard, constable of Jerusalem and husband of Hugh’s elder sister Burgundia, to both positions. In 1208, when Hugh attained the marriageable age of fourteen, Walter negotiated the marriage of the young king with Alice, daughter of Henry of Champagne and Isabel of Jerusalem. Hugh’s first act upon reaching his majority in 1210 was to demand from Walter an accounting of his administration. Breaking his promise to the high court to render an account, Walter decamped with his family and valuables to Acre, where he was welcomed by his cousin, John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem. Until his death, probably in 1212, Walter stirred up trouble for Hugh in his relations with the church. Hugh’s short reign was brought to a close by his death in Tripoli on January 10, 1218, while on the Fifth Crusade. He “was very ready to undertake anything which concerned him and might turn to his honour. He was very fond of the company of knights and all kinds of men of arms. He was irascible and violent, but his anger soon passed.” He left an heir, Henry I, about eight months old.

The barons of Cyprus entrusted the guardianship of the infant king to his mother Alice, and also recognized her as regent “but as the mother and not as any possible heir to the throne.” Fearing her inexperience, they associated with her as administrative bailie first her uncle, Philip of Ibelin (1218–1227), and then his brother John, the “old lord” of Beirut (1227–1228). Alice kept the guardianship and the whole of the royal revenues, but when difficulties arose between her and the Ibelins she finally left for Syria, probably in 1223. Though John was forced to turn the king over to the emperor Frederick and his bailies in 1228, the Ibelins worked

---

18 Eracles (RHC, Occ., II), p. 360, quoted in Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 83, where he corrects the translation of Mas Latrine, Histoire de l’Ile de Chypre, I, 182.
19 LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, p. 52, note 2. The documents call Alice simply “queen of Cyprus” and call the Ibelins “bailie”.
20 See Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 88, note 3, for the disputed date of Alice’s break with her uncles.
together to govern the island during the critical years of the Lombard war, and John continued, until his death in 1236, to exercise practical control over king Henry I.

Politically the middle third of Henry I’s long reign (1218–1253) was dominated by the Lombard war (1229–1243), so fateful for the Latin kingdoms in the east. Anticipating the claims which Frederick II might raise when he embarked on his crusade, the Ibelins had had Henry crowned in 1225, though he did not officially come of age until 1232. The war ended, as far as operations in Cyprus were concerned, in 1233, when effective imperial suzerainty over the island ceased.

In the earlier years of his reign Henry was too young to play an active role; even later on he never seems to have assumed a commanding position. The barons of Jerusalem in 1243 chose his mother Alice to be regent of their kingdom until Frederick II’s son Conrad should come to claim it. Henry succeeded his mother as regent when she died in 1246, and added to his title king of Cyprus that of lord of Jerusalem. Yet he was a singularly colorless figure. Hill, noting that Joinville does not even mention Henry, has suggested that “the corpulence, which won for him the nickname of ‘the Fat’, may have been connected with mental lethargy”.

In January 1253 Henry I died in Nicosia, leaving the kingdom to his infant son Hugh II (1253–1267), under the regency of his queen, Plaisance, sister of Bohemond VI of Antioch. Seemingly it was to this young Hugh, who did not live to attain his majority, that Thomas Aquinas dedicated the *De regimine principum*. In 1257 Bohemond took Hugh and Plaisance to Acre, and succeeded in having Hugh recognized as heir to the kingdom of Jerusalem, and Plaisance as regent for her son. But her death in 1261 brought up again the question of the regencies of both Cyprus and Jerusalem. There were at least three possible claimants: Isabel, sister of Henry I of Cyprus, who had married Henry of Antioch, younger son of Bohemond IV; her son, Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan; and Hugh of Brienne, the son of her deceased elder sister Mary and Walter of Brienne, count of Jaffa. Isabel’s claim to the regency of Cyprus was passed over by the high court in favor of a male, her son Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan, while Hugh of Brienne, possibly in deference to his aunt who had brought him up, did not press his claim. In Jerusalem, however, Isabel and her husband were

---
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recognized as regent and bailie in 1263, but, upon her death in 1264, a contest arose over the claims of the two Hughes. The high court of Jerusalem decided in favor of Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan on the grounds that “he was the eldest living male relative in the first degree of relationship to the minor, and was most closely related to the person last seised of the office.” This significant decision became a precedent in later cases in Cyprus, notably at the succession of Hugh IV in 1324.

The death of Hugh II in 1267 brought to an end the series of Lusignans directly descended in the male line from Hugh (VIII), ancestor of the counts of La Marche. The high court chose as king Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan, who adopted his mother’s name and thenceforth called himself Hugh of Lusignan. In 1268 Charles of Anjou executed Conradin, last of the Hohenstaufens, and Hugh became also king of Jerusalem. The reigns of Hugh III (1267–1284) and his sons, John I (1284–1285) and the epileptic Henry II (1285–1324), kings of Cyprus and Jerusalem, were to witness the death throes of Frankish Syria.

The establishment of a Latin kingdom in Cyprus presented certain advantages to the crusaders of the thirteenth century. It constituted an ideal advance base of operations, where successive expeditions might rendezvous, recuperate from the rigors of the long sea voyage, and concert plans for attack on Egypt or Syria. As a source of supplies, the island, “mout riche et bone et bien plaintive de tous biens,” was no less important. Furthermore, protected by the surrounding seas, it furnished for harried fighters from the mainland an ideal retreat, where they might rest and recover their spirits before returning to the struggle. Of much assistance, then, to the crusaders, “the possession of Cyprus allowed them to prolong for another century their occupation of the Syrian seaports.”

On the other hand its occupation led to certain distinct disadvantages. Secure and prosperous, it proved to be an irresistible attraction not only to the barons of Syria, but even to the common people on their Syrian estates, to whom the liberal policies of Guy

23 LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, p. 76; see above, chapter XVI, pp. 570–571.
24 Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 179, seems to have erred in stating that John was crowned king of Jerusalem. Of all the authorities he cites, only the late writer Lusignan speaks of his being proclaimed king in Tyre (Description de toute l’île de Cypre, f. 137v). The testimony is discounted by other modern authorities; cf. LaMonte, “Chronology,” Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Science, XII (1942–1943), 148.
26 Grousset, Histoire des croisades, III, 137.
and his successors made available lands in Cyprus, free from the menace of incessant Moslem raids. Merchants also were attracted, and the various towns of the island became thriving centers of trade, though Famagusta had to await the fall of Acre to enter upon its great commercial role. The mainland thus lost badly needed colonists and defenders. As the century advanced, the Cypriote knights became increasingly loath to leave the comfort and safety of the island in order to defend the few ports remaining to the Christians in Syria. After the final catastrophe of 1291, planners of future crusades still looked to Cyprus as their advance base, but the emphasis among Europeans in general shifted from crusading zeal to lust for commercial profit.

Aimery of Lusignan, in accepting the crown of Jerusalem, had made clear that he did not intend to mortgage the revenues of Cyprus to support the kingdom of Jerusalem, now threatened by the successors of Saladin, but he promised as much help as possible. He at once crossed to the mainland with a Cypriote contingent to reinforce the Germans and the military orders, but when the news of the death (September 28, 1197) of emperor Henry VI reached Palestine early in 1198, it effectively took the heart out of the German crusade. In the following summer Aimery concluded a truce with al-Āḍîl, and, when that expired, a further favorable one in 1204.

Meanwhile preparations for the Fourth Crusade were well advanced. In the spring of 1201, Alexius III appealed to Innocent III. If the pope would help him to recover Cyprus by excommunicating Aimery, Alexius would give aid to the crusaders. The pope refused, stating that Byzantium had already lost Cyprus when Richard I conquered it, that "the western princes have asked us, since in the island of Cyprus no modest aid is supplied to the eastern province, to warn your imperial magnificence, given the present state of the Holy Land, not to molest the king of that island . . . .", and that it would be most unwise to divert Aimery from the defense of the Holy Land to the protection of his Cypriote realm. When the main body of crusaders was detoured to Constantinople in 1203, Cyprus was militarily little affected, though the excesses committed by the Latins against the Greek church, after the fall of the city, had repercussions on Orthodox believers in the island.

Faced with delays in the army’s assembling in the ports of Italy for the Fifth Crusade, Honorius III, in July 1217, decided to

\[\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\text{Geita Inm. III (PL, CCXIV), cols. cxxiii–cxxxv. See Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 62, note 3 for further references.}\]
dispatch to the east the inadequate forces already collected. It was the intention of duke Leopold of Austria and king Andrew of Hungary to meet at Cyprus on September 8, and the pope wrote to archbishop Otto of Genoa instructing him to direct the crusaders gathered at Genoa to sail for Cyprus if they would avoid pirates and Saracens. He also wrote the king and patriarch of Jerusalem, and the masters of the Hospital and Temple, to meet Leopold and Andrew at Cyprus. These plans do not seem to have materialized. Leopold, after a swift passage from the Adriatic of only sixteen days, went straight to Syria, which he reached in mid-September, and Andrew followed in October. 28 Hugh I had already crossed with a Cypriote force, including Eustorgue of Montaugu, Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Walter of Caesarea, constable of Cyprus, and the Ibelins, who formed part of the Cypriote rather than of the Jerusalemite contingent. 29 Without effective leadership, the crusade degenerated into a series of fruitless attacks. In early January 1218 Hugh accompanied Andrew from Acre to Tripoli to witness the marriage of Bohemond IV of Tripoli and Melisende of Lusignan. On January 10 Hugh died suddenly. Andrew departed for Hungary, and most of the Cypriotes seem to have returned home.

When the remaining crusaders in Syria decided to transfer their activities to the Nile, archbishop Eustorgue sailed with the king of Jerusalem, John of Brienne, to the siege of Damietta. Shortly before the capture of that city, the constable Walter arrived with a band of one hundred Cypriote knights and their men-at-arms. During the siege, Cyprus proved a welcome source of supply to the besiegers, often hard pressed for provisions. When John left Egypt in the spring of 1220 to uphold his claim to the throne of Armenia, the Cypriotes also departed. In John's absence, the legate Pelagius left the sea routes between Acre and Damietta unguarded, with the result that a Saracen squadron of ten armed galleys surprised

28 Potthast, Regesta, nos. 5585-5587; Delaville le Roulx, Cartulaire, nos. 1580-1582; Pressetti, Regesta Honorii papae III, nos. 672-673; cf. Mas Latrie, Histoire de l'île de Chypre, II, 36; Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 82. Although Hill (loc. cit.) puts Leopold, and Delaville le Roulx, on the basis of the intentions announced by pope Honorius, puts Andrew on Cyprus (Delaville le Roulx, Cartulaire, no. 1582: "... qui vient de débarquer en Chypre"; idem, Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre (1110-1230) [Paris, 1904], p. 142), there really is no clear evidence that either stopped at the island; cf. Mas Latrie, Histoire de l'île de Chypre, I, 193. Hill's authority is A. W. A. Leeper, A History of Medieval Austria (Oxford, 1941), p. 300, which in turn leans on the Annales Claustrou-neuburgenses (MGH, SS., IX), p. 622, which refers to the swift passage of Leopold without once mentioning Cyprus. On Andrew's crusade, see above, chapter XI, pp. 386-394.

29 See J. L. LaMonte, "John d'Ibelin, the Old Lord of Beirut, 1177-1236," Byzantium, XII (1937), 435; seemingly, after the accession of John of Brienne, John of Ibelin, "... crowded out of his important position, ... began ... to be more interested in Cyprus than in Jerusalem."
a crusading fleet in the harbor of Limassol, burnt a large number of vessels, and took prisoner or killed a reported thirteen thousand Christians. In July 1221 John returned to Egypt by way of Cyprus, and probably brought some Cypriotes with him to take part in the fatal advance towards Cairo. Upon the evacuation of Damietta in September 1221, even “the earth, by a divine miracle, was saddened”, for in the following year an earthquake shook Cyprus, and a tidal wave submerged Limassol and Paphos.

Among the participants in the Damietta campaign was the young Philip of Novara, in the service of the Cypriote knight Peter Chappe. Born apparently in Novara around 1195, Philip went to the east and eventually settled in Cyprus. While in Egypt, he received instruction from Ralph of Tiberias, the great jurisconsult of Jerusalem. In his later years, Philip wrote not only one of the legal treatises making up the Assises de Jérusalem, but also a highly colored narrative of the war between Frederick II and the Ibelins.

When, in June 1228, Frederick II finally set out on his long-delayed crusade, he set in motion the train of events leading to the Lombard war — a war in which the “Ibelins, like the Guelphs in Germany, maintained the constitutional rights of the feudal baronage against the imperialists, and, more successful than their western counterparts, established in Jerusalem and Cyprus that rule of law so well illustrated by the Assises which were written by the most famous member of their family.”

As early as 1225 the bailie of Cyprus, Philip of Ibelin, fearing that Frederick would claim the wardship of king Henry, still a minor, had him crowned. Frederick considered Cyprus an imperial fief, since king Aimery in 1197 had recognized the suzerainty of his father, the emperor Henry VI. After Henry’s coronation, Frederick had written protesting that he alone had the right to bestow the crown and demanding the regency; but he could take no action until he reached Limassol in July 1228. Encouraged by Amalric Barlais, a Cypriote baron who had gone to meet him with a group of other anti-Ibelin barons, Frederick determined to exercise his rights over the island.

30 The figure is probably exaggerated by the chroniclers; it may well include not only the casualties at Limassol, but others captured on the sea lanes between Acre, Cyprus, and Egypt. For Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade at Damietta, see above, chapter XI, pp. 397–428.
31 R. Röhricht, Testimonia minora de quinto bello sacro (Geneva, 1882), p. 240; see Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 87 and note 5 for other accounts.
32 LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, p. 60. These “Lombards” or “Longobards” are not to be confused with the natives of northern Italy; they were the inhabitants of the old Byzantine theme of Longobardia in southern Italy. Cf. LaMonte’s introduction to Philip of Novara, The Wars, pp. viii–ix.
Immediately he wrote his “dear uncle”, John of Ibelin, bailie since the death of Philip in 1227, asking him to join him and bring the young king. Though many of the Cypriote barons distrusted the emperor, Ibelin determined to obey the summons, for he did not wish “that people could say throughout the world: ‘The emperor of Rome came across the sea in great force and would have conquered all, but that the lord of Beirut and other disloyal men of Outremer loved the Saracens better than the Christians, and because of this they revolted against the emperor and did not wish that the Holy Land should be recovered.’”

Frederick received Ibelin cordially, invited him to a banquet, and persuaded him and his retinue to put off their mourning garments for more cheerful robes of scarlet. But at the banquet, after filling the hall with armed men, Frederick made three demands: that John surrender the person of king Henry to him as suzerain of Cyprus; that John render an accounting of the bailliage since the death of Hugh; and that he surrender Beirut, which, as a fortress of Conrad’s kingdom, should be in Frederick’s hands as regent for his young son, since Isabel had died before Frederick sailed for the east. John reluctantly conceded the emperor’s right to the custody of king Henry. As for the second demand, he declared that he was not responsible for accounting for the revenues of Cyprus, which had been given to queen Alice, and offered to prove his case before the high court of Nicosia, by whose authority he held the bailliage. As for Beirut, he held it as a fief, granted by queen Isabel and king Aimery, and appealed to the high court of Acre, which alone should judge matters of feudal tenure in Jerusalem: “Et sire, vous sois certains que pour doute de mort ou de prison je ne feray plus, se jugement de bonne court et de loyale ne la me faisoit faire.” Thus the issue was joined.

After giving hostages for his appearance in the high courts of Cyprus and Jerusalem, the “old lord” withdrew to Nicosia, whither Frederick followed him. Refusing to take up arms against his lord (for Frederick, as overlord of the king of Cyprus, could claim John’s allegiance as a Cypriote vassal), the lord of Beirut withdrew to the fortress of Dieudamour. At this point, Frederick received word of the rebellion fomented against him by Gregory IX in Italy. He was anxious to finish his crusade and return to the west, and made a treaty with John by which the hostages were returned, and

---

33 Philip of Novara, The Wars (tr. LaMonte), pp. 75-76. For this situation and the ensuing conflict as it affected the kingdom of Jerusalem, see above, chapter XV, pp. 543-554.
34 Gesta des Chiprois, 127 (RHC, Arm., II), p. 679; Philip of Novara, The Wars (tr. LaMonte), p. 79.
the castles of Cyprus surrendered to liegemen selected by Frederick. John promised to accompany him on his crusade. On September 3, 1228, Frederick, taking king Henry with him, sailed for Syria.

After he had concluded the treaty of Jaffa with the sultan al-Kāmil on February 18, 1229, and had crowned himself king of Jerusalem in the church of the Holy Sepulcher, Frederick was eager to start home. He sold the baillage of Cyprus to the anti-Ibelin Amalric Barlais and four colleagues. The revenues of Cyprus were farmed to them for three years for 10,000 marks. The Ibelin case was still undecided when, on May 1, the emperor sailed from Acre.

From 1229 to 1233 Cyprus was torn by Frederick’s war with the Ibelins. While the imperial bailies in Syria were gaining adherents by their wise rule, the reverse was true in Cyprus. To raise funds to pay the emperor, the five bailies imposed heavy taxes, and despoiled the estates of the Ibelins and their supporters. In June 1229 John of Ibelin crossed from Syria, raised the countryside and, after a battle near Nicosia on July 14, drove the bailies to take refuge in the northern castles. Kantara and Kyrenia were quickly taken. Besieged in Dieudamour, the surviving bailies finally surrendered after Easter in 1230, gave up the person of king Henry, and relinquished all claims to the baillage.

By then Frederick, successful against the papal armies in Italy, and, after the treaty of San Germano in July 1230, once again restored to the bosom of the church, was ready to turn his attention eastward. He sent out an army under Richard Filangieri, the imperial marshal. The first contingent under the bishop of Melfi arrived off Cape Gata near Limassol in September 1231. Envoys dispatched to king Henry at Kitī demanded in the name of the emperor that Henry banish John of Ibelin and all his relatives from Cyprus. Henry replied that he could not banish Ibelin since he was his liegeman and so deserving of his protection, and that, since he himself was Ibelin’s nephew, he could not banish all the relatives of the house of Ibelin from the island. The “old lord” had disposed a force at Limassol to prevent a landing; so the imperial fleet sailed on to capture the town of Beirut, and lay siege to its castle. When Filangieri arrived in Syria, he summoned the high court, which accepted his credentials as bailie of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Yet, as we have seen, when the barons realized that he was not going to submit to them the case of the seizure of Beirut, the majority turned against him.

John of Ibelin, having assembled the Cypriote host at Famagusta

35 See above, chapter XV, pp. 548–549.
to go to the relief of Beirut, crossed to the mainland in the spring of 1232, whereupon Barlais and his confederates promptly deserted to the imperialists. John reinforced his castle and then went to Acre, where, in April 1232, he received the oath of the recently established commune and seized the imperial fleet in the harbor. Since Ibelin had stripped Cyprus of most of its defenders, Filangieri sent over a force under Barlais, which overran the island and took all the castles except Dieudamour and Buffavento. In retaliation, Ibelin planned an attack on the imperialist base at Tyre, but at Casal Imbert, north of Acre, the Cypriotes, while Ibelin was absent in Acre, were surprised on the night of May 3–4, and were badly routed. Filangieri then dispatched the main body of his troops to finish the reduction of Cyprus. Ibelin at once collected his scattered forces and, toward the end of May, crossed over in Genoese ships and captured Famagusta by surprise. Most of the Cypriote population welcomed the Ibelins as deliverers. On June 15, at Agridi, the Cypriotes completely defeated the imperialists, who retreated to the castle of Kyrenia. Its capitulation in the spring of 1233 brought to a close the imperialist threat to the island.

The struggle on the mainland continued for another ten years, though after the death of John of Ibelin in 1236 an uneasy truce was maintained. Finally, in 1243, Philip of Novara suggested that, since Conrad would come of age on April 25, 1243, Frederick’s regency would thereby end and with it Filangieri’s appointment as bailie; so the barons would be acting legally if they should drive Filangieri out. In June 1243 a full meeting of the vassals of Jerusalem and Cyprus at Acre accepted the claim of Alice of Champagne, as nearest heir of Conrad present in the country, to the regency of Jerusalem.\(^{38}\)

With the capitulation of Tyre the baronial party in the east triumphed and the imperial rule almost ceased. In 1247 Innocent IV absolved Henry of Cyprus from any oath he might have taken to the emperor, and took him and his kingdom under the protection of the holy see. Alice and then Henry I were regents for Conrad, still legally king; it was not until after the death of Conradin in 1268 that Hugh III of Cyprus, proclaimed by the high court in 1269, could style himself “twelfth Latin king of Jerusalem and king of Cyprus.”

The struggle with Frederick had exacerbated the factions in the kingdom of Jerusalem and weakened its fabric. We are reminded,

\(^{38}\) See above, chapter XV, pp. 553–554, and chapter XVI, p. 559.
however, that if that kingdom, “for which the Ibelins and their allies fought so stubbornly in the thirties and forties was lost before the end of the century, the institutions which they fought to preserve continued in Cyprus for two centuries more, and the rights of the individual and the limitation of the crown were the cornerstones of the Cypriot constitution as long as the Lusignan dynasty lasted.”

In 1239, during the Lombard war, the truce which Frederick II had made with al-Kāmil, the sultan of Egypt, had expired, and, as we have seen, the crusade of Theobald of Champagne and Richard of Cornwall had followed. The most tangible result of their efforts was the fortification of Ascalon. Cyprus remained largely apart from all this, however, and in 1244 king Henry ignored an appeal for aid when Jerusalem was threatened by the Khorezmians, and finally fell on August 23, though he later sent over a force of three hundred men, who all perished at the disaster of Ḥarbiya (La Forbie) on October 17. In 1247 Henry furnished eight ships under Baldwin of Ibelin, seneschal of Cyprus, to aid in the attempt to relieve Ascalon, which fell on October 15.

A year or two before he sailed on his crusade, Louis IX sent a sergeant, Nicholas of Choisy, to Cyprus to collect provisions. Tuns of wine were stacked in great piles along the seashore. “Wheat and barley they had put in heaps amid the fields; and when one saw them, it seemed as if they were mountains; for the rain which had beaten on the grain for a long time had made it sprout on top, so that there appeared there only green grass. So it happened that when they wished to take the grain to Egypt, they cut down the top layers with the green grass and found the wheat and barley as fresh as though it had just been threshed.” Louis landed on September 18, 1248, at Limassol, where he was welcomed by king Henry and the Ibelin lords. John of Ronay, vice-master of the Hospital, and William of Sonnac, master of the Temple, came from Acre to plan the campaign. Louis “was eager to press on to Egypt without stopping,” but his barons persuaded him otherwise, and not until May 13, 1249, did he depart. The long delay was costly in money and bad for morale. An epidemic broke out in the French camp and, though the troops were dispersed around the island, many died. Diplomatic activity, however, did not slacken. In

37 LaMente’s introduction to Philip of Novara, The Wars, p. 56.
38 See above, chapter XIII.
39 See above, chapter XVI, pp. 563–564.
40 Joinville, Histoire de Saint Louis, 130–131 (ed. N. de Wailly, Paris, 1874), pp. 72–74. For this crusade, see above, chapter XIV, pp. 493–495.
41 Ibid., 132 (ed. Wailly), p. 74.
December, envoys arrived with a letter alleged to be from the Great Khan Göyük to initiate the first of the abortive pourparlers for an alliance with the Mongols. Later, the emperor Baldwin II of Constantinople sent his wife, Mary of Brienne, to ask for aid to ward off the threatened attack of the Greeks on Constantinople.42

When Louis finally sailed from Cyprus, the island chivalry sailed with him — king Henry, the seneschal Baldwin of Ibelin, the constable Guy of Ibelin, and the archbishop Eustorgue, who died at Damietta. King Henry rode with king Louis on the solemn entry into Damietta, on June 6, but soon departed for Cyprus, leaving one hundred and twenty knights to serve for a year under Baldwin and Guy, who were also in command of one thousand knights from Syria. After the surrender at Mansurah (April 6, 1250), the Ibelins narrowly escaped with their lives from the massacre planned by the mamluks subsequent to the murder of the sultan Tūrān-Shāh. "There came at least thirty [mamluks] to our galley, with naked swords in their hands and Danish axes round their necks. I asked my lord Baldwin of Ibelin, who knew Saracen well, what these people were saying; and he replied that they were saying that they were coming to cut off our heads."43 The Ibelin brothers were among the negotiators for the renewal of the agreement which Louis had made with Tūrān-Shāh, and returned to Cyprus with the other Cypriote captives who were released on May 6.

Hugh III, first as regent and later as king of both Cyprus and Jerusalem, had to deal with the fanatical and determined Mamluk sultan Baybars (1260–1277). His task was formidable. Hugh tried to reconcile warring Christians — Venetians, Genoese, Templars, Hospitallers, and others — for a concerted effort against Baybars, but even his Cypriote vassals, preferring the relative security of their island estates to the ceaseless struggle on the mainland, would not always support him.

In the spring of 1271, when prince Edward of England (afterwards king Edward I) arrived from Tunis with one thousand men, Hugh crossed from Cyprus to plan a campaign with Edward and Bohemond VI of Tripoli. Baybars took the opportunity of Hugh’s absence from Cyprus to fit out seventeen galleys camouflaged as

42 Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 144, errs in his interpretation of Joinville when he says that Mary’s ship was torn from its mooring at Paphos and driven to Acre “whence she was fetched back to Lemesos by Joinville.” Actually, Joinville met Mary at Paphos, where she was left with nothing to wear but the clothes she had on, since her ship with all her “harnois” had been driven off. Joinville brought her to Limassol, and later sent her fine cloth for new clothes (Joinville, 137 [ed. Wailly], p. 76). On the situation of Baldwin and the Latin empire, see above, chapter VI, pp. 225–226.

Christian ships to carry the war into the island, but most of them were wrecked off Limassol. Meanwhile, Edward and Hugh with their inadequate forces could do little more than raid.\footnote{On Edward’s crusade, see above, chapter XIV, pp. 517–518, and chapter XVI, pp. 582–583; on the Manluls, see below, chapter XXII, p. 749.}

At this inauspicious moment occurred the celebrated dispute in which the Cypriote knights, whose one desire was to return home, claimed that their liability for their fiefs was limited to service in the island. The case was referred to Edward. Hugh maintained that the knights owed service at the desire and need of the king outside the realm as well as within, that the barons of Jerusalem had served at Edessa and elsewhere outside the kingdom of Jerusalem, and that Cyprus was ruled by the same laws as Jerusalem. He then cited instances, going back to the reign of Aimery, when the Cypriote knights had served outside Cyprus. James of Ibelin, author of one of the legal treatises of the Assises, presented the knights’ case, arguing that they were not bound by their oaths to unlimited service at the king’s discretion, nor were they bound to serve outside the realm. In citing instances of former service Hugh was taking advantage of their former good deeds, for in the past they had voluntarily served for love of God and of their lord, and never because of the summons of the king. “And further we show certainly by men who are still full of life, that the men of the realm of Cyprus have served more often outside the realm the house of Ibelin than [they have served] my lord the king or his ancestors; and if the usage of their service subjects them to service, by such reasoning the Ibelins could demand of them what my lord the king demands.”\footnote{Document relatif au service militaire, II, 25 (RHC, Lois, II), p. 434; quoted in LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, p. 157, note 1.} James chided Hugh for his tactlessness when he concluded that the king could have their service “par biau parler, qui poi coste.” Edward seems to have made no decision, but in 1273 a compromise was reached, by which the barons agreed that they owed the king service outside Cyprus for four months a year and that they must serve in person wherever the king or his son went.

Such a debate was hardly likely to encourage Edward or Hugh to aggressive action against Baybars, and in April 1272 they signed a truce for ten years, ten months, ten days, and ten hours (renewed in 1283 with Baybars’ successor Kalavun) to cover the plain of Acre and the road to Nazareth. In September Edward sailed for home, leaving Hugh to continue the struggle to maintain his authority against the factions, complicated by the arrival in Acre in 1277 of Roger of San Severino with letters from pope John XXI,
Charles of Anjou, and Mary of Antioch, to take possession as bailie for Charles. Appeals to Hugh in Cyprus went unanswered and the lieges of Jerusalem finally did homage to Charles’s representative. In 1279 Hugh crossed over to try to restore his authority, but, when the four months’ service of his Cypriote vassals ended, he was forced to return home. Again in August 1283 he crossed for a final effort, but died in Tyre in March 1284. If Hugh III had proved unequal to the task of reconciling the quarreling factions, he had been withal a competent king.

With the death on January 7, 1285, of Charles of Anjou, whose son Charles II showed no interest in the crown of Jerusalem, the factions were gradually brought round to acceptance of Hugh’s son, Henry II, as king of Jerusalem. He was crowned in the cathedral of Tyre on August 15, 1286. The chivalry of Cyprus and Syria celebrated the event with festivities for fifteen days at Acre, where, in the Auberge of the Hospital, they enacted scenes from the romances of the Round Table, “et contrefrent Lancelot et Tristan et Pilamedes, et mout d’autres jeux biaus et delitables et plaissans.”

And this less than five years before the final catastrophe. The epileptic Henry, probably on the advice of his counselors, who feared that his popularity might evaporate as had Hugh’s before him, soon returned to Cyprus.

The expulsion of the Angevins, who had had an understanding with Egypt, freed Kalavun’s hands. Latakia fell on April 20, 1287. When Kalavun threatened Tripoli, Henry sent a Cypriote force in four galleys, but the city fell on April 26, 1289. Refugees were pouring into Cyprus. Three days after the fall of Tripoli, Henry arrived in Acre to patch up a truce with Kalavun, and then returned to Cyprus. In answer to appeals to the west, the pope had managed to collect and send a fleet manned by a nondescript rabble of Italians, whose undisciplined conduct in Syria provided Kalavun, as we have seen, with grounds for asserting that the truce had been violated. Kalavun’s sudden death at the end of 1290 left his son al-Ashraf to finish the destruction of the kingdom. The investment of Acre on April 5, 1291, finally achieved the union of all the Latin factions in one last heroic stand. On May 4, when Henry arrived with reinforcements, he was welcomed with feux de joie, but found the besieged in a bad way, with no agreement on a single command. Though accused of deserting the siege with three thousand men on May 15, the king of Cyprus seems to have

47 See above, chapter XVI, pp. 593-594.
remained until the grand assault of May 18, when it was clear that
the city was lost. One by one during the summer the remaining
cities fell, while their inhabitants escaped to live for years in Cyprus
in poverty and distress. Cyprus went into mourning, and, as late
as 1394, the traveler Martoni noted that when the Cypriote ladies
went out, they wore long black cloaks showing only their eyes “on
account of the sorrow and dire grief for the loss of that city of Acre
and other cities of Syria.”

The kingdom of Jerusalem had fallen, but its institutions, with
some modifications, were to live on for two more centuries in the
kingdom of Cyprus. In its earlier years Cyprus seems to have had
its own customs, similar to, but distinct from, those of Jerusalem.
The chronicler Makhairas, after speaking of the settlement made
by Guy, says that the lords “made assizes for their advantage, and
made the king, when he would put on the crown in the church,
swear upon the (holy) Gospel to accept and to maintain the assizes
and all the good customs of the said kingdom, and to maintain the
privileges of the holy church of Christ ... Then the kings and
the lords one after another built churches and many monasteries ... ,
And they made the assizes, and arranged that they should have their revenue to live upon.”

It is difficult to trace the evolution of Cypriote law and the
transmission of the customs of Jerusalem to Cyprus during the
thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, since court records are lacking
and it is necessary to rely largely on theoretical legal treatises. Philip
of Novara states that Henry I of Cyprus and his lieges swore an oath to keep “the assizes and good customs of the king-
dom of Jerusalem”; this took place between 1230 and 1233,
when a general meeting in Syria of the barons of Cyprus decided
to prepare an expedition to oust Frederick II’s partisans from

---

48 For a discussion of this point, with references, see Hill, History of Cyprus, p. 186.
49 Excerpta Cypria, p. 24; see also p. 17.
50 Makhairas, Chronicle, 27, 29 (ed. and tr. Dawkins, I), pp. 25, 27; quoted in Grand-
claude, Étude critique, p. 114, note, following edition of Miller and Sathas.
51 See the significant article of Jean Richard, “Paire d’orient latin,” Revue historique de
droit français et étranger, XXVIII (1959), p. 80, and especially note 3, where he states that he
is preparing an edition of Cypriote documents found in the Vatican Archives, which show the
existence of certain institutions in Cyprus somewhat different from those set forth in the
Assises. Although M. Richard, in reply to my inquiry, was kind enough to inform me that
his edition was scheduled to appear in the Bibliothèque de l’Institut français d’archéologie à
Beirut, it had not been done by 1957. These documents, as well as various other articles of
M. Richard, largely concern the fourteenth century.
52 Documents relatifs à la successibilité au trône, 5 (RHC, Lois, II), p. 406; Livre de Philippe
Frederick had obtained from king Henry fealty and homage and from the men of Cyprus fealty without homage, and had then taken seisin, without judgment, of several seifs, and even of the kingdom of Cyprus contrary to the Jerusalemite Assise sur la Ligèce established by king Amalric. According to this assise, all holders of seifs in the kingdom owed liege homage to the chief lord, i.e. to the king or regent, but if the king failed to aid a vassal, threatened in person or in his goods, or if he imprisoned him without judgment, all the lieges of the kingdom, who were peers, should unite and arm to restore the liberty or possessions of their fellow and might even deprive the king of his lordship. This assise was obviously an excellent weapon to use against Frederick and seems to explain the formal adoption of the law of Jerusalem by the Cypriotes.

At their coronation, the kings of Cyprus swore: “les preveilages des benuéres reis mes devanciers et les assises dou royaume et dou rei Amaurie et dou rei Baudoyn son filz et les ancienes costumes et assises dou royaume de Jerusalem garderai; et tot le peuple cresten dou dit royaume, selonce les costumes anciénes et approvéz de ce meisme royaume, et selonce les assises des devant dis rois en lors dreis et en lor justices garderai, si come roi cresten et feil de Dieu le doit faire en son royaume, et totes les autres choses dessus dites garderai feament. Ensi m’ait Dieu et ces saintes Evangiles de Dieu.” 53 Though many of the men responsible for the legal treatises which make up the Assises de Jérusalem held seifs on the mainland and were active in the affairs of that kingdom, they also had strong ties with Cyprus. King Aimery ordered the compilation of the Livre au roi to preserve the memory of the old laws, lost when Jerusalem fell in 1187. Philip of Novara in the middle of the thirteenth century wrote the Livre de forme de plait. John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, was probably brought up in Cyprus while his father Philip was bailie (1218–1227); he wrote, shortly before his death in 1266, the Livre des assises de la haute cour (which, together with some later assises, was given official sanction by the high court of Cyprus in 1369). 54 James of Ibelin, author of one of the less important treatises, was spokesman for the barons of Cyprus when they refused the demands of Hugh III for military service in Syria.

53 Livre de Jean d’Ibelin, 7 (RHC, Lois, 1), p. 50, quoted in Grandclaudc, Étude critique, p. 155. This is the Jerusalemite oath.
54 Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 165, adheres to the old view that John was still alive in 1268, ignoring the evidence for 1266 cited in Grandclaudc, Étude critique, p. 141. Richard, loc. cit. (note 51, above), remarks that John’s book was not in regular use in the early fourteenth century for it took months, in 1369, to find a good text of the manuscript.
The law, as expounded in these and other treatises of the thirteenth century, was the law laid down by the high courts of Jerusalem and Nicosia; it was the feudal law of the west modified by conditions in the east; not French, as Hugh of Brienne found out when he appealed to that law in 1264; not imperial, as Frederick II learned when he tried to claim the regency of Cyprus without reference to the high court of Nicosia. Only in the Assises de la cour des bourgeois, where the Franks took over from the law in use in the east rules applicable to the lower classes, is much Roman law to be found.\(^5\)

The chief governing body in Cyprus was the high court of Nicosia, composed of the Cypriot barons and presided over by the king or his representative. It chose the king, and, when necessary, a regent for the kingdom. It had jurisdiction over the nobles in all questions, except religion, marriage, and testament, which were reserved to the ecclesiastical courts, and except for cases involving the nobles with their inferiors, which were dealt with by the cour des bourgeois or low court. The latter, consisting of twelve “jurats”, chosen by the king, and presided over by the viscount of Nicosia, a knight also chosen by the king, exercised jurisdiction likewise in all cases concerning non-noble Franks. The viscount, head of the police and collector of dues from the bourgeois, was assisted by an official with the title of matheesep.\(^6\) The grand officers of the crown were the seneschal, constable, marshal, chamberlain, and chancellor.\(^7\) The thirteenth-century registers of the secrète royale, the central office of the treasury, have unfortunately been lost, and other accounts are lacking; so information on the revenues of the kings of Cyprus is scarce, except for casual mention of customs duties, special taxes, and the like. Besides the regular feudal levies, the army included the arrière ban of all men capable of bearing arms, and the mercenaries. Important among the latter were the light-armed native horsemen, the Turcopoles. For a fleet, the thirteenth-century rulers of Cyprus depended largely on procuring ships from the Genoese.

The general lines of Cypriote institutional development had been marked out by the first two Lusignans. Whatever the chroniclers may say about Guy’s generous concessions even to artisans, the territorial fiefs were probably granted largely to French barons, many of whom had lost their lands on the mainland though they

\(^5\) LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 100–101; Grandclaude, Étude critique, pp. 123 ff.

\(^6\) For special privileges of the Syrians, see Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 52. Matheesep derives from Arabic muhibb al-bayda’; inspector of weights and measures.

\(^7\) For lists of the holders of these offices, see LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 256–257.
often kept their Palestinian titles. These fiefs were hereditary, but, unlike the system in the kingdom of Jerusalem, where the fief descended to all heirs of the first holder, in Cyprus, from the time of either Guy or Aimery, in the event of the failure of a direct heir, born in wedlock, the fief reverted to the crown. This custom proved a distinct advantage to the crown. Contributing also to its strength was the fact that, while such a noble house as the Ibelins might acquire much wealth and exercise great influence, there never developed in Cyprus great territorial fiefs such as weakened the position of the kings of Jerusalem. Furthermore, unlike the latter, the rulers of Cyprus kept the prerogative of coinage in their own hands. Yet the island was small; practically all the nobles were immediate vassals of the king; all were equally concerned in maintaining their interests against their lord. So a compact and united group developed, which could on occasion be extremely dangerous to the crown.68

To non-noble Europeans and easterners, Guy and his successors granted burgage tenements in the towns or rents in money or in kind (grain, sugar, olives, etc., for sale or for immediate consumption). As in Jerusalem, rents came to be habitually granted also to knights and were regarded as true fiefs.

Between the French ruling class and the native Graeco-Cypriotes no fusion, such as occurred in England between Normans and English after 1066, and to a lesser extent in Syria and in Frankish Greece between French and natives, ever took place. Religious differences, exacerbated by the Latin policy of forcing the Greek church into obedience to Rome, were too great.59 Many Greek landholders had fled the island during Isaac’s rule or at the time of Richard’s conquest; others lost their lands because of opposition to the new rulers. Numbers of the remaining free Greeks seem to have fled to the towns, where, subject to arbitrary tallages and other exactions, they suffered a loss in status.60 Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who visited Cyprus in 1211, recorded his rather prejudiced impressions of the island and its native population: “There is one archbishop, who has three suffragans. These are Latins. But the

68 See Grandclaude, Étude critique, pp. 151 ff. for this point and a technical discussion of the effect of the Assise sur la Ligée on Cyprus and Jerusalem respectively. See also Richard, op. cit., pp. 81 ff.
59 For other elements — Syrians, Maronites, Armenians, Jews, etc. — fused in varying degrees with the native Greek population, see Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 1 ff.
60 For the view that the leading Greek families maintained their former rank and prerogatives in the bosom of the native population, hostile to the conquerors, and bid their time until their position was restored, partially under the Venetians and more fully under the Turks, see Laurent’s review in Revue des études byzantines, VI (1948), 270.
Greeks, over whom throughout this land the Latins have dominion, have thirteen [sic] bishops, of whom one is an archbishop. They all obey the Franks, and pay tribute like slaves. Whence you can see that the lords of this land are the Franks, whom the Greeks and Armenians obey as serfs. They are rude in all their habits and shabby in their dress, sacrificing chiefly to their lusts. We shall ascribe this to the wine of that country which provokes to luxury, or rather to those who drink it. ... For the wines of this island are so thick and rich that they are sometimes specially prepared to be eaten like honey with bread.”

According to the writers of the Frankish period, the classes of the Cypriote population on the land remained the same as under Byzantium. They fell into three categories. At the lowest level were the parioi, similar to the adscriptitii glebae in the west, who paid a yearly head-tax, rendered a corvée (angaion) of two days’ labor a week to their lord, and surrendered to him one third of the produce, except seed. Under the Lusignans, they were made subject to the jurisdiction of their lord, who treated them as mere chattels and could inflict any punishment short of mutilation or death. Next higher in the social scale were the perpyriarii, so called from an annual tax of fifteen hyperpers (the gold nomisma or bezant) paid to their lord. They had risen from the class of parioi by compounding with the Byzantine dukes or katapans for their personal freedom and that of their descendants, but their crops were still subject to the one-third tribute. Above the perpyriarii were the eleutheroi or francothai, who had bought emancipation, or obtained it by free grant, from their lord. He still took from a fifth to a tenth of the produce of their lands, which were free, and, if he asked them to work, paid them wages, usually nominal. They came under the jurisdiction of the ordinary magistrates, and paid tribute to the king for salt and various privileges.

The population and prosperity of the towns increased after Richard’s conquest, with the establishment of colonies from the great mercantile communities of the west. The Latin penetration of Cyprus had begun even prior to the Lusignan period, for in 1148 Manuel Comnenus had granted to the Venetians the same commercial privileges in Cyprus as they enjoyed elsewhere in the empire. And Latin merchants had welcomed Richard at Limassol. In 1196 Aimeri conferred privileges on the merchants of Trani, whose archbishop had brought the scepter for his coronation.

---

61 Excerpta Cypria, p. 13.
Two years later Aimery granted to the men of Marseilles freedom of trade and a village or manor (casale) in Cyprus in exchange or as a reward for 2,800 bezants contributed to the defense of Jaffa.

With the turn of the century, grants to foreign merchants become more numerous. The first recorded act of the queen-mother Alice of Champagne (July 1218) was the concession, made to the Genoese upon the advice of the bailie Philip of Ibelin and her lieges, of extensive privileges: freedom of trade, free jurisdiction in all cases concerning their nationals, except treason, rape, and homicide; two plots of land, one in Limassol and one in Famagusta, with rights to build thereon; and protection of life and property in wrecks.63 Since Cyprus had no fleet at the time, the grant was doubtless motivated by the desire to obtain the assistance of Genoese ships, but it marked the first of a long series of concessions, which were to end disasterously in 1377 with the Genoese seizure of Famagusta. In October 1291 Henry II granted consular courts and commercial privileges to the Pisans and Catalans. These privileges included large reductions in import and export duties, which, by then, were assuming important proportions in the revenues of the kings of Cyprus.

The inevitable counterpart of the establishment of a Latin kingdom in Cyprus was the establishment of the Latin church and the attempt to convert the Greek Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, and to bring into obedience to the Latins not only the Greek clergy, but also the clergy of the Syrian, Nestorian, and Armenian rites. The tactlessness of many emissaries of the holy see was countered by the obstinate opposition of the Cypriotes. The extreme zeal of such popes as Honorius III and Gregory IX increased the bitterness of the struggle, which the more moderate policy of Innocent IV and the Constitution of Alexander IV did little to allay. The Lusignan rulers made generous grants, as loyal sons of Rome, to the Latin churches and religious orders, but did not wish to see the native population driven in desperation to emigration or revolt. They

tried with only partial success to hold the balance between the unevenly matched contestants.

In February 1196, at about the time when Neophytus was writing his bitter denunciation of the Latin conquest, pope Celestine III addressed to the clergy, magnates, and people of Cyprus a bull stating that, at the request of Aimery, who, “recognizing the Roman church as head and mistress of all churches”, desired to recall the schismatic Greeks to the true church, the pope had given full powers to the archdeacon of Latakia and to Alan, archdeacon of Lydda and Aimery’s chancellor, to establish the Latin church in Cyprus.\footnote{PL, CCVI, cols. 1147-1148; LaMonte, “Register of the Cartulary of Santa Sophia,” Byzantion, V (1929-1930), no. 21 Jaffé, Regesta, no. 17329. B., archdeacon of Latakia, has not been identified.} The two commissioners set up the archbishopric of Nicosia with the three suffragan dioceses of Paphos, Limassol, and Famagusta, and began gradually to despoil the Greek church. Alan became the first Latin archbishop of Nicosia, while his fellow-commissioner was elected bishop of Paphos. The four sees were endowed in part from the property of the Greek church and in part from lands abandoned by their Cypriote holders and from the public domain.

The Latin clergy who were introduced into the island ministered largely to the conquerors and their descendants. As in the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople, “traces of Latin secular clergy below the level of cathedral chapters are few.”\footnote{C. R. L. Wolff, “The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261: Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest,” Tradditio, VI (1948), 41.} When members of the Latin aristocracy found it difficult to attend cathedral services, they often endowed private priests.\footnote{See LaMonte, “Register of the Cartulary of Santa Sophia,” Byzantion, V, nos. 14, 15.} Regular clergy swelled the ranks of the Latins. Even before the arrival of the Lusignans, the Templars had begun a church in Nicosia, which Guy continued and in which he was buried. Hugh I made important donations to the Hospitallers. During the thirteenth century numerous monastic orders received endowments in the island and, with the fall of Acre, a flood of regular clergy arrived from the mainland.

The establishment of the Latin church in Cyprus led to difficulties on two fronts. On the one hand the Latin clergy were soon involved in disputes with the secular authorities. The clergy complained that the lay lords and the crown were not enforcing the collection of tithes on domainial and baronial lands as was the custom in the kingdom of Jerusalem; the clergy further objected to having serfs on church lands liable to royal tallages and angaria
(corvées). On the other hand, overshadowing the differences with the secular authorities, was the struggle with the Greek church. As in Constantinople and other Latin states in the east, the Latins were at first prepared to allow some differences in rite, though they tried unceasingly to convert the Greeks, from whom they also insisted on absolute obedience. The Latin archbishop was to be metropolitan of all Christians in Cyprus, and the Greek bishops were to do homage and fealty to the Latin bishops.

An attempt to settle some of these questions was made by an agreement at Limassol in October 1220 between Alice and the Cypriote barons on one side and Eustorgue, archbishop of Nicosia, and his three suffragans on the other. The crown confirmed to the Latin church the tithes on all domainial and baronial lands according to the custom of Jerusalem and remitted services and dues owed the crown by ecclesiastical serfs. The agreement stated that the Greek clergy owed obedience to the Latin archbishop, and made rules to check the practice of Greeks' taking minor orders to avoid taxation and service. The agreement did not work. The papal registers abound in repeated admonitions to the secular authorities urging them to enforce collection of tithes and other payments due the church. The Greeks proved recalcitrant.

In 1222 the legate Pelagius, on his way back to Italy, stopped in Cyprus, and, in association with Eustorgue's brothers Peter and Garin of Montaigu, the masters of the Temple and of the Hospital, tried to arbitrate. An accord concluded at Famagusta renewed the Limassol convention and enacted numerous provisions to tighten the hold of the Latins on the Greek church. Most important was the provision made "at the wish of both parties" (i.e. the lay authorities and the Latin ecclesiastics, for the Greeks were not represented) that the fourteen Greek bishoprics be reduced to four; that the bishops obey their Latin ordinaries according to the usage of Jerusalem; that their sees be transferred to secondary towns — Soli in the diocese of Nicosia, Arsinoë (modern Polis) in that of Paphos, Lefkara in that of Limassol, and Karpassia (Rizokarpasso) in that of Famagusta; and that existing incumbents retain their estates for life, while their successors would receive for their support the payments from their priests and deacons which were customary for the Greeks in other places. The provision for the reduction of the Greek dioceses, which seems not to have been immediately put into effect, was probably an attempt to mitigate the demand of Honorius III that all the Greek bishops be expelled. It was obvious to the queen and her counselors that the Greeks could
not be converted en masse and could not be left wholly without pastors. The Greek archbishop Neophytus (not to be confused with the hermit of the Enkleistra) refused to submit and was banished. The Cypriotes then sent a delegation to Germanus, the Greek patriarch of Nicaea, to ask for guidance. In a letter of 1222–1223 Germanus directed the Greek bishops to refuse to do homage to the Latins, but to yield in such matters as obtaining leave from the Latin ordinary to take possession of their offices and admitting appeals to the ordinaries from decisions of Greek bishops. Some of the Greek clergy seem to have submitted, for in 1229 Germanus wrote a second letter, addressed this time to Syrians as well as Greeks, denouncing the unbridled ambition of the Roman church, which was trying to set up the pope in place of Christ, and forbidding the clergy and laity to have any dealings with those who had given in to the demands of the Latins.

In the ensuing years the martyrdom of thirteen Greeks further inflamed the struggle. Two monks from Mt. Athos, wishing to share the sufferings of their co-believers, had settled in the monastery of Kantara with a small group of disciples. A Dominican friar named Andrew entered into a disputation with them on the long- vexed question of the “azymes” (whether it was proper to use unleavened bread for the sacramental wafer as was done in the Roman church). Summoned before archbishop Eustorgue for opposing the Roman practice, they were thrown into prison, where they suffered manifold hardships and one died. Gregory IX sent orders to treat them as heretics if they persisted in their “error”. When Eustorgue had to retire for a time to Acre because of a quarrel with Balian of Ibelin, whom he had excommunicated for marrying within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, he left friar Andrew to deal with them. When they were brought before the high court, King Henry allowed Andrew to impose sentence. They were to be dragged through the market-place or river-bed at the tails of horses

---

67 See Hill, History of Cyprus, III, 1047 and 1044–1045, referring to Honorius’ letters of December 30, 1221 (Potthast, no. 6747), and of January 3, 1222 (Potthast, no. 6755). Presutti, no. 3663, summarizing the letter of December 30 to queen Alice, notes that Potthast, in nos. 6747 and 6748, makes two letters to the queen out of “one and the same letter”, a point not noticed by LaMonte (“Register of the Cartulary of Santa Sophia,” Byzantion, V, p. 451, note 2).

68 Laurent, in his review of Hill in Revue des études byzantines, VI (1948), 271, and in his article, “La Succession épiscopale,” ibid., VII (1949), 37, does not credit the story given in Hackett, Orthodox Church in Cyprus, pp. 84 and 309, and in Hill, History of Cyprus, III, 1044, based on the evidence of the 17th-century Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus, that an earlier archbishop, Easias, submitted in 1220, then repented and sought pardon at Nicaea for his apostasy.
and mules, and then burnt. Sentence was carried out, but since some of their bones remained unconsumed, they were mixed with the bones of unclean animals, so that they might not be venerated as relics, and burned again (1231). The Orthodox world was stirred to its depths. Germanus wrote Gregory IX a letter singularly mild, considering the provocation, and the pope in 1233 dispatched two Dominicans and two Franciscans to confer with the patriarch, but their mission accomplished little.

In 1240 Gregory sent new instructions to Eustorgue not to allow Greeks to celebrate mass unless they had taken an oath of obedience to the Roman church, and had renounced their heretical opinions, especially in regard to unleavened bread (azymes). In answer, the Greek bishops stripped the churches and monasteries of their remaining treasures and, together with the principal monks and priests, secretly left the island. Gregory then directed Eustorgue to fill the vacancies with Latins.

Innocent IV decided to try a more conciliatory policy. In 1247 he appointed his penitentiary, the Franciscan Lawrence, as legate to the east with instructions to protect the Greeks from molestation by the Latins. In 1248 a new legate, Odo of Châteauroux, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, arrived in Cyprus with Louis IX to continue the work of conciliation. Many Cypriote ecclesiastics returned. Odo’s task was complicated by the death of archbishop Eustorgue in April 1250 at Damietta and by the election in his place of Hugh of Fagiano, who, with fanatical zeal, chose to ignore the pope’s injunctions to leave the Greeks in peace, and issued various harassing orders. Odo allowed the Greek bishops to elect and consecrate a new metropolitan, Germanus Pesimandrus, with the understanding that the Greek suffragan bishops might ignore the Latin archbishop and promise obedience directly to Germanus, while the latter was to promise obedience directly to the holy see. Archbishop Hugh was so angry that he placed the kingdom under an interdict and retired temporarily to his native Tuscany.

Odo continued his attempt to carry out the papal policy of tolerating the rites and usages of those Greeks who had returned to the Roman obedience, but he soon had to leave Cyprus, and Innocent IV died in December 1254. Nothing now stood in the way

---

69 The legate Pelagius has been charged with responsibility for the death of these Greeks, but he himself died in 1230, a year before their execution: see Donovan, Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade, p. 104, and Hill, History of Cyprus, III, 1049, note 1, correcting H. T. F. Duckworth, The Church of Cyprus (London, 1900).

70 For fuller details of this mission than are given by Hackett or Hill, see R. L. Wolff, “The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans,” Traditio, II (1944), 225-227.
of Hugh’s burning desire to root out what he regarded as heretical opinions. Latin and Greek archbishops hurled excommunications at each other, while the secular authorities tried vainly to keep the peace. Finally Germanus appealed to Rome, and Alexander IV referred the matter to Odo, whose decision was embodied in the *Constitutio Cypria* or *Bulla Cypria* of Anagni (July 3, 1260). Thereupon Hugh retired again to Tuscany, though he kept his title of archbishop of Nicosia until his death in 1267.

The *Constitutio Cypria* attempted to settle the relationship of the two churches for the future, but it could not eliminate all seeds of controversy. It confirmed the reduction of the Greek sees to four and provided that after the death of Germanus, who was made independent of the Latin hierarchy in the island, the Latin archbishop should be sole metropolitan. A series of lengthy articles dealt with the oath of obedience to be taken by newly elected Greek bishops, their rights and jurisdiction.\(^{71}\)

Alexander IV’s constitution brought no peace. “Heresy” still flourished; the schism endured. Greeks who conformed were excommunicated by Greeks who resisted. The civil arm refused to intervene to punish recusant Greeks. The fear that, with the fall of Latin Constantinople, the new Byzantine emperor might take advantage of Cypriote disaffection to make a landing in the island proved unfounded, but discontent smouldered on, though no acute outbreak occurred until early in the next century. In about 1280 or shortly thereafter the Latin archbishop, Raphael, issued a constitution giving instructions to the Greek clergy for their discipline, ritual, and administration, which was to be read four times a year by the Greek bishops to clergy and laity. The tone of the document, which speaks of the Greek prelates as merely “tolerated”, while the Latin were “ordained”, was not such as to assuage the bitter feelings of the Greeks. It charged the Greek clergy with being ignorant and slack, but perhaps such a charge could have been brought with equal justice against the Latin clergy. The struggle continued and was ended only with the expulsion of the Latins by the Turks in the sixteenth century. Today such monuments as the noble thirteenth-century cathedral of Hagia Sophia (now a mosque) in Nicosia and the magnificent fourteenth-century ruins of the Premonstratensian abbey of Bellapais in the north alone bear witness to the once dominant position of the Latin church in the island.

\(^{71}\) For a summary of the *Constitutio Cypria*, see Hill, *History of Cyprus*, III, 1059 ff., and Hackett, *Orthodox Church in Cyprus*, pp. 114-123.
Secure behind its sea walls, Cyprus played a significant role in thirteenth-century crusading history. When the Latin states on the mainland fell, it offered asylum to the hordes of refugees. The kingdom of Cyprus became the heir, in its institutions, of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Succeeding centuries were to witness bitter struggles — the Greek church against the Latin, and Cypriote barons against their rulers. In a wider sphere, however, Cyprus was to become the great emporium for commerce between east and west, and was to loom large in the projects of those who planned future crusades.