

Christopher David Schabel

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5508-6516>

University of Cyprus

schabel@ucy.ac.cy

DOI: 10.35765/pk.2020.3003.07

Géraud de Veyrines, Bishop of Paphos, and the Defense of the Kingdom of Armenia in the 1320s

ABSTRACT

The activities of Géraud de Veyrines, papal nuncio and then bishop of Paphos in the 1320s, have been known since 1962, when Jean Richard published *Instrumenta Miscellanea* in the Vatican Archives on the accounts of his financial dealings as nuncio on Cyprus. These accounts concern his handling of a large fund of 30,000 gold florins for the defense of the Kingdom of Armenia in Cilicia, the raising of clerical tithes and taxes on Cyprus in support of the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia, the legacy of Patriarch Pierre of Jerusalem, and the debts and property of Géraud's predecessor as bishop of Paphos, Aimery de Nabinaud. This article publishes the remaining *Instrumenta Miscellanea* pertaining to these accounts—number 1086 and the unpublished portion of number 1045—and updates the history of the Armenian fund in papal letters, many of which Professor Richard only discovered later, while compiling the third volume of the *Bullarium Cyprium*, published a half-century later, in 2012.¹

KEYWORDS: Armenia, Cyprus, papacy, Crusades, Géraud de Veyrines

STRESZCZENIE

Géraud de Veyrines, biskup Pafos i obrona Królestwa Armenii w 1320

Pierwsze wzmianki o działalności Gérauda de Veyrinesa, nuncjusza papieskiego, a następnie biskupa Pafos w latach dwudziestych XIV wieku, pojawiły się w 1962 roku, kiedy Jean Richard opublikował w Archiwach Watykańskich kursywa: *Instrumenta miscellanea* – zapis swoich transakcji finansowych jako

1 Generally the papal letters are only accessible in often inadequate and sometimes inaccurate summaries. These summaries are cited below, but frequently the information is found solely in the full text in the manuscripts cited in the summaries. The full text will be published in the continuation of the *Bullarium Cyprium*. A few of the letters are in Raynaldus (1646–1677), but this is not noted below. Pertinent earlier summaries are used sporadically in Coureas (2010), but without the benefit of the *Bullarium Cyprium*. I thank Peter Edbury for his comments.

nuncjusza na Cyprze. Dokument ten stanowi źródło informacji o wykorzystaniu znacznych funduszy w wysokości 30 000 złotych florenów na obronę Królestwa Armenii w Cylicji oraz zbieraniu dziesięcin duchownych i podatków na Cyprze na wsparcie Królestw Cypru i Armenii. Ponadto opisuje on schedę patriarchy Piotra z Jerozolimy oraz wymienia długi i majątek poprzednika Gérauda, wcześniejszego biskupa Pafos, Aimerego de Nabinaud. W niniejszym artykule udostępnione zostaną pozostałe kursywa: *Instrumenta miscellanea* odnoszące się do tychże ksiąg – dokument nr 1086 i niepublikowana część dokumentu 1045. Przedstawione zostaną tu także nowe fakty dotyczące zapisanej w listach papieskich historii funduszu ormiańskiego. Wiele z tych listów profesor Richard odkrył w późniejszym okresie, podczas opracowywania trzeciego tomu książki *Bullarium Cyprum*, który ujrzał światło dzienne pół wieku później, w 2012 roku.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: Armenia, Cypr, papieństwo, krucjaty, Géraud de Veyrines

The history of the relations between the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia from the fall of Acre in 1291 to the final fall of Cilician Armenia in 1375 has yet to be written, because not all the source material is available in print. This article is a small contribution to this project, including the edition of two documents in the recently renamed Archivio Apostolico Vaticano: *Instrumenta Miscellanea* 1045 and 1086. Because of space limitations, the paper deals with these documents only insofar as they concern the project of Géraud de Veyrines, first papal nuncio and then bishop of Paphos, to support the defense of the Kingdom of Armenia in the 1320s.

Cyprus and Armenia after the Fall of Acre

After the fall of Acre and most other Western Christian outposts in Syria–Palestine in 1291, the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia took on a more important geopolitical role as the last bastions of Latin Christianity in the Eastern Mediterranean. Not only would the two kingdoms be crucial for any recuperation of the Holy Land, but they were now more vulnerable to attack from the advancing Muslims, primarily Mamluk Egypt, but also the Turks of Asia Minor. Although the general population of Cyprus was mostly Greek, with a number of Syrians of various rites, some Armenians, and various other groups, the nobility and some of the merchant class were of Western origin and of the Latin rite, ecclesiastically loyal to Rome. The situation in Cilician Armenia was even more complicated: the nobility consisted of culturally Westernized Armenians, but again the general

population included many Greeks and other groups. After 1198 the Armenian Church was officially united with Rome, but much of the Armenian aristocracy and episcopal hierarchy was hostile to this union, while the Greeks and others remained loyal to their own traditions (Coureas, 1994, 1995; Mutafian, 2012).

The royal houses of Cyprus and Armenia grew closer in the course of the thirteenth century, and before the fall of Acre the popes supplied dispensations for children of King Hugh III of Cyprus (1267–1284), who had eleven legitimate offspring, to marry children of King Leo II (or III) of Armenia (1269–1289), who had sixteen of his own. Hugh's eighth child, Margaret, married the future King Thoros III of Armenia (1293–1298), who was murdered, and her son by Thoros became Leo III (or IV, 1303–1307), who was also murdered. Hugh's fourth son and child, Amaury, married Leo II's tenth child and fourth daughter, Isabella. Moreover, of the six children Amaury had with Isabella, his third son and child, Guy, would become King Constantine II of Armenia (1342–1344), his fourth, John, would be the father of the last king, Leo V (or VI, 1374–1375), and his sixth child and only daughter, Agnes or Maria, either married or became engaged to her unfortunate cousin Leo III (or IV), who died without children (Hill, 1948; Edbury, 1991; Coureas, 1994, 1995; Mutafian 2012).

It would seem that the lineages were interwoven enough that the two isolated kingdoms would support one another against the Muslim threat, and as fate would have it Amaury became heir to his childless older brother, King Henry II (1385–1324). In 1306 a coup overthrew Henry and placed Amaury in power, which at first seemed to bode well for relations between Cyprus and Armenia. Among the justifications for the coup were complaints about Henry's foreign policy and defense initiatives. Henry's failure to aid the Kingdom of Armenia, which was then under the rule of Amaury's nephew and perhaps son-in-law Leo III, was very high on the list. After Leo's murder, Amaury's brother-in-law via Isabella, Oshin (1307–1320), became king. In early 1310, when Amaury's support on Cyprus had dwindled, he sent his brother King Henry into exile and confinement at the court of King Oshin in Armenia, who around this time even married Henry's and Amaury's youngest sister, the eleventh child of Hugh III, Isabella (divorcing her in 1316) (Hill, 1948; Edbury, 1991; Schabel & Minervini, 2008; Edbury, 2016).

Unfortunately for ties between the two kingdoms, Amaury himself was murdered in 1310, and King Henry was forced swear to terms that were beneficial to Armenia in order to secure his release. Naturally, once he was safely back in Cyprus Henry refused to abide by the oath, which he claimed was given under duress, and for the next decade the diplomatic efforts of the papacy managed to prevent open war, but could not establish

peace between the two Christian outposts. Oshin died in mid-1320, succeeded by his son Leo IV (or V, 1320–1341), who in the summer of 1321 married Alice, the daughter of Margaret of Ibelin by the regent of Armenia—another Oshin, of Gorhigos. This Oshin was thought to have poisoned King Oshin, and, in early 1323, to have had Amaury's widow, Isabella, and their eldest surviving son, Henry, killed; their firstborn, Hugh, had died earlier. If this is true, or if King Henry II of Cyprus believed it to be true, he may have been less negatively disposed toward Armenia at the very end of his life (Perrat, 1927; Edbury, 1991; Schabel & Georgiou, 2016).

If so, the timing was right, because Armenia suffered from Mamluk attacks in the early 1320s. When Henry II finally decided to come to Armenia's aid, he drew the wrath of the Sultan against Cyprus (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-161). On December 20, 1322 Pope John XXII sent three versions of a long bull with at least twenty surviving copies in which he called for general assistance and a crusade for both kingdoms (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-151). It was in this context that the pope sent Géraud de Veyrines to Outremer.

Géraud de Veyrines

The first known mention of *Geraldus de Vitrinis* is in a letter of Pope Clement V dated July 1, 1311 concerning Templar property, in which Géraud is said to have drawn up a document as public notary by royal authority of Agen, about 60 km west-southwest of John XXII's hometown of Cahors, in southwest France (Clement V, 1885–1892, no. 7183). On the basis of a letter dated February 21, 1325 granting the rectorship of the church of St. Michael in Nicosia to a "Helyas de Virtinis" of the diocese of Périgueux in the Dordogne region (Jean XXII, 1904–1947, no. 21612), Jean Richard was certain that Géraud and Hélié were relatives and that "de Virtinis" corresponded to Veyrines-de-Vergt, which lies about 20 km south-southeast of Périgueux. Nevertheless, according to a papal letter of June 8, 1321 (Jean XXII, 1904–1947, no. 13602), Géraud himself was from the neighboring diocese of Sarlat, about 35 km east-southeast of Veyrines-de-Vergt, but only 14 km northeast of Veyrines-de-Domme. Given that the only published papal letters from 1316 to 1378 to people in the region from *Vitrinis* are to Géraud and Hélié, who both ended up in Nicosia at the same time, Richard is surely right that they are relatives, but whether they hailed from Veyrines-de-Vergt in the diocese of Périgueux or from Veyrines-de-Domme in the diocese of Sarlat cannot be determined (Richard, 1962; Salles, 2007).

Géraud's services for Clement V must have been valuable, for the next we hear of Géraud, on January 2, 1314, he was archdeacon of Troia, in far-away Apulia, when the pope made him the rector in the spiritual affairs of the city and the district of Benevento (Clement V, 1885–1892, no. 10121). When Géraud reappears on June 8, 1321, as canon with prebend and still archdeacon of Troia, he is given an expectancy of a benefice in the city or diocese of Bordeaux by Pope John XXII (Jean XXII, 1904–1947, no. 13602). Less than two weeks later, on June 21, Pope John—on being informed of the death of the incumbent—granted Géraud the canonry with prebend and the position of archdeacon in Benevento, while allowing Géraud to retain his posts in Troia and even his expectancy in Bordeaux (Jean XXII, 1904–1947, no. 13866). Finally, in the context of his crusading plans, on February 13, 1323 John XXII granted Archdeacon Géraud of Benevento the canonry with prebend in Nicosia Cathedral that was vacated by Pierre de Genouillac's promotion to patriarch of Jerusalem (at some point, Géraud received a parallel post in Famagusta; *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, f-315). Unlike in the previous letters, this time Géraud is addressed as “magister,” indicating a high level of education. John made a point that the grant was made *motu proprio* and not at Géraud's or anyone else's request. Unusually, there is no mention at all of Géraud's other benefices. The letter was addressed to the bishops of Paphos and Famagusta as well as a canon of Benevento itself, to get the message across (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-134, 158). The situation was urgent.

The choice of Géraud de Veyrines has been seen as part of a trend whereby clerics from the Périgord region, centered on Périgueux but including Sarlat, were sent to Cyprus and became prominent local figures, especially the Nabinaud and Chambarlhac families, which supplied archbishops to Nicosia and bishops to the other dioceses. Besides John XXII himself, Cardinal Hélie Talleyrand of Périgord has been seen as a driving force (Salles, 2007), from before being raised to the purple in 1331 until his death in 1364, when he was preparing to go as legate on the crusade that Peter I of Cyprus would eventually lead to Alexandria in 1365, with Peter Thomae as legate. However, the rise of Périgord in Cyprus predates John XXII's pontificate, since Aimery of Nabinaud was already lector at the Franciscan convent in Famagusta during the negotiations for King Henry II's release in 1310 (Perrat, 1927).

Géraud and the Armenian Question

Aimery of Nabinaud was in fact one of the recipients of the February 13, 1323 letter granting Géraud a canonry in Nicosia, because John XXII had made Aimery bishop of Paphos the previous year, on July 18, 1322

(*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-139). Even here, however, Pope John merely accepted the chapter's election of Friar Aimery, replacing the late Jacques More, who had been active in the dispute between Cyprus and Armenia (Schabel & Georgiou, 2016). In fact, in his monumental *Annales Minorum* from the mid-seventeenth century, the Irish scholar Luke Wadding not only edited Pope John's letter promoting Aimery, but described the situation, and his words serve as a transition to our theme:

This year the Pontiff committed much serious business to be carried out in the East to Friar Aimery, who ... rose to the bishopric of Paphos the previous year, especially in order to pacify King Henry of Cyprus and the Grand Master Hélon of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem and the other brothers of the same military order, who were sharply at variance with one another and dealing with each other with hostility (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-168, 192), and to conclude pacts of peace between the same king and King Leon of Armenia (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-166, 194) and finally between the same Henry and the Genoese (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-167, 195), working along with Patriarch Pierre of Jerusalem. (Wadding, 1625–1654, for 1322 and 1323)

Wadding then introduces our Géraud:

The Pontiff had sent the sum of 30,000 florins of Florence, via the Florentine merchants and associates of the Bardi, to be handed over to Master Géraud de Veyrines, archdeacon of Benevento, nuncio of the Apostolic See in areas of Outremer, for the relief of King Leon of the Armenians ... and of all Christians living in his kingdom, whom the treachery and neighboring madness of the Saracens was cruelly and monstrosly afflicting (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-163). But once truces of long duration were made between the aforesaid king and the Armenian barons, on one side, and the Sultan of Babylon and his peoples opposed to the Armenians, on the other (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-230), this year the Pontiff wrote to the aforesaid nuncio so that, with the advice of the aforesaid Bishop Aimery of Paphos, he would spend the money for the good of the Armenians, either in repairing the castles of Laiazzo [Ayas], and other fortified places of said kingdom, which the Saracens had just cruelly destroyed, or in purchasing arms or acquiring other things necessary to protect the kingdom (cf. *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-233-234). (Wadding, 1625–1654, for 1322 and 1323)

Wadding had direct access to the Vatican Archives and put together his paragraph on the basis of a number of still-unpublished materials. Let us unpack his dense paragraph.

In letters from the spring of 1323, Pope John XXII outlined plans for a crusade in 1324 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-162). On April 1, 1323,

in a letter to both Patriarch Pierre and Archdeacon Géraud, Pope John informed them that in support of the Kingdom of Armenia he had sent the staggering sum of 30,000 gold florins of Florence, which at the time was the equivalent of 180,000 bezants. It is difficult to put this into perspective, but one could pay the annual salaries of roughly 500 cathedral canons with that money, the equivalent of many tens of millions of euros today. The funds were to be transferred via the Bardi bank, payable in the port city of Famagusta or in the capital of Nicosia in four unequal monthly installments of 10,500, 10,500, 4,500, and 4,500 florins, and the patriarch was to carry out arrangements for the money. The reason for the unequal sums is given in another letter to the same recipients, 17 columns in length, undated but presumably around the same time. Most of this is taken up by the texts of two notarial documents drawn up in Avignon that Pope John XXII included; they provide the details of two agreements with the Bardi bank, one dated September 7, 1322 concerning 12,960 florins—12,000 of which would go to the East in two monthly installments of 6,000—and the second dated March 5, 1323 involving 19,440 florins, of which 18,000 would go to Cyprus in four monthly installments of 4,500. The remaining 2,400 florins, 8% of the 30,000, would remain with the Bardi bank for its services (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-163; Schaefer, 1904).

A few days later, on April 6, Pope John again wrote Pierre and Géraud the first of a series of letters that month ordering them to raise various tithes and taxes on ecclesiastical income in Cyprus for the defense of both kingdoms (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-165, 191, 197, 199–201). On April 10, the pope granted Géraud the rather generous per diem of two gold florins and safe passage for his journey east (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-188, 190), although he was also allowed to retain the income from his benefices for a number of years (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-249). On April 28, John wrote to Patriarch Pierre and Géraud asking Pierre to hand over to Géraud his accounts for his activities as papal nuncio, now that Géraud was replacing him (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-198).

In the summer of 1324, however, Pope John XXII learned from a letter sent from representatives of the Bardi bank in Famagusta, dated May 31, that the Armenians had come to terms with the Mamluks at the request of the Tartars, with the Armenians paying—in addition to a share of duties, tolls, and other royal income—an astronomical annual tribute to the Sultan of 1,200,000 dirhams, the equivalent of 300,000 white bezants of Cyprus or 50,000 gold florins, more than the entire sum of the papal aid package. In exchange, the Sultan was obliged to repair the castle of Laiazzo and every other fortification that he had destroyed to the point where they were at least as strong as before (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-230).

The crusade was thus cancelled, but despite the Sultan's alleged obligation to repair the castles, as Pope John XXII informed Géraud on August 9, 1324, the pope and the cardinals decided that the 30,000 florins should still be used for the defense of Armenia. By this time, Patriarch Pierre had died on Cyprus, so the pope instructed Géraud—with the advice and aid of Bishop Aimery of Paphos, if he would and could, or else alone—to discern from trustworthy prelates and others in the area whether the money should be used for the reconstruction and repair of the castle of Laiazzo and other fortified places in Armenia that were recently destroyed by the infidels, or the purchase of arms, or supplies, or anything else for the defense of Armenia. After the investigation, Géraud was to dispense the money accordingly, with the help of able and worthy persons chosen carefully, who would render accounts afterwards. He was told to make sure that no money should fall into the hands of other individuals or groups. Whatever he decided to do with the money, he was to keep the pope informed via public documents, acting with ecclesiastical censure against anyone who took away, usurped, misappropriated, or converted any or all of the money to other uses without papal permission, or against anyone who helped such people in any way (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-233). A few days later, on August 13, Pope John reminded Géraud to be careful with the 30,000 florins, but to inform him about what he and Bishop Aimery did with the money collected or to be collected from the tithes and fruits of vacant benefices on Cyprus, about how it could best be used for the defense of Cyprus against the enemies of the Cross, and about the state of the area and rumor circulating (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-235). Still, on October 25, 1324 the pope told Géraud to exempt Maurice de Pagnac—who was in charge of half of the Hospitaller holdings in Cyprus—from the clerical tithe, because Maurice was also preceptor in the Kingdom of Armenia, from which he was no longer receiving anything because of the Mamluk destruction, and yet he had to continue to support the Armenian holdings (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-243).

With the crusade cancelled and the local funds from the Cypriot clergy thus diverted to Cyprus, only the 30,000 florins were left for Géraud to direct to Armenia. By this point, King Henry II had already died—on March 31, 1324 (Edbury, 1991). Nevertheless, as late as June 3, 1324 the news had not reached Avignon, since Pope John addressed a letter to King Henry on that date (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-229). For some reason, the first sign that the pope was aware of Henry's death and Hugh IV's succession is a letter dated March 20, 1325 addressed to "the same king" (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-256), in the manuscript immediately following a letter to "Hugoni regi Cipri illustri" (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-260, June 10, 1325). Indeed, the letter from March 20 informing the king

that his nuncio, the knight Jacques Vidal, had arrived bearing the king's letter declaring his fealty seems to be the pope's reply to Hugh's official announcement. Pope John also commended to King Hugh Master Géraud of Veyrines, archdeacon of Benevento, papal nuncio, as if for the first time. Nevertheless, for some reason, on June 10, Pope John sent another letter to King Hugh commending Géraud (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-261).

Almost two years later, on 17 March 1327, Pope John commended Géraud to Hugh IV yet again, but this time it was because of Géraud's promotion to bishop of Paphos. The pope was responding to Hugh's letter in which the king described his actions toward Géraud after the latter's promotion (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-307). By February 24, 1327 Pope John had appointed a new archdeacon of Benevento because of Géraud's promotion, and the pope specified that Géraud had already been consecrated in Outremer while carrying out his duties as nuncio (Jean XXII, 1904–1947, no. 27984). The previous time we hear of Géraud is in a letter dated September 20, 1326, in which Pope John acknowledges receipt of the nuncio's own letter (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-298). Following Bishop Aimery's death, Géraud must have been elected or appointed bishop toward the end of 1326.

Following Géraud's promotion, Pope John replaced him as nuncio with Pierre de Manso, who was given Géraud's canonry and prebend in Nicosia on May 14 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-314), and Jacques Raymond Sartor—who received Géraud's corresponding benefice in Famagusta on May 14 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-315)—on 22 May (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-319). On May 25, the new nuncios were instructed to look into the fate of the 30,000 florins, with Bishop Géraud's assistance (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-325). The pope explained the background, how Patriarch Pierre and Archdeacon Géraud were assigned to deal with the money, but that following Pierre's death Géraud was told to go ahead with the funds with Bishop Aimery's assistance, despite the truces between Armenia and the Sultan. Pierre and Jacques were to have Géraud render an account of the money. If nothing had been used or only a portion of it, they were to recover the money or what was left and put it in a safe place. On the advice of Géraud and other prelates and trustworthy persons, they were to put the money to as good and expedient use as possible. In any event, they were to inform the pope about Géraud's accounts and their actions. John XXII addressed other letters to the same nuncios in parallel on the tithes, clerical taxes, and other financial matters touching on Géraud's actions as nuncio (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-322–324, 326–328).

That much was standard and expected, but on June 1, 1327 the nuncios were also told to recover the goods of the late Bishop Aimery of Paphos,

which included sugar, revenues from the *casalia* (villages) of the bishopric, chalices and ornaments for the chapel, cloth of gold, silk, and camlet, silver vessels, animals, furniture, wine, and various items in the *casalia*, amounting to approximately 50,000 bezants, not counting the 26,000 bezants that Aimery had collected from the tithe (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-329). Unfortunately for Géraud, his diocese was in debt, and this would have repercussions for the Armenian fund.

On July 24, 1327, having learned that Jacques Raymond was unable to travel to Cyprus, Pope John replaced him with the Dominican Arnald de Fabricis, and in a series of letters sent them to Cyprus with a per diem of 1/2 florin each, one-fourth of what Géraud had enjoyed throughout his period as nuncio (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-338–341). On August 1, John informed King Hugh of the fact that Pierre and Arnald were replacing Géraud as nuncios (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-342). According to Géraud's later accounts (Richard, 1962), his activities as nuncio ceased on September 30, 1327, probably with the arrival of the letter to Hugh and of the nuncios themselves.

The activities of the pope's new nuncios, Pierre de Manso and Arnald de Fabricis, are well known, perhaps even infamous (Richard, 1962; Kaoulla & Schabel, 2007), but we hear nothing else about the case of Bishop Géraud for over a year. On October 15, 1328 Pope John wrote to Géraud, relating that King Leon of Armenia and the regents Oshin of Gorighos and Ethon de Nigrino had sent nuncios to the pope asking that the money the pope had entrusted to Géraud for regaining and repairing the castles of Armenia be given to them now for repairing the castle of Laiazzo, despite the truce between the two sides, so that if any discord should arise between the king and the Sultan of Babylon the Armenians could be secure. With a view to helping the king and kingdom and for the Orthodox faith, since the pope's letters to Géraud on this matter both while Géraud was nuncio and after he became bishop always indicated that this money was for the support of the Kingdom of Armenia, Pope John ordered Géraud to turn over the money to the nuncios in Cyprus in full and immediately, so that they could spend it as intended. Géraud was also told to have three public instruments drawn up recording this restitution to the nuncios, keeping one, giving one to the nuncios, and sending the third to Avignon without delay. On the same day Pope John wrote his nuncios to this effect, asking them to spend the money as intended, once they received it from Géraud (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-382).

It seems that the pope had no information on the fate of the 30,000 florins that he had arranged to send to Cyprus over five years earlier. The letters to Géraud, or at least to the nuncios, had an immediate effect, as we shall see. Before the pope knew of this effect, however, he sent a series of

five letters to his nuncios, Pierre de Manso and Arnald de Fabricis, on February 22, 1329. One letter summarizes the problems that the nuncios had with Géraud concerning Paphos: he had seized the possessions of the late Aimery, who had significant debts to the apostolic camera that were still unpaid; the back tithes of nine years from the diocese now amounted to 36,000 bezants or 6,000 florins; as a result, the nuncios excommunicated and suspended Géraud and placed his church under interdict. Because of this, Géraud paid 1,000 florins in order to delay payment by one year, and Pope John ordered the nuncios to allow it (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-391). Since Géraud had appealed to the pope, in another letter John XXII ordered the nuncios to relax the sentences and absolve him of any irregularities that he may have incurred while celebrating the divine offices while under such sentences, on the condition that Géraud dealt with the debts within a year, as mentioned (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-388). In another letter, the pope authorized Géraud to borrow up to 6,000 florins for the above, matching what Paphos owed the papacy for the tithes (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-392).

The other two letters concerned the 30,000 florins. In one, Pope John reminded his nuncios of his earlier letter ordering them to receive the accounts from Géraud, demand the return of whatever had not been spent, place that remainder or the full amount in a safe place, and seek advice about what best to do with it. Although Géraud offered to render these accounts and return the remainder to the best of his ability, Géraud had the pope informed that, because he did not turn over the money to them, they resorted to sentences of excommunication and suspension for this as well, despite Géraud's appeal to the pope on this matter. The pope told his nuncios that if Géraud rendered a proper account and returned the 30,000 florins or the part that remained—which should be deposited in a safe place—they should absolve him of these sentences and harass him no more (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-389). In the other letter, the pope relates that Géraud sent word that he had already placed the remainder of the 30,000 florins in a safe place, so the pope ordered the nuncios to absolve him of any irregularity he may have incurred if he celebrated or involved himself in the divine offices while bound by the sentences, except if he was in contempt, with the proviso that Géraud must deposit the money within 15 days of being presented with this letter. Thus, the nuncios were to announce publicly that Géraud was absolved or still bound, depending on his actions with respect to the 30,000 florins (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-390).

The Agreements and Accounts of Early 1329

On January 15, precisely three months after John dispatched his previous letter of October 15, 1328, the bishop of Paphos came to an agreement with the nuncios, as recorded in *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1086, which was described previously (Richard, 1962, pp. 33–34), but is published below for the first time. The agreement was drawn up in the lodgings of the bishopric of Paphos in Nicosia by the public notary (on apostolic authority) Arnaud Bregas, a cleric of the diocese of Rieux, south of Toulouse, with another copy made by the notary Master Radolfo de Osuertulo of Cremona, in the presence of the Carmelite vicar provincial of the Holy Land Guillaume Garde, the Carmelite Thomas Catalan, the Dominican Bernard Sarrazin, the priest Giovanni Cosenza, Géraud's relative Hélie de Veyrines, cantor of Paphos, the master chaplain of Paphos Gerald of Geneva, and the notary Raymond Vidal. The agreement concerned several issues, listed in this order: the debts that the late Bishop Aimery of Paphos owed the apostolic camera; the 30,000 florins; the restitution of the goods of Bishop Aimery; the sugar already collected that was in Paphos and in Famagusta; and the modest expenses of the nuncios in the “expedition” of the above-mentioned master chaplain Gerald of Geneva (perhaps to Avignon), the “business of the inquisition” of Stephen “Pacisingressi” (who must have been assisting them), the collection of the above-mentioned sugar, and other things pertaining to the Church of Paphos.

The agreement contained seven articles, the second of which stated that within eight days of receiving this document Bishop Géraud would render an account to the nuncios of what he had done with the 30,000 florins intended for the relief and support of Armenia. The first item, however, was the debt of the bishop of Paphos, which Géraud had inherited, and of which Géraud pledged to pay each year 18,000 white bezants (3,000 florins)—9,000 in August and the other 9,000 in February—although the repayment was not to begin until March 1, 1329. The bishopric of Paphos was relatively wealthy, but this still amounted to half of the bishop's estimated income (Hoberg, 1949). These payments would continue until Bishop Aimery's debts had been paid, especially the six-year tithe on the Church of Paphos. According to the third article, the new bishop agreed to turn over to the nuncios whatever goods of Aimery had ended up with Géraud, or their value, in accordance with the inventory that had been conducted, as well as anything not mentioned in the inventory. The bishop's assets in sugar were to be sold in Famagusta to reduce the debt, both what was already in Famagusta and what was still in Paphos, which was to be shipped to Famagusta for sale. The income from the tithe on royal property in the diocese of Paphos for 1328 was to be turned over to the

nuncios for the same purpose of debt reduction. The nuncios agreed to make an accurate account of these transactions. Finally, Bishop Géraud would pay the modest expenses of the nuncios mentioned above.

Géraud quickly supplied some of the required accounts. *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1088, which was dated February 3 in the Dominican convent of Nicosia and which has been published (Richard, 1962, pp. 35–36), concerns the goods of the late Patriarch Pierre, which were not mentioned in the January 15 agreement. Géraud had already secured from Archbishop Homodeus of Tarsus in Armenia a document drawn up in Tarsus and dated June 15, 1328—the previously published part of *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1045 (Richard, 1962, pp. 37–38)—which recorded the money he had received from Géraud for the castles in Armenia, taken from the 30,000 florins: 5,000 white bezants of Cyprus on March 26, 1326; 10,000 bezants on December 12, 1326; 10,000 bezants on March 2, 1327; 10,000 bezants on April 30, 1327; and at various times in 1327 (old style), via Count Oshin of Gorighos, 30,000 bezants, as recorded in a letter from August 24, 1327.

Archbishop Homodeus's letter is incorporated into a document published below, the remainder of *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1045, drawn up for the nuncios by the same Arnaud Bregas on March 3, 1329 in Famagusta, after Géraud had shown them Homodeus's sealed letter in the Dominican convent of Nicosia, likely either on February 3, on the occasion of the account of Patriarch Pierre's legacy, or on January 26, when Géraud's own account was drawn up (see below). In Famagusta the Dominican John Torelli and Odino Valerius of the diocese of Verdun, along with Master Raymond Vidal, served as witnesses, while the priest Giovanni Cosenza assisted Bregas with the collation of Homodeus's letter.

That accounted for 65,000 bezants, 10,833 florins, just over one-third of the original amount (Richard, 1962). The most exciting document, *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1087, which was published previously (Richard, 1962, pp. 41–49), is Géraud's own account of how he used the money on Cyprus in support of Armenia, notably in the construction of ships, covering the period from August 10, 1325 to May 1326. The copy of Géraud's account was drawn up on January 26, 1329 by the same Arnaud Bregas in the Dominican convent of Nicosia. The total amount came to around 35,000 bezants, 5,868 florins (Richard, 1962).

The Aftermath

As has been remarked (Richard, 1962), together with what was sent to Armenia in cash for the reconstruction and restoration of fortifications in Laiazzo and perhaps elsewhere, only 16,671 of the original 30,000 florins

were accounted for, and 3,268 of that went to Géraud's own per diem and expenses. But what of the more than 13,000 florins that remained? Papal letters from June 4, 1329, before the August payments were due, reveal that the nuncios, according to Géraud, continued to harass him over his predecessor Aimery's debts despite the agreement, while Géraud continued to negotiate with the pope concerning the sugar stocks, which Aimery had apparently pledged as security (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-407–408). In a letter dated August 5, 1329, John responded to the nuncios' explanation of the debts of and agreement with Géraud concerning everything but the 30,000—the subject of another letter—asking for distinct clarification about the origins of the various debts and the terms of the payments (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-424). The saga continued into 1330, when, on March 22, the pope wrote another five letters on these and other matters relating to Paphos, the tithe, and Géraud's handling of the goods of deceased clerics (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-434–438).

On August 5, 1329 Pope John also responded to the nuncios concerning the accounts of Bishop Géraud regarding the 30,000 florins, which accounts the nuncios had sent to Avignon. The nuncios had asked the pope whether Géraud's own salary and expenses as nuncio, i.e., 3,268 florins, should be deducted from the 30,000, as the bishop insisted. The pope answered that the camera was still ill-informed about what had been done in those parts and could not easily examine the accounts, although if the nuncios had specific doubts they could write for clarification. So the pope ordered Pierre and Arnald to carefully examine the accounts themselves and, if they had doubts or suspicions, to explain them clearly to the apostolic camera, and not to deduct anything for Géraud's salary until they had the pope's response to their examination, specific doubts, and suspicions (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-425).

Meanwhile, King Hugh IV must have got wind that there was still money left over from the Armenian fund and that the Armenians were requesting the remainder be sent to them directly. For this and other matters Hugh sent an embassy to Avignon, asking that the “rest of the money sent by us [the pope] at one time for the defense of your [Hugh's] kingdom and the Kingdom of Armenia” be given to Hugh for the defense of Cyprus and the construction of castles, with the tithes and taxes on Cyprus to be devoted to work on the walls of Nicosia. On the same day he sent the other letters, August 5, 1329, Pope John replied to Hugh that the money the pope had sent was actually for the defense of the Kingdom of Armenia and this grant could not be revoked (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-423). Earlier, on May 7, probably soon after the Cypriot embassy arrived (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-404–406), Pope John had written to his nuncios that he had heard—possibly from the Cypriots—doubts about the

solidity of the faith and devotion to the Church of the Kingdom of Armenia. If true, the nuncios were not to send any more of the money to Armenia, but to keep it safe and to be cautious about it. If instead Armenia persisted in its loyalty, the nuncios were to spend the money for its defense as previously ordered without impediment, except for obvious reasons (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-423). Indeed, in January 1329 King Leon IV, coming of age, had murdered Oshin of Gorighos and several others (Richard, 1962; Coureas, 1994), and among his letters from March 22, 1330 Pope John wrote one to his nuncios informing them that he had heard that Leon had destroyed churches and other religious places constructed for the Latin rite, so Pierre and Arnaud were ordered not to give any (more) of the 30,000 florins sent in aid “of the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia”—reflecting the perspective of King Hugh of Cyprus—until they received further papal orders (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-432).

Pope John must have learned that the report about King Leon IV was untrue and that he favored the Roman Church, and on February 28, 1331 John referred again to the money “*dudum* directed for the repair of the castles and fortifications of the Kingdom of Armenia.” Pierre and Arnaud, the pope’s nuncios, had informed him that part of the money had in fact been used for the repair of the castle of Laiazzo, but that a certain portion of the money remained, no doubt the 13,000 florins. Pope John ordered his nuncios to employ the money as earlier directed, i.e., in aid to Armenia, and to report back to him (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-451). *Prima facie*, our story seems to end here.

Post mortem

We hear no more about the 30,000 florins during Géraud’s lifetime, probably because the remainder was spent as directed. Understandably, having discovered the fascinating document concerning the specifics of the effort to build ships for the defense of Armenia, Jean Richard was less interested in Géraud himself, although more than a half century later he would publish a detailed report on Géraud’s almost immediate successor, Eudes de Cauquelines (Richard, 2016). It turns out that the issue of the 30,000 florins did not end in 1331 or die with Géraud, so let us glance quickly at the succession. According to Pope Benedict XII’s letter to Eudes appointing him bishop of Paphos, dated June 2, 1337 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-29), Pope John XXII had reserved for himself and the Apostolic See the appointment of Géraud’s successor while Géraud was alive. At some point after Pope John’s death on December 4, 1334, and after the news of Benedict’s election on December 30 and rumors that he had cancelled all of

John XXII's reservations reached Cyprus, Bishop Géraud died in Cyprus and the chapter convened and elected as bishop Philippe Alaman, canon and cantor of Nicosia and papal chaplain (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-523). The de facto Bishop-elect Philippe himself then died in Cyprus, and the chapter once again gathered and elected Eudes, treasurer of Nicosia, whose election was confirmed by Archbishop Hélie of Nicosia. Eudes was consecrated, and he took over duties as bishop. Only then did Eudes learn that Benedict XII had not cancelled all of Pope John's reservations, so Eudes travelled to Rome and eventually obtained his position from Benedict (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-29). The date of Géraud's death can be established with more precision, because on June 3, 1336 Pope Benedict gave to Lambertino of Bologna Philippe Alaman's position of canon and cantor of Nicosia, having learned of Philippe's death (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-18). Lambertino was in Avignon by January 3, 1336, when Benedict wrote to King Hugh IV announcing Lambertino's arrival (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-7), yet on February 10 the pope was still addressing letters to the unnamed bishop of Paphos (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-15). Thus Géraud's death occurred after Lambertino's departure in the fall of 1335 and probably before the spring of 1336, allowing time for Philippe's election, death, and the arrival of the news in Avignon by June 3.

On June 22, 1336 Benedict wrote to Archbishop Hélie concerning the late Bishop Géraud and the Armenian money. The Bardi bank had sent a petition to the pope concerning the money that the late Pope John had assigned to the late Bishop Géraud for the defense of Cyprus, probably an error for Armenia. Géraud had not spent the money for the defense of the island, the petition claimed, and John ordered Géraud to return it. The petition then continued that Géraud asserted that he had spent the money for the "evident utility" of his Church of Paphos and could not repay the apostolic camera. As a result, John allowed Géraud to borrow up to a certain sum and oblige his successors and the Church of Paphos to repay, they claimed. The agents of the Bardi bank in Cyprus then lent Géraud a certain sum of money, which Géraud used to pay the apostolic camera. The Bardi petition concluded that Bishop Géraud and the chapter of Paphos had obliged themselves to repay the money before a certain deadline, which had now elapsed. Since Géraud had died before repaying the loan, and the new bishop (Eudes) and the chapter were refusing to repay the bank the loan that Géraud borrowed *indebite*, the Bardi agents asked the pope for a remedy. Pope Benedict wrote to Archbishop Hélie of Nicosia, a relative of the late Bishop Aimery of Paphos, ordering him to summon the parties, force witnesses to testify, and decide what was just, any obstacles notwithstanding (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-19).

This loan was not the 6,000 florins that Pope John XXII had permitted Géraud to borrow on February 22, 1329 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-388), as we learn from the last letter on the subject, dated July 23, 1337. Pope Benedict wrote again to Archbishop Hélié and the bishop of Limassol, summarizing what Bishop Eudes of Paphos had told him: not administering his see well, the late Bishop Géraud had obliged himself and his church to the agents of the Florentine Bardi bank on Cyprus to the amount of 25,000 florins or thereabouts, or roughly 150,000 bezants. At the time of his death, Géraud still owed 11,000 florins to the bank. After his election, confirmation, and consecration in Cyprus, Bishop Eudes was asked many times to pay the remaining principal of the loan. Eventually, the Bardi agents and Bishop Eudes agreed to the arbitration of Archbishop Hélié, the bishop of Famagusta, and two knights, but Eudes had expressly protested beforehand that he would not oblige his church or his successors in any way. The panel of arbitration decided that, although the loan was not taken out for the use of the Church of Paphos, which it was not, nor for any reasonable necessity of that church, Eudes should nevertheless pay the 11,000 florins. Fearing what would happen if he refused completely, Eudes paid 1,000 of this amount and wrote to the pope. The pope ordered the archbishop and bishop of Limassol to summon the parties, hear the case in Nicosia, and put a just end to the matter, restoring Eudes and his church if justice demanded (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-36).

According to the Bardi petition of June 22, 1336 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-19), Bishop Géraud had used the money from the Armenian defense fund, likely the roughly 13,000 florins, for the Church of Paphos. It is thus probable that, upon learning of the dire financial straits of the church he had inherited from Aimery, Géraud shifted money around to lessen his Paphos burden. Later, probably in late 1328 or early 1329 when he was under pressure from the pope and his nuncios, Géraud borrowed around 25,000 florins from the Bardi bank. (By the time of his death roughly seven years later, Géraud had managed to repay 14,000, so perhaps the terms were that he would pay 2,000 florins per year.) Given that more than 13,000 florins of the original 30,000 earmarked for the defense of Armenia were unaccounted for, and Géraud was saddled with the huge debt of Bishop Aimery, it is reasonable to assume that he had first used the roughly 25,000 florins to repay the nuncios, and thus the apostolic camera, the remaining 13,000 or so florins of the Armenian fund, which is why we never hear about that after 1331. Géraud probably applied the remaining 12,000 to satisfy part of the Paphos debt.

It is likely that Archbishop Hélié found a solution, but it was in Eudes's and his church's interest to delay, for in the mid-1340s the Bardi bank famously collapsed, largely because King Edward III of England defaulted

on his loans. As for Laiazzo, the Mamluks took the city again in 1337 (Edbury, 1991; Coureas, 1994; Mutafian, 2012), the same year the story of the 30,000 florins destined principally for the fortification of the city ends. The already fascinating narrative that Jean Richard began in 1962 is made much richer by pursuing the details in the full text of unpublished papal letters, the existence of many of which was only revealed in 2012 by Professor Richard, completing the research that Charles Perrat had begun in 1926. For the half century of Cypriot history between the restoration of Henry II in 1310 and the coronation of Peter I as king of Jerusalem in 1360, papal letters are our main source. The publication of the full text of all these letters is crucial for further advances in the historiography of this period of Frankish Cyprus.

Note on the Editions

The initial transcription of *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 1086 was done by Christina Kaoulla more than a decade ago in the context of my class on Latin palaeography, and I have made minor corrections.

INSTRUMENTUM MISCELLANEUM 1086

Nicosia, house of the bishop of Paphos, January 15, 1329

In nomine Domini, amen. Noverint universi presentes pariter et futuri quod reverendus in Christo pater dominus Geraldus Dei gratia Paphensis episcopus, ex parte una, et venerabiles et discreti viri domini Petrus de Manso decanus Pacensis et frater Arnaldus de Fabricis Ordinis Predicatorum, Apostolice Sedis nuncii in partibus cismarinis, ex altera, de debitis in quibus bone memorie dominus frater Aymericus, quondam Paphensis episcopus, dicti domini episcopi proximus predecessor, camere domini nostri pape tenebatur, dum viveret; item, de ratione ac depositione reddenda et facienda dictis dominis nunciis per eundem dominum Geraldum episcopum summe triginta milium florenorum auri sibi traditorum in subventionem et tuitionem regni Armenie per ipsum expendendorum; item, super restitutione ab ipso domino episcopo facienda de bonis dicti fratris Aymerici, predecessoris sui; item, super zucara iam collecta tam in Papho quam Famagusta, necnon de expensis moderate factis ab ipsis nunciis seu aliis eorum nomine in expeditione domini Geraldi de Lagenebra magistri capellani Paphensis, et in negotio inquisitionis Stephani Pacisengressi, atque collectione zucare antedictae, et aliis dictam Paphensem ecclesiam contingentibus; in presencia mei notarii et testium infrascriptorum ad hoc specialiter vocatorum et rogatorum, pro bono pacis et quietis utriusque partis, ad ordinationem et conventionem que sequitur devenerunt:

[1] In primis, quod dictus dominus Geraldus Paphensis episcopus cum hoc presenti publico instrumento obligavit se et omnia bona sua et dicte sue Paphensis ecclesie dictis dominis nunciis nomine Romane Ecclesie recipientibus dare, solvere, et restituere annis singulis, incipiendum in prima die mensis Marcii proxime futuri, decem et octo milia bisanciorum argenti alborum de Cipro in terminis qui sequuntur, videlicet novem milia bisanciorum argenti per totum mensem Augusti proxime futurum et novem milia bisanciorum argenti per totum mensem Februarii continue sequentem predictum mensem Augusti, tamdiu donec sit integre satisfactum camere domini nostri summi pontificis de omnibus debitis in quibus bone memorie dictus dominus frater Aymericus tenebatur, dum viveret, domino pape et eius camere antedicte, et specialiter de decima sexannali ecclesie sue Paphensis.

[2] Item, dictus dominus Geraldus Paphensis episcopus obligavit modo quo supra se positurum rationem et depositum facere assignari pro posse suo dictis dominis nunciis, secundum tenorem litterarum apostolicarum, infra octo dies a receptione huius instrumenti continue computandos, de summa triginta milium florenorum auri sibi traditorum et assignatorum ex parte dicti domini nostri summi pontificis, pro succursu et subventionem regni Armenie.

[3] Item, obligavit se dictus dominus episcopus modo quo supra ad reddendum et restituendum dominis nunciis antedictis bona que penes ipsum restant, vel eorum iustum precium, iuxta tenorem inventariorum exinde factorum, que fuerunt dicti predecessoris sui, et alia dicti predecessoris que per ipsum vel de eius mandato recepta fuerunt, licet non fiat de ipsis mentio in inventariis antedictis, hinc ad festum Pasche Domini proxime futurum.

[4] Item, prefatus dominus episcopus debet zucaram que est in Papho per dictos nuncios collectam recipere et facere integre aportari quam cito comode poterit Famagustam. Et zucara que est in Famagusta collecta per ipsos nuncios per duos homines electos a dictis domino episcopo et nunciis statim vendatur, et zucara que est in Papho, quam cito erit Famaguste, per dictos homines electos in continenti modo simili debet vendi et precium utriusque zucare statim post venditionem dictis dominis nunciis pro diminutione predictorum debitorum plenarie assignari. Et dicti etiam nuncii debent totam pecuniam regalium anni millesimi trecentisimi vice-simi octavi statim recipere pro diminutione antedicta, preter solutionem decem et octo milium bisanciorum argenti que annis singulis debet fieri, ut superius est expressum. Cetera autem preter dictam zucaram et regalia debet recipere episcopus antedictus et sibi integraliter responderi.

[5] Item, quod dicti domini nuncii Apostolice Sedis debent ponere rationem sive calculum de omnibus per ipsos receptis de bonis proximi predecessoris dicti episcopi per eundem episcopum sibi assignatis et de omnibus aliis receptis per ipsos sive eorum mandato de redditibus sui

episcopatus predicti, et totum illud allocabunt in extenuatione debitorum predictorum, ita quod possit sciri quantum restabit ad solvendum camere domini nostri pape de debitis supradictis.

[6] Item, quod omnes expensas moderatas quas fecerunt dicti nuncii in expeditione domini Geraldii de Lagenebra magistri capellani Paphensis, et in negotio inquisitionis et liberatione Stephani Pacisengressi, atque collectione zucare antedictae, seu aliis dictam Paphensem ecclesiam contingentibus, solvet dominus episcopus memoratus.

[7] Item, mandabunt dicti domini nuncii quod respondeatur dicto domino episcopo de omnibus redditibus, proventibus, et debitis, preteritis, presentibus, et futuris, ecclesie Paphensis predictae, et decetero ipsum non impediens – ymo sibi prestabunt auxilium, consilium, et favorem in agendis – ita dumtaxat si eis respondeatur de predictis decem et octo milibus bisanciorum annis singulis donec fuerit de toto debito satisfactum et de aliis prout est superius expressatum; et quod de residuo reddituum et proventuum dicti episcopatus teneatur idem dominus episcopus providere clero et capitulo de prebendis, assiziis, et aliis stipendiis consuetis, necnon et alia onera dicte Paphensis ecclesie incumbencia supportare. Quibus sic peractis, dicti domini nuncii pronuntiaverunt ex processibus factis per eos super premissis contra dictum dominum episcopum ipsum episcopum decetero non ligari, submoventes interdictum in eius ecclesiam promulgatum.

Per hanc autem ordinationem seu conventionem dicti domini nuncii et episcopus memoratus non intendunt in aliquo obviare declarationi, ordinationi, seu dispositioni domini nostri pape faciente vel iam facte super omnibus et singulis supradictis, sed quod omnia et singula in dicta ordinatione seu conventionem contenta tantum medio tempore a dictis dominis episcopo et nunciis inviolabiliter observentur.

Et renunciaverunt partes predictae exceptioni doli, mali, metus et in factum actioni rei predicto modo non geste, et exceptioni nullitatis, et omni exceptioni, defensionis ac auxilio iuris scripti canonici et civilis, consuetudinis vel statuti, ac iuri dicenti generalem renunciationem non valere nisi precesserit specialis, et illi legi qua cavetur quod partes possint penitere ante litem contestatam, renunciaverunt ex certa scientia et expresse. Voluerunt enim partes perinde renunciationem presentem valere ac si quecumque defensio vel inpugnatio alicui ipsarum competens contra premissa vel eorum aliquod expresse nominata fuisset et renunciatum eidem per que contra premissa vel eorum aliquod venire possent, per se vel alium seu alios, publice vel occulte, seu quomodolibet se tueri.

Qui predictus dominus Geraldus Paphensis episcopus, ex parte una, et dicti domini nuncii, ex altera, de communi concordia et voluntate rogaverunt magistrum Raphaellem de Osuertulo de Cremona et me Arnaldum Bregas notarios quod de predictis omnibus conficiamus duo publica instrumenta sicut de iure melius fieri poterunt et dictari, non mutata substantia de consilio sapientum.

Acta fuerunt hec Nicossie, in domibus episcopalibus ecclesie Paphensis, sub anno a nativitate Domini millesimo trecentesimo vicesimo nono, die quintadecima mensis Januarii, presentibus discretis et religiosis viris fratribus Guillelmo Garde Ordinis Beate Marie de Monte Carmelo, vicario provinciali provincie Terre Sancte, Thoma Catalani eiusdem ordinis, Bernardo Sarraceni Ordinis Predicatorum, domino Johanne de Cusencia presbytero, domino Helia de Vitrinis cantore Paphensi, domino Geraldo de Lagenebra magistro capellano Paphensi, et magistro Raymundo Vitalis notario, testibus ad predicta vocatis et rogatis.

[NOTARIAL SIGN] Et ego Arnaldus Bregas predictus, clericus diocesis Rivensis, auctoritate apostolica publicus notarius, omnibus et singulis supradictis una cum dictis testibus presens fui et de mandato dictorum dominorum episcopi et nunciorum ea omnia propria manu scipsi et in hanc formam publicam redegei meoque signo solito signavi vocatus specialiter et rogatus.

INSTRUMENTUM MISCELLANEUM 1045

Famagusta, March 3, 1329

In nomine Domini, amen. Noverint universi quod, reverendo patre domino Geraldo episcopo Paphensi nuper rationem reddente de expensis quas asseruit se fecisse in facto reparationis castrorum et aliorum locorum regni Armenie dissipatorum per Sarracenos, venerabilibus et discretis viris domino Petro de Manso decano Pacensi et fratri Arnaldo de Fabricis Ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum, Apostolice Sedis nunciis, fuit exhibita ex parte dicti domini episcopi in capitulo Predicatorum Nicossie quedam littera in pergameno scripta sigillo pendente sigillata, ut prima facie aparebat, reverendi patris domini Homodei archiepiscopi Tarsensis. Cuius tenor dinoscitur esse talis: [see Richard, 1962, pp. 37–38].

[...]

Unde ut iidem domini nuncii possent de tenore predictae littere cameram domini nostri summi pontificis plenius informare, petierunt a me notario infrascripto³⁾ tenorem supradictae littere in publicam formam transferri. Facta fuit dicta petitio et requisitio per dictos dominos nuncios in Famagusta, die tertia mensis Marcii, anno a nativitate Domini M^o CCC^o XXIX^o, pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Johannis divina providentia pape XXII^{di} anno terciodecimo, presentibus fratre Johanne Torrelli Ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum, magistro Raymundo Vitalis notario diocesis Tholosane, et Odino Valerii Viridunensis diocesis, testibus ad predicta vocatis et rogatis.

[NOTARIAL SIGN] Et ego Arnaldus Bregas clericus diocesis Rivensis, auctoritate apostolica publicus notarius, qui predictis interfui, de mandato

dictorum dominorum nunciorum dictam litteram fideliter hic inserui ac transscripsi de verbo ad verbum, habita prius collatione de tenore predictae littere cum domino Johanne de Cusencia, presbytero domini episcopi memorati, et in hanc formam publicam redegisti signoque meo solito signavi in testimonium premissorum.

a) infrascripto] tenorem *add. et exp.*

REFERENCES

- Bullarium Cyprium III: Lettres papales relatives à Chypre 1316–1378.* (2012). C. Perrat, J. Richard, & C. Schabel (Eds.). Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Clement, V. (1885–1892). *Regestum Clementis papae V*, Order of St. Benedict (Eds.). Rome: Ex Typographia Vaticana.
- Coureas, N. (1994). The Papacy's relations with the kings and the nobility of Armenia in the period 1300–1350. In C. Mutafian (Ed.), *Les Lusignans et l'Outre-Mer* (pp. 99–108). Poitiers: Auditorium du Musée Sainte-Croix Poitiers.
- Coureas, N. (1995). Lusignan Cyprus and Lesser Armenia 1195–1375. *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 21, 31–71.
- Coureas, N. (2010). *The Latin church in Cyprus 1313–1378*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Edbury, P.W. (1991). *The kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191–1374*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edbury, P.W. (2016). Knights, nobles and the rule of Amaury of Tyre, 1306–1310. *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 38, 9–93.
- Hill, G. (1948). *A history of Cyprus: Vol. 2. The Frankish period, 1192–1432*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoberg, H. (1949). *Taxae pro communibus servitiis ex libris Obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1455 confectis*. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Jean XXII (1904–1947). *Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*. Guillaume Mollat et al. (Eds.). Paris: A. Fontemoing.
- Kaoulla, C., & Schabel, C. (2007). The inquisition against Peter de Castro, Vicar of the Dominican Province of the Holy Land, in Nicosia, Cyprus, 1330. *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 77, 121–198.
- Mutafian, C. (2012). *L'Arménie du Levant, XIe-XIVe siècle*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Perrat, C. (1927). Un diplomate gascon au XIVe siècle. Raymond de Pii, nonce de Clément V, en Orient. *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École française de Rome*, 44, 35–90.

- Raynaldus, O. (1646–1677). *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1198*. Rome.
- Richard, J. (1962). *Chypre sous les Lusignan. Documents chypriotes des archives du Vatican (XIV^e et XV^e siècles)*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Richard, J. (2016). Un évêque de Paphos nonce du pape au xive siècle: Eudes de Cauquelines. In C. Balandier (Ed.), *Nea Paphos. Fondation et développement urbanistique d'une ville chypriote de l'antiquité à nos jours* (pp. 349–354). Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Salles, G. (2007). L'Église de Chypre... colonie périgordine au XIV^e siècle. *Bulletin de la Société Historique et Archéologique du Périgord*, 134, 233–268.
- Schabel, C., & Georgiou, C. (2016). Neither at peace nor at war: The non-implementation of the Armenia–Cyprus agreements of 1310. *Epeteris Kentrou Epistemonikon Ereunon*, 38, 95–116.
- Schabel, C., & Minervini, L. (2008). The French and Latin dossier on the institution of the government of Amaury of Lusignan, Lord of Tyre, brother of King Henry II of Cyprus. *Epeteris Kentrou Epistemonikon Ereunon*, 34, 75–119.
- Schaefer, K.H. (1904). Geldspenden der päpstlichen Kurie unter Johann XXII (1316–1334) für die orientalischen Christen, insbesondere für das Königreich Armenien. *Oriens Christianus*, 4, 184–187.
- Wadding, L. (1625–1654). *Annales Ordinis Minorum*. Lyon.

Chris Schabel (PhD in History, University of Iowa, 1994) – Working primarily on later-medieval intellectual history and the Latin East, he is Professor of Medieval History in the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Cyprus. His publications include *Pierre Ceffons et le déterminisme radical au temps de la peste noire* (Paris 2019), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages* (two edited volumes, Leiden 2006–07), and *Theology at Paris, 1316–1345* (Aldershot 2000).



