

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

University of Cyprus

schabel@ucy.ac.cy

DOI: 10.35765/pk.2021.3504.04

The Village of Psimolophou in Cyprus and the Latin Patriarchs of Jerusalem

In memoriam Johannis Richardi (1921–2021)

ABSTRACT

Psimolophou is perhaps the best known village in medieval Cyprus, thanks to a document published by Jean Richard in 1947 that provides extensive and detailed information about the finances and organization of the fief, the people, and their obligations in the early fourteenth century. Less attention has been paid to the unusually well-documented vicissitudes of the fief, an important Templar property that after the dissolution came into the hands of the exiled Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem. The story presented below involves a long struggle over tithes, the diversion of the river going through the fief, and the gradual decline of patriarchal control over Psimolophou. It is told largely using sources discovered by Professor Richard himself in the 65 years following his 1947 publication, and two key documents are printed in an appendix.

KEYWORDS: Psimolophou, Cyprus, Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem, tithes, papacy, water rights

Pamięci Jeana Richarda (1921–2021)

STRESZCZENIE

Wioska Psimolophou na Cyprze i łacińscy patriarchowie Jerozolimy

Psimolophou jest być może najlepiej poznaną wioską średniowiecznego Cypru dzięki dokumentowi opublikowanemu przez Jeana Richarda w 1947 r., który dostarcza obszernych i szczegółowych informacji na temat finansów i organizacji lenna, ludu i jego obowiązków na początku XIV w. Mniej uwagi poświęcono niezwykle dobrze udokumentowanym perypetiom lenna, ważnej posiadłości templariuszy, która po rozwiązaniu zakonu przeszła w ręce wygnanych łacińskich patriarchów Jerozolimy. Przedstawiona poniżej historia

Suggested citation: Schabel, Ch.D. (2021). The Village of Psimolophou in Cyprus and the Latin Patriarchs of Jerusalem. © ⓘ *Perspectives on Culture*, 4(35), pp. 27–54. DOI: 10.35765/pk.2021.3504.04.

Submitted: 08.07.2021

Accepted: 30.11.2021

obejmuje długą walkę o dziesięć, zmianę kierunku biegu rzeki przepływającej przez lenno oraz stopniowy zanik patriarchalnej kontroli nad Psimolophou. Jest ona opowiedziana w dużej mierze poprzez źródła odkryte przez samego profesora Richarda w ciągu 65 lat po pierwszej publikacji z 1947 r., a dwa najważniejsze dokumenty załączone zostały jako dodatek.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: Psimolophou, Cypr, łacińscy patriarchowie Jerozolimy, dziesięć, papieństwo, prawa wodne

In the fourteenth century, knights, masters of theology, archbishops, patriarchs, cardinals, kings, and popes argued over the village of Psimolophou, not far to the southwest of Nicosia. Psimolophou was the subject of the first publication concerning Cyprus by Jean Richard, who recently passed away, two weeks shy of his 100th birthday. In 1947, the young Richard published *Le casal de Psimolofou et la vie rurale en Chypre au XIV^e siècle*, in the already venerable *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome*. Despite his young age, Richard's illustrious career was well underway, eventually leading to his election to the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres forty years later in 1987, a prelude to his becoming *doctor honoris causa* of the University of Cyprus in 2006. He continued to bring out fine studies about Frankish Cyprus until the day of his death over 70 years after his first article on the topic. Richard's inaugural and pioneering paper in Cypriology touched on the crusades and the papacy, but provided a unique textual window onto Cypriot rural life with his partial edition and analysis of an early-fourteenth-century document from the Vatican Archives concerning Psimolophou. This paper is a minor contribution to the history of Psimolophou, updating Richard's fourteenth-century history of the village, often using my transcriptions of documents that Richard himself later discovered while compiling summaries for volume III of the *Bullarium Cypricum*, published in 2012 (for context with discussion of the village, see also Coureas, 2010, pp. 144–161 *passim* & 260, 328, & 435; and Coureas, 2020, pp. 138–141). For what follows, I have made full transcriptions of the documents, but only the summaries will be cited, pending the future publication of the next volumes of the *Bullarium Cypricum*. An appendix offers editions of the last of the pertinent documents in the Vatican's *Instrumenta Miscellanea* series, numbers 654 and 6204.

Dramatis personae:

Patriarchs of Jerusalem during the Avignon papacy:

Anthony Bek, 6 Feb. 1306–†3 March 1311

Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne, OFM, 26 Feb. 1314–†6 Feb. 1319

Pierre de Genouillac (admin. Limassol) 19 June 1322–†by end of 1323

Raymond Bequin, OP (admin. Limassol) 19 March 1324–†by end of 1328
Pierre de la Palu, OP (admin. Limassol) 27 March 1329–†31 Jan. 1342
Hélie de Nabinaud, OFM (admin. Nicosia) 28 June 1342–promot. 20 Sept. 1342
Pierre de Casa, OCarm, 7 Oct. 1342–†2 Aug. 1348
Guillaume Amy, 2 March 1349–†9 June 1360
Philippe de Cabassolle, 18 Aug. 1361–promot. 22 Sept. 1368
Guillaume le Chevalier, OP, 22 June 1369–1370/71
Guillaume de la Garde, 12 Dec. 1371–†23 July 1374
Philippe d’Alençon, 27 Aug. 1375–ca. 1380

Other important *dramatis personae* of that period:

Antoine Michel de Voiron, renter of Psimolophou, 1375
Arnaud *de Fabricis*, papal nuncio, 1327–1333
Bernard de Muret, Hospitaller in charge of Psimolophou, 1315–1319
Déodat *de Planis*, nuncio of patriarch, 1318–1319
Gérard de Veyrines, papal nuncio, bishop of Paphos, 1323–1335/36
Giovanni Conti, archbishop of Nicosia, 1312–1332
Guillaume *Laboria*, nuncio of patriarch, 1318
Hélie de Nabinaud, OFM, archbishop of Nicosia, 1332–1342 (see above)
Hugh IV of Lusignan, king of Cyprus, 1324–1359
Jacques de Bar, Templar commander of Psimolophou, 1308
Jacques de Nores, turcopolier of Cyprus, mid-1340s–early 1370s
Jean de Saint-Michel, steward of Psimolophou, 1363–1365
Johannes de Manso, agent of patriarch, 1375
Peter I of Lusignan, king of Cyprus, 1359–1369
Peter II of Lusignan, king of Cyprus, 1369–1382
Pierre *de Antissaco*, OESA, vicar of patriarch, 1372
Pierre *Domandi*, papal collector, 1357–1363
Pierre *de Manso*, papal nuncio, 1327–1333
Pierre des Près, cardinal-bishop of Palestrina, 1323–1361
Philippe de Chambarlhac, archbishop of Nicosia, 1342–1360
Raymond de la Pradele, archbishop of Nicosia, 1361–1376
Raymond Saquet, papal legate, 1350
Simon Sudbury, auditor of the palace and papal chaplain, 1355–1356
Thomas de Montolif, *bailli* of the royal Secrète of Cyprus, 1372

The transfer of Psimolophou from the Templars to the Patriarchate

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the village or, in medieval terms, *casale* of Psimolophou was the property of the Knights Templar. There is no information on exactly when Psimolophou had come into the hands of the Templars, but the military order could very well have retained the village when it relinquished control of Cyprus in 1192, when Guy de Lusignan began his rule (Edbury, 1991, pp. 7–9). The first evidence for Psimolophou appears in the context of the saga of the arrest, trial, and dissolution of the Templars in the period 1307–1312. Referring to 29 May 1308, the so-called Chronicle of Amadi even records the actions of Brother Jacques de Bar as commander of Psimolophou: *fra Jacomo de Bar, commendator de Psimolopho* (*Chronique d'Amadi*, 1891, p. 287), indicating that the village was among the most significant Templar properties. The sixteenth-century chronicler Florio Bustron omits the name in mentioning the *commendator de Psimolofu* (Florio Bustron, 1886, p. 168), but, unlike “Amadi,” Florio provides an inventory of Templar properties on Cyprus that were to be transferred to the Knights Hospitaller by orders of Pope Clement V, as arranged by his legate, Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne, at that time bishop of Rodez. At the very end of this catalogue, Florio lists *Psimolofu, Cato Deftera, et Tripi* (Florio Bustron, 1886, p. 171).

The next we hear of Psimolophou, however, it appears as a property not of the Hospitallers but of the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem. On 26 February 1314 (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-109), a few weeks before he died on 20 April, Pope Clement V promoted Bishop Pierre of Rodez to the position of the patriarch of Jerusalem, replacing the already deceased Anthony Bek, also bishop of Durham, who had died three years earlier on 3 March 1311 (Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 28). At the end of the document that formed the core of Jean Richard's 1947 study, *Instrumentum Miscellaneum 4733*, a report for the year 1317 (which corresponds to our period from 1 March 1317 to 28 February 1318, when the document was drawn up), there is a list of funds connected to Psimolophou remaining from the year 1316 (1 March 1316 to 28 February 1317). Some money “from the loan that the lord patriarch lent the peasants (*villanis*) for purchasing oxen and donkeys” (Richard, 1947, p. 153) was carried over from the year 1314 (1 March 1314 to 28 February 1315), when Brother *Johannes de Sepulchro* was in charge, whereas Brother Bernard was in charge in 1315 (1 March 1315 to 29 February 1316). According to *Instrumentum Miscellaneum 654*, printed below, the latter was the Hospitaller Bernard de Muret, Patriarch Pierre's proctor or agent on Cyprus.

The question is when and how Psimolophou was given to the patriarchate of Jerusalem. Patriarch Pierre was already in possession of it during his first year at his new post. Although *Johannes de Sepulchro* could have been a Hospitaller, he may have been a canon of the Holy Sepulchre, the patriarch's own cathedral church. Canons of the Holy Sepulchre had their own property on Cyprus (Coureas, 1997 and 2010, *passim*). Nevertheless, the fact that afterwards the patriarch's agent was a Hospitaller suggests that Florio Bustron is correct and the village first passed through the hands of the Knights of St John of Jerusalem. It is probable that Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne managed to obtain the property before his appointment. It is doubtful that the legate could have done so after his promotion to patriarch, because by the time Pierre received official word of this in the 26 February 1314 letter sent from Provence, Clement was either already dead or would have been dead before Pierre's response reached the papal curia. Clement's successor, John XXII, was not elected until 7 August 1316, by which time Psimolophou already belonged to the patriarchate. However it happened, Pierre had been in a position as legate in charge of the Templar question to divert some of the property to the vacant patriarchate after Patriarch Anthony's death, perhaps with papal, royal, or even Hospitaller approval.

Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne returned to the West by 26 October 1317, when Pope John XXII asked him to give an account of his legation (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, r-40). On 15 July 1318, probably after receiving the account from his agent, Bernard de Muret, Pierre had a document drawn up in the castle of Palmas, the present Palmas-d'Aveyron, about 20km east of Rodez, in which the patriarch made two of his chaplains his proctors and special nuncios in business and legal matters. These chaplains were Guillaume *Laboria*, rector of the church of Saint-Pierre de *Latapetra*, and Déodat de *Planis*, curate of the church of Sainte-Austremoine, both in the diocese of Rodez. The document, included in *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 654, stipulated that both or either of the two had the power to deal with the financial matters of his *casale* of *Psimolofa* in the Kingdom of Cyprus and his other goods there, specifically to "request, exact, receive, and have from Brother Bernard of Muret of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, our proctor in Cyprus, and any other persons, Greeks and Latins, an account and computation of the incomes and expenses" of Psimolophou and his other goods in the Kingdom of Cyprus, and to "request, receive, and recuperate, exact, and have from any persons in the kingdom, both Greeks and Latins," all goods and rights that belonged to his patriarchate. They were also given the power to retain or remove and replace Bernard as proctor.

In the end, Déodat alone arrived on Cyprus, where in his capacity as "chaplain, proctor, and familiar" of the patriarch he had a document drawn up in Nicosia on 13 March 1319 in the house of Bishop Baldwin of

Famagusta and Tortosa, in the presence of the bishop, knight Thomas de Picquigny, bailli of the royal Secrète, and six other witnesses (including the scribe), one of whom, Bernardin *de Ienoulayco*, must have been a relative of the later patriarch of Jerusalem, Pierre de Genouillac. The document, the present *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 654, is an agreement between Déodat and Bernard, described as “bailli and proctor of said lord patriarch in the Kingdom of Cyprus in his *casale* of *Psimolofa*.” First, the document gives the background, namely that when Déodat arrived on Cyprus for the purposes of his business, he fell seriously ill and was unable to stay in Cyprus safely without grave danger. Thus, having confidence in Bernard and his previous actions, Déodat decided to retain him in his post.

Nevertheless, they agreed on several items outlined in the document. First, for the present year, i.e., 1 March 1319 to 29 February 1320, Bernard was to pay to the patriarch or his agent 5000 white bezants of Cyprus in two installments, 2500 in September and 2500 in February, from the incomes of the *casale* of *Psimolofa*, minus the expenses of Bernard and his scribe, two servants, and two animals. Anything in excess would be ascribed to the patriarch, and Bernard would have to make up the difference in case the incomes fell short of 5000 white bezants. Bernard was to provide a guarantee with pledges from secular persons in the royal Secrète in case he failed to fulfill his obligation to pay the 5000 in whole or in part. Those who vouched for him would be completely freed from any obligation if the patriarch terminated Bernard’s administration before the year ended, once Bernard first rendered an account for his entire time as bailli of the *casale* to the person of the patriarch’s choosing.

In addition, Bernard was obligated to pay the normal tithe to the church of Nicosia and the papal tithe as well. The traditional tithe to the local secular clergy was 10% of annual income, which in Cyprus was paid to the diocesan bishop, in this case the archbishop of Nicosia. As a papal letter of 27 August 1326 reminds us, however, at the Council of Vienne (1311–1312) Pope Clement V announced a special tithe on ecclesiastical incomes for six years to support crusading (starting on 1 October 1312), and Pope John, the author of the letter, started the tradition of renewing this tithe for three-year periods (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-296).

The dispute over the tithe obligation of Psimolophou

In 1947, Jean Richard employed the figure of 4.5:1 for the ratio of value between the florin and the Cypriot white bezant in this period (Richard, 1947, p. 139), but by the time he published *Chypre sous les Lusignans* in 1962, his new *Documents chypriotes des archives du Vatican* had taught him

that the correct ratio at the time was actually 6:1 (Richard, 1962, pp. 18, 34 n. 7, 38 n. 3), and I have verified this in other sources. Regarding Psimolophou, later papal letters, as we shall see, suggest that the normal tithe obligation for the village was 120 florins, which Professor Richard calculated in 1947 as 510 bezants, which in turn happened to correspond roughly to an annual income of 5000 bezants, the amount that Bernard had to pay the patriarch after expenses. If we employ Richard's corrected ratio of 6:1 from 1962, however, the 120 florins indicates an income of 7200 bezants. This makes more sense, especially when we take into consideration the fact that Bernard was obliged to pay two tithes in addition to the 5000 bezants, the normal one to the archbishop of Nicosia and another to the pope. If the *casale* was only worth around 5000 bezants, after paying the two tithes Bernard would only be left with 4000 bezants, and he would never have agreed to pay 5000 to the patriarch minus expenses. Starting with an income of 7200 bezants, in a normal year he would have 5760 remaining after the tithes, leaving enough leeway to make the job worth his while.

A letter of Pope Benedict XII from 5 July 1335 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-5) repeats the claim of a later patriarch of Jerusalem, Pierre de la Palu, that since the Church of Jerusalem was occupied by the Saracens, his properly patriarchal revenues on Cyprus and in the West amounted to less than 1700 florins, or around 10,000 bezants. It is true that from 1295 until 1449 newly appointed patriarchs of Jerusalem are recorded as obliging themselves to pay 2000 florins for the common services, normally equivalent to one third of a prelate's first annual income, but perhaps the popes took into consideration the fact that the patriarchs had incomes from other posts after the fall of Acre, so *de facto* an entire year's income from the patriarch was exacted (Hoberg, 1949, p. 63b). At any rate, the bulk of the patriarch's income proper came from Psimolophou, and to compensate for that, Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne was allowed to retain his post and income as bishop of Rodez. Pierre died in Rodez on 6 February 1319, a few weeks before the agreement between Déodat and Bernard was drawn up (Mas Latric, 1893, p. 28, mistakenly giving 1318, which is old style). Pierre's successor, Pierre de Genouillac, papal nuncio in Cyprus, was merely a canon of Nicosia when Pope John XXII promoted him to patriarch on 19 June 1322 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-134), so Pope John renewed a thirteenth-century tradition when a Latin patriarch (of Antioch) administered the see of Limassol and enjoyed its income for almost a quarter-century, granting the administration of Limassol to the new Patriarch Pierre on the same day as his promotion (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-135; cf. *Bullarium Cyprium I*, 2010, f-20; *Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, k-11).

Nevertheless, the tithes on Psimolophou were irksome. Pierre de Genouillac's successor, Raymond Bequin, a Dominican master of theology at the University of Paris who was appointed on 19 March 1324 following Pierre's death, also succeeded Pierre as administrator of Limassol (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-224–225). Raymond soon complained to the pope, however, that his patriarchal incomes were not befitting of his patriarchal status, and yet he had to pay the archbishop of Nicosia (another Dominican, Giovanni Conti) the tithe on his *casale de Psimolofa*, despite the fact that, unlike the patriarch, the archbishop was very wealthy (*in redditibus valde habundat*). Patriarch Raymond asked the pope to exempt him and his successors as patriarch from this tithe, as well as the tax on the first year's income paid to the papal camera (*primitia*). Pope John XXII responded favorably on 27 August 1326, instructing the bishop and official of Paphos and the abbot of Stavrovouni (St Paul of Antioch) to make it so, as long as the tithe normally owed to the archbishop of Nicosia did not exceed 120 florins (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-294), although some have mistakenly understood the reverse, that he had to pay if the sum did not exceed 120 florins (Mas Latrè, 1893, pp. 29 & 32; Hill, 1948, pp. 192–193 n. 2). The same day, the pope responded favorably to a similar request of Raymond concerning his grange or hamlet (*grangia seu prestaria*) variously called *Credo*, *Cerdo*, or *la Crida* in the diocese of Paphos, claiming this time that the bishop of Paphos was rather wealthy (*in redditibus satis habundat*). John XXII ordered the bishop of Paphos himself, along with the abbot of Stavrovouni and the cantor of Nicosia, to implement the decision, although this time only if the annual tithe did not exceed 60 florins (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-295). In the 1360s, what was then elevated to the status of the *casale* of *Lacrida* paid just 105 bezants for the papal triennial tithe, or 35 *per annum*, indicating that it was worth only 350 bezants per annum, which suggests that the 60 florins mentioned in Pope John's letter was simply a standard figure in the case of *Credo/Cerdo/Crida* (Richard, 1999, p. 13). It should be noted that the archbishop of Nicosia was indeed very wealthy and the bishop of Paphos rather wealthy.

Having obtained a tithe exemption for Psimolophou, Raymond wanted even more, as we learn from another papal letter from a few months later, 22 May 1327. Since as administrator of Limassol and as lord of the *casale* of *Psimalofa* he was subject to the archbishop of Nicosia, Raymond thought this beneath his patriarchal dignity, so he appealed to the pope. John XXII responded by fully exempting Raymond, the bishopric of Limassol, the *casale* of Psimolophou, and all his vicars and agents from all jurisdiction of the archbishop and the chapter of Nicosia, for as long as it pleased the papacy (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-318).

The exemption from the archbishop's tithe and jurisdiction did not solve all of Raymond's problems with Psimolophou, however, because not only did he have to pay the papal tithe, but his predecessor had neglected to do so and the sum owed had accumulated. On the same day that Pope John granted Raymond exemption from the normal tithe, 27 August 1326, the pope addressed a letter to the archbishop of Nicosia and the bishops of Paphos and Famagusta, in other words the heads of all the churches of Cyprus besides Patriarch Raymond himself, responding to Raymond's complaint that the papal nuncio and tithe collector on Cyprus, Gérard de Veyrines, archdeacon of Benevento and future bishop of Paphos, had occupied the patriarch's *casale* of *Psimaloffa* at the time of the death of Raymond's predecessor and still enjoyed much of the fruits of that *casale*, while at the same time Raymond was being compelled to pay the papal tithes that the late Patriarch Pierre de Genouillac had neglected to pay as well as Pierre's other debts. The pope ordered the addressees to investigate and either to have Gérard restore whatever fruits of Psimolophou he had taken or their equivalent value, or to have him retain enough to match the tithe debt, rendering a full account to Patriarch Raymond or his agents and returning the remainder to Raymond (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-296).

After his death on Cyprus (Mas Latric, 1893, p. 29), Raymond's struggles over Psimolophou were repeated under his successor, another Dominican master of theology at the University of Paris, Pierre de la Palu, who was appointed on 27 March 1329 and made administrator of Limassol on the same day (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-399–400). Even though Patriarch Raymond Bequin had secured for himself and his successors a perpetual exemption from paying normal tithes on *Psimalofa* in the Nicosia diocese and on *Credo/Cerdo/Crida* in the Paphos diocese, a papal letter dated 20 June 1329 and addressed to the bishop of Famagusta, the archdeacon of Paphos, and Goffredo Spanzota, canon of Nicosia, informs us that Patriarch Pierre de la Palu had to request the same and received the same terms as his predecessor, as if the exemptions from less than three years before had never been granted (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-412).

Eight days earlier, on 12 June 1329, Pope John had written to the archbishop of Nicosia and the bishop of Famagusta relating that the new Patriarch Pierre had informed him that Bishop Gérard of Paphos' replacements as nuncios and tithe collectors, Pierre *de Manso* dean of Badajoz and the Dominican Arnaud *de Fabricis*, had seized goods and property of the late Patriarch Raymond, including the *casale* of *Psimolofa*, and continued to occupy them, while Patriarch Pierre de la Palu was obliged to pay Raymond's debts and remaining papal tithes. Once again Pope John ordered the addressees to look into the matter and to have the nuncios

return everything they had seized or received, or to instruct them to keep only what covered the tithe debt and return the rest to Patriarch Pierre (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-409). Perhaps in the process of fulfilling the papal directive, the two nuncios reminded the pope that their predecessor had also occupied and received the fruits of “a certain *casale* in the Kingdom of Cyprus,” no doubt Psimolophou. The nuncios reported that some money was still owed for the papal three-year tithe on this *casale* from the time of Gérard’s occupation, so on 22 March 1330 John XXII instructed the nuncios to determine whether any money should be exacted from Patriarch Pierre or Bishop Gérard and, if so, to collect the money from Gérard, not Pierre (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-437).

It seems that Pierre de la Palu was successful in putting to rest for a time the patriarchate’s troubles with its main possession, and we hear nothing of Psimolophou during the papacy of Pope John XXII’s successor, Benedict XII (1334–1342). Nevertheless, the financial status of the patriarch changed in the East, for although Benedict first allowed Pierre de la Palu to continue as administrator of Limassol as long as he lived, approving the patriarch’s request on 5 July 1335 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-5), the following year on 17 July 1336 he granted Pierre the administration of the diocese of Couserans in the French Pyrenees and revoked the concession of the administration of Limassol, ordering Pierre not to involve himself in the affairs of the Cypriot diocese any further (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-21). On 2 June 1337 the pope named Lambertino bishop of Limassol, explaining that, following the death of Bishop John of Limassol, Pope John XXII had granted the administration of Limassol “to various patriarchs of Jerusalem successively, and then, when they had died,” he entrusted it to Pierre de la Palu for as long as the latter presided over the Church of Jerusalem. After Pope John’s death, Benedict continued, he revoked all such grants, but renewed it for Pierre for as long as it pleased the papacy. For unspecified reasons, Benedict finally revoked the grant to the patriarch and thus ended the tradition of patriarchs administering Limassol (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-30).

Theoretically, with the loss of Limassol the *casale* of Psimolophou became all the more important for the patriarchate, but because the effort to summarize the many tens of thousands of letters of Pope Benedict XII’s successor, Clement VI (1342–1352), is nowhere near complete, at present we have no further mention of the village until 1351. (It is also during the reign of Pope Clement that Louis de Mas Latrie’s catalogue of Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem begins to go astray: Mas Latrie, 1893, pp. 31–35.) Upon Patriarch Pierre de la Palu’s death on 31 January 1342 (Dunbabin, 1991, p. 195; *pace* the summary in *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-30, Pierre did not die in 1337), and Benedict XII’s death less than three months later on

24 April, Clement decided to renew John XXII's policy temporarily, but in reverse, by 28 June 1342 granting the patriarchate to the archbishop of Nicosia, Hélié de Nabinaud, yet another master of theology at the University of Paris, this time a Franciscan (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, t-3). The renewal lasted only a few months, however, because on 20 September 1342 Pope Clement raised Hélié to the cardinalate and five days later transferred Philippe de Chambarlhac from the bishopric of Sion to Nicosia (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, t-21). On 7 October, Clement appointed the Carmelite master of theology Pierre de Casa patriarch of Jerusalem and following Pierre's death on 2 August 1348 he was succeeded by Guillaume Amy on 2 March 1349. Pierre de Casa was attached to the bishopric of Vaison not far from Avignon, while Guillaume was the administrator of Fréjus, farther to the east in Provence (Mas Latrie, 1893, 31–32; Eubel, 1913, 276 & 517).

On 12 August 1351 Pope Clement wrote to Patriarch Guillaume Amy, responding to the latter's petition concerning, once again, the patriarch's tithe obligation toward the archbishop of Nicosia for the *casale* of *Psimolofō*. This time not only did Clement exempt both Guillaume and his successors perpetually from this tithe, as well as the tax on the first year's income, but the pope made no mention of any upper limit of 120 florins. Just as Pope John XXII's grant of a perpetual exemption to Pierre de la Palu and his successors made no mention of the identical grant the same pope had made to Pierre's predecessor Raymond Bequin, Clement's grant to Guillaume Amy was silent about John XXII's earlier exemptions (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-616).

Although this silence is hard to explain, the need for the renewal was clearly due to the constant opposition of the archbishops of Nicosia. As Mas Latrie noted as far back as 1893, on 6 March 1356 Pope Clement VI's successor, Innocent VI (1352–1362), “ratifie la sentence arbitrale rendue par Pierre, évêque de Palestina, entre Guillaume, patriarche de Jérusalem, et Philippe, archevêque de Nicosie, sur les dîmes de Psimolopho, en Chypre” (Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 32). The summary in the *Bullarium Cyprium* published 119 years later merely adds that “le patriarche prétendait ne pas payer plus de 60 florins en alléguant un privilège de Clément VI” (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, u-91). While Mas Latrie was confused about the earlier exemptions, Charles Perrat and Jean Richard, who discovered the full papal letter in the papal registers, were rather taciturn about the dispute and the settlement, although the letter covers two full folios, roughly seven printed pages, and includes a document within a document.

The earliest document in the letter is dated Avignon, 11 January 1356, in the house of Pierre des Près, the elderly cardinal-bishop of Palestrina (since 1323) and vice-chancellor of the Holy Roman Church (since 1325).

The document explains the background as a dispute over the tithes from the *casale* of *Psimolopho* between Patriarch Guillaume Amy and Archbishop Philippe. Probably after 1 September 1355, when Pope Innocent VI wrote to King Hugh IV recommending the patriarch's *familiares* and *ministri* living in Cyprus (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, u-78), the two prelates litigated in person in the "Palace of Cases" of the papacy in Avignon, before Simon Sudbury, already described as chancellor of Salisbury, auditor of the palace and papal chaplain, who later became bishop of London (1361–1375) and then archbishop of Canterbury (1375–1381), in which capacity he was beheaded on 14 June 1381 by rebels in the Peasants' Revolt (Logan, 2020). Archbishop Philippe of Nicosia argued that he was owed the tithe on all the revenues from *Psimolophou*, while Patriarch Guillaume countered that by virtue of a privilege of Pope Clement VI he was exempt from paying the tithe, a claim that, as we have seen, was true. The executors of the exemption, that is, the bishops of Barcelona and Paphos and the archdeacon of Antwerp, conducted legal proceedings against Archbishop Philippe over the issue, while the archbishop did the same against the patriarch on the authority that he asserted had been granted him by the papal legate Raymond Saquet, bishop of Th erouanne, soon to be archbishop of Lyon, who had gone to the East in early 1345 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, t-128) and was named legate in 1350 (Setton, 1976, 221a-b). In fact, Archbishop Philippe specified that the money from *Psimolophou* was required as reimbursement for a stipend that Philippe had paid to the legate. Another bone of contention was the fact that, in connection with the above, the archbishop had seized a certain quantity of grain that the patriarch had purchased, after the patriarch had appealed to the pope. Since the litigation was exhausting and expensive, in the end the two parties agreed to the arbitration of Cardinal-Bishop Pierre of Palestrina, with the will and permission of Pope Innocent, given to the parties in person (*oraculo vive vocis*), even without the consent of the chapters of Jerusalem and Nicosia. Cardinal Pierre would decide on all matters of disagreement between the two, including what was argued before Simon Sudbury and others elsewhere, and with their hands on their hearts they swore to obey Cardinal Pierre's decision, on pain of the large sum of 1000 silver marks, over 4000 florins, one half being paid to the other, obedient party, and the other half to the papal camera.

This document, witnessed by a bishop, a dean, an archdeacon, a scribe, and the notary, allowed Cardinal Pierre to pronounce his decision, which he did in a document dated the same day and place in front of the same witnesses. Pierre decided on a compromise on the tithe issue, ignoring the exemption granted by Pope Clement VI, but apparently reducing the obligation on *Psimolopho* from what seems to have been the original 120

florins annually to half that amount, 60 florins, which Patriarch Guillaume Amy and his successors would pay to Archbishop Philippe and his successors every 1 November, All Saints Day, after the harvest. Philippe and his successors were never to ask more, and Guillaume and his successors were never to bring up Pope Clement's exemption again. Cardinal Pierre cancelled all sentences of excommunication, suspension, and interdict that the archbishop and the executors of Clement's exemption had promulgated against the other party, and declared that all related litigation would cease, with no further question of penalties, damages, or interest. Both parties accepted the arbitral decision and swore to obey it forever, binding their successors as well.

On 8 March 1356 Pope Innocent approved the arrangement and, one assumes, the issue was put to rest. According to the accounts of the papal tith collector on Cyprus for the years 1357–1363, Pierre *Domandi*, archdeacon of Limassol, the sum of 60 florins was indeed collected from the patriarchate's *casale* of *Psimolof* for the year 1360 (1 March 1360 to 28 February 1361), during which the see of Nicosia was vacant following the transfer of Archbishop Philippe to Bordeaux (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, u-248). Archdeacon Pierre also received 350 florins from the patriarchate, since that see too was vacant following the death of Patriarch Guillaume Amy on 9 June 1360 (Richard, 1984–1987, p. 43; Mas Latric, 1893, pp. 32–33).

The patriarchs received no corresponding reduction for their papal tith obligations, however. Patriarch Guillaume Amy's successor, Philippe de Cabassolle, was appointed on 18 August 1361 and remained patriarch until he assumed his duties as cardinal-priest of Ss Marcellino e Pietro following his appointment on 22 September 1368, although on 31 May 1370 he became cardinal-bishop of Sabina (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, v-237; *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 4600, f. 8r). We have the record of what he paid for the triennial papal tith for the years 1363–1365 (1 March 1363 to 28 February 1366), when 1800 bezants was collected for what was owed for *Simoloph* (Richard, 1999, p. 12). An unpublished section of the document specifies that Guillaume actually paid 1895: in the first year he paid 635, in the second 530, and then 730 was received from the grain that Jean de Saint-Michel (presumably the patriarch's steward) sold from the *casale* of *Simaloph*. The document continues by explaining that 1800 was exacted for the Nicosia diocese, but that the patriarch owed 105 bezants for the diocese of Paphos, i.e., for *Lacrida*, although only 95 was paid, leaving 10 still owed (*Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 4600, ff. 13r & 14v).

The above figures indicate that the *casale* of Psimolophou was assessed at 6000 bezants per year, close to but one sixth less than what was estimated above for its value in the 1310s. Nevertheless, the same unpublished

document records that in 1369 the Lord Turcoplier was paying 7000 bezants rent for what can only have been Psimolophou. Since, as the text explains, Patriarch Philippe became cardinal on 22 September 1368 and the post of patriarch was vacant until the following June, and we know that Guillaume le Chevalier was appointed on 22 June 1369 (Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 33), exactly nine months later, the papal camera received 5250 bezants from the rent paid during the vacancy, corresponding precisely to nine months, three-fourths of the 7000 (*Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 4600, f. 8r).

The Diversion of the Pediaios River

Having found a *modus vivendi* with the local ecclesiastical authority, it did not take long for the patriarch to clash with the secular powers. The turcoplier was a high military official, and in this case the office holder was Jacques de Nores, already turcoplier in 1344 (Edbury, 1991, p. 175; *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, t-122) and still playing that role on 20 May 1368 (*Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantium II*, 1889, 144 no. 83), who is last mentioned in ca. 1372–1373 (Leontios Makhairas, 2003, p. 260). How did it come about that the patriarch ceased administering Psimolophou directly between early 1366, when presumably his agent Jean de Saint-Michel seems to have been in charge, and early 1369, when Jacques de Nores was renting the *casale*?

In what would be the last papal letter addressed to King Hugh IV, dated 20 August 1359, “a certain *casale*” belonging to the patriarchate of Jerusalem in the kingdom of Cyprus, obviously Psimolophou, is described as being “of fertile plenty” (*frugifera ubertas*). “Less licitly,” however, “the Turcoplier Jacques,” a member of the famous de Nores family who perhaps held a neighboring fief, “changed the natural channels of a certain river that normally passes through [the *casale*],” managing to delay the legal cases and trials set up under royal authority and preventing justice from being shown, much to the detriment of Patriarch Guillaume Amy and the finances of his church, which had figuratively collapsed. The pope urges and requests that the king have this “channel and aqueduct” returned to its earlier course, hear the cases, beside what is just, and show the patriarch justice, out of proper reverence for God, the pope, and the Apostolic See, not to mention the king’s eternal reward (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, u-216).

King Hugh IV died on 10 October, probably before Pope Innocent VI’s letter arrived in Nicosia, definitely too late to have any effect. The so-called chronicles of “Amadi” and of Makhairas both claim that Hugh crowned his son Peter king of Cyprus during the former’s lifetime,

on 24 November 1358, but there is no indication that the pope or anyone else knew this, and the Venice manuscript most closely associated with Leontios Makhairas himself adds that he read elsewhere that the coronation took place on 25 November 1359, which would make more sense both because that was a Sunday and because it was only a few weeks after Hugh's death (Makhairas, 2003, pp. 111–112). Thus the first letter addressed to King Peter I after the pope was informed of his father's death and the new king's coronation, sent on 16 April 1360, concerned precisely the same issue, the Pediaios River and the *casale* of Psimolophou. Unlike the 1359 letter, which Jean Richard only discovered after his 1947 article and published in the *Bullarium Cyprium* in 2012, the 1360 letter was already known to him in 1347 through a draft copy in the Vatican, *Instrumentum Miscellaneum* 6204 (Richard, 1947, p. 125), although Richard later found another copy in the Vatican Registers. The draft, printed below in the appendix, is fascinating in that one can detect three different versions as the papal chancery progressively edited the letter.

The arenga in all three versions emphasizes that the pope is obliged to support all collapsed churches and all oppressed faithful. Pope Innocent goes on to say that consideration of Peter's royal honor and reputation leads the pope to approach his highness as he had found that he approached Peter's father Hugh of clear memory when Hugh was still alive, noting that he was sending Peter a copy of his earlier letter to Hugh along with this one. Innocent then rehearses the issue, in the first version remarking that the river going through a "certain *casale*" belonging to the Church of Jerusalem had newly become dry because of the diversion of the natural course, while the second and third versions specify that this is the *casale* of *Symuloffa* in the diocese of Nicosia, that the river was "very" dry, from which river the now arid *casale* used to be irrigated and kept quite fertile. In the first version Peter is urged to divert (!) his reforming eyes to the *casale*, and in the second and third versions to the otherwise collapsed Church of Jerusalem, rather than – as the pope finds hard to believe – to his familiar the noble knight Jacques the Turcoplier, at whose intervention, the later versions note, the course of the river is said to have been changed. In the first version the chancery continued with a passage emphasizing how upset the pope was and pushing King Peter toward virtue, but the second and third versions are more conciliatory, remarking that King Hugh had also neglected to deal with the issue. The second version adds a threatening phrase about the danger to souls, presumably Jacques' and Peter's, but the chancery thought the better of it and removed the reference in the third version.

The final section of all three versions contains the pope's exhortation to Peter to show justice to the patriarch. The first version refers to the

problems as “evils” (*mala*), but this is later softened to “losses” (*dispendia*). The second and third versions interject that the pope is adding prayers on prayers and exhortations on exhortations, but otherwise what is added in the second version is removed in the third.

Leasing Psimolophou

Just what King Peter did is unknown. Patriarch Guillaume Amy died on 9 June 1360, probably around the time Innocent’s letter reached Cyprus, and Philippe de Cabassolle was not appointed until 18 August 1361. After the papal tithe collectors had rendered an account for the three-year period ending 28 February 1366, Patriarch Philippe complained to the pope via a petition that he was unable to rent out or sell the produce of his *casale* of *Cimoleph* and his other patriarchal possessions on Cyprus profitably without doing so for long periods of time, and for this sort of leasing or farming agreement special papal approval was required. Pope Innocent VI’s successor, Urban V (1362–1370), responded by writing to Archbishop Raymond of Nicosia on 12 October 1366, asking him to investigate and, if it seemed useful and fruitful for the patriarch and the Church of Jerusalem, to grant the request for a length of time that seemed fitting to the archbishop, as long as it did not exceed five years (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, v-157).

Evidently Patriarch Philippe de Cabassolle then rented Psimolophou to the very person who had diverted the Pediaios River away from the village for his own uses. There is no evidence, but it is possible that, with King Peter’s backing, Jacques de Nores pressured Patriarch Philippe, who did not wish to deal with the administration of Psimolophou under those circumstances. The deal was apparently for 7000 bezants per year, probably starting in early 1367, after the arrival of the papal letter of 12 October 1366. Perhaps not surprisingly, the new arrangement did not solve the patriarch’s problems, for we learn from a letter of Pope Urban dated 5 July 1370 that Philippe, then cardinal-bishop of Sabina, had informed him that “the priest John *de Aquatio*, alias Monguent, the noble knights Francis *Fabri* and the turcoplier,” that is, Jacques de Nores, “and several others of the city and diocese of Nicosia” were refusing to pay various sums of money, goods, and other things that they owed Philippe from the time he was patriarch of Jerusalem. The pope ordered the bishop of Famagusta to investigate and compel the debtors to pay Philippe de Cabassolle or his agents what they owed (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, v-237). We have seen that the papal collectors were more successful in securing the rent from the turcoplier from the vacancy after Philippe became cardinal, but they did not work for Philippe.

After the brief reign of Philippe de Cabassolle's successor, Patriarch Guillaume le Chevalier, Pope Urban V's successor, Gregory XI (1371–1378), appointed Guillaume de la Garde patriarch of Jerusalem on 12 December 1371, and recommended him to King Peter II on 26 June 1372. Guillaume de la Garde is described as a close relative of the pope, which probably would have assisted Patriarch Guillaume in his efforts to “recover and keep the rights and goods of himself and of his Church of Jerusalem,” which the young King Peter was called upon to support. Pope Gregory addressed similar letters on the same day to Peter's mother Queen Eleanor and his uncles Princes John and James (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, w-125–126; Eubel, 1913, p. 276). On 30 June 1372, Gregory wrote to Cardinal Philippe de Cabassolle, the former patriarch, recommending the Augustinian Pierre *de Antissaco*, bachelor of canon law, whom Patriarch Guillaume de la Garde was sending to Cyprus as his vicar to recover his rights and goods (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, w-127). Finally, on 2 July the pope addressed a letter to Thomas de Montolif, the *baillif* of the royal Secrète of Cyprus, to help in this financial matter (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, w-129).

Guillaume de la Garde died two years later, on 23 July 1374 (Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 33), to be replaced by Philippe d'Alençon on 27 August 1375 (Eubel, 1913, p. 276). On 6 December of that year, Patriarch Philippe d'Alençon's agent, Johannes de Manso, a knight of the Order of St Lazarus, farmed out the patriarch's Cypriot properties to a priest, Antoine Michel, of the church of Nicosia, also known as Antoine Michel de Voiron, who already had ecclesiastical incomes in Nicosia in 1358 (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, u-200). The arrangement was for four years for 800 florins *per annum*, but the exchange rates had changed and this was then worth only about 3500 bezants, half the 7000 that Jacques de Nores had paid only a few years earlier (Mas Latrie, 1882, p. 587; Richard, 1962, p. 18). Like Jacques, who had probably passed away, Antoine was close to the crown: he was a student of canon law in 1366 (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, v-163), and by the time of the lease he was chaplain of King Peter II, described as such on 26 June 1376, when he was granted the important position of archdeacon of Paphos (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, w-340), and a few months later he was papal chaplain and auditor of legal cases in the papal palace, which was then back in Rome (*Bullarium Cypricum III*, 2012, w-347–349).

Not long afterwards, in 1378, the papacy was weakened by the onset of the Great Schism of the West, in which Europe was split into two obediences, to two popes in Rome and Avignon. No longer enjoying any useful support from the popes of Avignon, the kings of Cyprus took advantage of the situation to expropriate ecclesiastical revenues. A valuable *casale*

owned by an absentee and titular patriarch, rented out to a royal official, was an easy target. At any rate, we hear nothing of Psimolophou in papal correspondence during the Schism, although we do have letters from both the Avignon and Roman popes concerning their patriarchs of Jerusalem (Kouroupakis, 2018, *passim*). In 1409 a third pope was elected, and the circus was only resolved during the Council of Constance (1414–1418) with the resignation or deposition of the three popes and the election of Martin V in 1417. At the moment, there is no record of which I am aware concerning any Latin patriarch of Jerusalem between 1409, when the patriarch of the Avignon pope died, and 7 June 1419, when Martin V appointed the Catalan Francesc Climent (†1430), although there are vague reports that Patriarch Ugo Roberti of the Roman line, appointed on 12 April 1396, also died in 1409 (Eubel, 1913, p. 276).

A document dated 1421 and discussed by Jean Richard may clarify the matters. Containing our first mention of Psimolophou in four decades, the document is a report of Patriarch Francesc's agent for his Cypriot properties, P. de Casasajes. When Casasajes arrived on Cyprus and requested to be put in possession of the patriarch's holdings on the island, he met with much resistance because Patriarch Ugo Roberti, apparently not dead at all, had long enjoyed the revenues of *Ximoloso* and the dependent *Defteras*, along with a hamlet near Paphos, obviously *Credo/Cerdo/Crida*. For more than ten years, we are told, the Cypriot knight Étienne Pignol was leasing Psimolophou, subleasing the *casale* to various individuals. Now, the pope of the Avignon line, the Aragonese Benedict XIII (†1423), refused to step down after the election of Martin V and retreated to Peníscola Castle near Valencia, where he continued to hold out in increasingly comic fashion. Jean Richard surmised that Patriarch Francesc was from Benedict XIII's obedience (Richard, 1947, pp. 125–126). It is indeed possible that Benedict XIII had appointed Francesc in 1409, and eventually Francesc, perhaps unlike Ugo, professed his obedience to Martin, who rewarded Francesc with his support.

Losing Psimolophou

In 1421, the rent from Psimolophou and the dependency of Deftera were estimated at 520 to 570 ducats, between 3120 and 3420 bezants (Richard, 1947, p. 126 n 1; Richard, 1962, p. 18). The continuing decline in the revenues that reached the patriarchs, coupled with the more indirect ties they had with Psimolophou, suggests that they were losing their grip. Psimolophou was soon confiscated by the crown, for Philippe de Lusignan, illegitimate son of King James I's third son Henri (†1426), who possessed the

casale as a fief, and passed it to his son, Charles or Clarion de Lusignan (Mas Latrie, 1881, p. 32; Lusignan, 1586, f. 96v). The next mentions of the *casale* come in the context of James II's reconquest of Famagusta in 1464, when, according to Florio Bustron, "Psimolofo et Tripi" were in the hands of a member of an old Frankish-Cypriot family, "Helena Zappe" (Florio Bustron, 1886, p. 423), in fact the wife of Charles de Lusignan, James II's cousin, who, according to Étienne de Lusignan, received the tithes of the "bourg de Psimoloffe" (Lusignan, 1580, f. 180v; Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 38). Charles and Helena had supported Queen Charlotte against James, so James deprived them of their estates. According to the sole surviving volume of the *Livres des Remembrances* of the royal Secrète, on 7 June 1468 King James II gave the "cazal de Psimolofou" to "sire Piere Bibi, fis de sire Jaque" and five days later he granted "la presterie de Trippi, aparthenance dou cazal de Psimilofou" to Guomes Davila (Richard, 1983, pp. 17 & 84).

In the Venetian period, the patriarchal claims resurfaced. According to a document that Mas Latrie found in Venice, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Bernardino López de Carvajal, cardinal-bishop of Sabina, claimed the *casalia* of *Psimolophis et Defeterce*. On 20 May 1520 the Venetian Senate ordered the *luogotenente* and *consiglieri* on Cyprus "to put the patriarch of Jerusalem or his representative in possession of the villages" (Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 37). At some point later, however, the *casale* appears to have been the property not of the patriarch of Jerusalem, but that of Antioch: "Lo patriarcha d'Antiochia, videlicet casal Psimolosu de Laphethera, val ogni anno per stima ducati 600," with Laphethera probably meaning "Deftera" (Mas Latrie, 1852–1861, III: 502; Mas Latrie, 1893, p. 38).

Thanks largely to the discoveries of Jean Richard made over the span of 65 years, we now know twice as much about Psimolophou as Richard did when, at the age of 26, the future Doyen published his first article on Cyprus. May he rest in peace.

Document 1

Instrumentum Miscellaneum 654

Nicosia, house of Bishop Baldwin of Famagusta, 13 March 1319

In nomine Domini, amen. Anno nativitatis Eiusdem millesimo CCC^o nonodecimo, Indictione secunda, die terciadecima mensis Martii. Noverint universi presens publicum instrumentum inspecturi et etiam audituri quod, in presencia mei notarii infrascripti et testium infrascriptorum ad hec specialiter vocatorum et rogatorum, venerabilis et discretus vir dominus Deodatus de Planis, curatus ecclesie Sancti Austermonii Ruthenensis diocesis, capellanus, procurator, et familiaris reverendi in Christo patris et domini domini fratris Petri, Dei gratia sancte Ierosolimitane ecclesie patriarche et episcopi Ruthenensis, pro ut constat per patentes litteras seu per publicum instrumentum eiusdem domini patriarche patriarchali sigillo munimine roboratas seu roboratum, quarum quidem litterarum seu cuius publici instrumenti tenor per omnia talis est:

In nomine Domini, amen. Anno Eiusdem millesimo CCC^o decimo octavo, mense Julii et die quintodecimo ab introitu eiusdem mensis, Indictione prima, pontificatus sanctissimi patris et domini nostri domini Johannis digna Dei providencia pape vicesimi secundi anno secundo, per presens publicum instrumentum pateat cunctis presentibus et futuris quod nos, frater Petrus, miseratione divina sancte Ierosolimitane ecclesie patriarcha et episcopus Ruthenensis, pro nobis et nostro patriarchatu, cum presentis publici instrumenti testimonio facimus, constituimus, et ordinamus nostros certos et indubitatos procuratores ad negocia et ad lites¹ et nuncios speciales Guillelmum Laboria, rectorem ecclesie sancti Petri de Lata-petra, et Deodatum de Planis, curatum ecclesie Sancti Austermonii nostre diocesis Ruthenensis, cappellanos nostros, exhibitores huius publici instrumenti, et quemlibet ipsorum insolidum, ita quod non sit melior conditio occupantis, immo quod unus inceperit, alter resumere valeat et finire, ad petendum, exigendum, recipiendum, et habendum rationem et computum de perceptis et expensis gestis et administratis de redditibus, proventibus, et obventionibus nostris casalis nostri loci seu reparii de Psimolofa in regno Cipri et aliis bonis nostris a fratre Bernardo de Mureto Hospitalis Sancti Johannis Ierosolimitani, procuratore nostro in Cipro, et aliis quibuscumque personis Grecis et Latinis, et ad petendum, recipiendum, et recuperandum, exigendum, et habendum omnia bona nostra, debita, deveria, et iura patriarchatus nostri et nostra in ipso regno a quibuscumque personis, Grecis pariter et Latinis, quibus et cuilibet ipsorum insolidum damus et concedimus potestatem, auctoritatem, licentiam, et mandatum premissa omnia et singula faciendi nec non et agendi et deffendendi,

1 [ad lites] adalites MS.

libellos offerendi, litem contestandi de calumpnia et de veritate dicenda, in animam nostram iurandi et subeundi ac prestandi cuiuslibet alterius generis iuramentum, testes et instrumenta producendi, sententiam audiendi, expensas petendi et recipiendi, restitutionem in integrum petendi, quitationem, pactum, et financiam faciendi, dictum fratrem Bernardum de Mureto in procuratione nostra quam hactenus habuit confirmandi ac etiam, si eis visum fuerit, ab ipsa procuratione et administratione bonorum nostrorum revocandi et amovendi eundem, alium et alios procuratores substituendi et constituendi, et substitutos et constitutos amovendi et revocandi, et demum generaliter et universaliter omnia alia et singula facienda procurandi, explicandi, et exercendi quae veri et legitimi ac legitime constituti procuratores ad negocia et ad lites facere possunt et debent, etiam si mandatum exigant speciale, et que nos facere possemus si presentes essemus et que causarum et negotiorum merita exigunt et requirunt. Et volentes eosdem procuratores nostros relevare ab omni onere satisfaciendi, promictimus tibi subscripto notario pro omnibus quorum interest stipulari de rato et iudicatum solvi cum suis clausulis sub ypotheca bonorum nostrorum et nostri patriarchatus pro ipsis nos obligantes nomine fideiussorio ac etiam principali. Que omnibus quorum interest per presens instrumentum publicum per notarium publicum infrascriptum scriptum et signatum et sigillo nostro sigillatum vicem epistole² continens fieri volumus manifesta.

Acta fuerunt hec in castro Palmacii Ruthenensis diocesis, anno, die, mense, Indictione, pontificatu quibus supra, presentibus testibus discretis viris dominis Bernardo Gaffinelli rectore ecclesie sancti Petri de Broresta, Guillelmo Cayrosa curato ecclesie de Palmatio, Magistro P. Planhas fisico, et Petro Addemarii domicello.

Ego, Imbertus de Turreta clericus, publicus imperiali auctoritate notarius, premissis omnibus et singulis una cum dictis testibus presens fui et ut supra stipulatus fui et presens instrumentum publicum sumpsi et scripsi et signo meo sequenti signavi rogatus.

In quorum etiam fidem et testimonium nos, idem patriarcha, sigillum nostrum apponi fecimus huic presenti publico instrumento.

Constitutus coram reverendo in Christo patre domino B., Dei gratia Famagustane et Antheradensis ecclesiarum episcopo, et nobili et sapienti militi domino Thoma de Pinquiniaco, ballivo Secrete regalis, ex una parte, et religiosus et honestus vir frater Bernardus de Mureto, ballivus et procurator dicti domini patriarche in regno Cipri in casali suo de Psimolofe, ex altera, ipsi ambo unanimiter et concorditer dixerunt, fecerunt, narraverunt,³ ac stipulati sunt inter se in omnibus et per omnia ut inferius continetur.

2 [epistole] epistolie *a.c.* MS.

3 [narraverunt] naraverunt *a.c. s.l.* MS.

Et ecce cum hoc sit quod idem dominus Deodatus venerit ad regnum Cipri ex parte dicti domini patriarche ad faciendum, exercendum, et procurandum facta et negocia sibi commissa per ipsum dominum patriarcham pro ut et sicut in sua procuracione predicta plenius continetur, et postquam venerit ad regnum Cipri sit et fuerit gravibus infirmitatibus detentus, ita quod non possit in regno Cipri secure morari absque periculo sue persone, idcirco procuratorio nomine eiusdem domini patriarche et pro eo ex auctoritate et potestate sibi concessa per ipsum dominum patriarcham, pro ut constat, ut dictum est, ex procuracione predicta, confidens de legalitate et industria fratris Bernardi predicti, eundem fratrem Bernardum ibidem presentem et mandatum huiusmodi in se sponte suscipientem tanquam illum qui bene, legaliter, et fideliter se habuerit atque gesserit in procuracione sibi commissa per ipsum dominum patriarcham toto tempore retroacto, ratificavit, confirmavit, atque de novo constituit seu substituit ac ordinavit procuratorem, actorem, deffensorem, et nuncium specialem ad agendum, deffendendum, procurandum, et recuperandum omnia bona dicti domini patriarche, et pro eo dans et concedens sibi potestatem et auctoritatem faciendi et exercendi omnia supradicta pro ut et sicut in procuracione dicti domini Deodati plenius continetur.

Hiis tamen pactis et conventionibus appositis et factis inter procuratores predictos:

In primis videlicet quod dictus frater Bernardus teneatur reddere et restituere dicto domino patriarche seu procuratori suo vel eius mandato pro fructibus, redditibus, et obventionibus quorumcumque casalis de Psimolofe cum omnibus iuribus et pertinenciis suis unius anni tantummodo quinque milia bizantium alborum de Cipro bene ponderatorum et numeratorum ad iustum pondus regni Cipri, deductis honeribus et expensis dicti casalis de Psimolofe, solvendorum per terminos infrascriptos, videlicet in mense Septembris proximo futuro II^m V^c biz., et in mense Februarii anno a nativitate Domini Mⁱ CCCⁱ XXⁱ, Indictione tertia, alia II^m V^c biz. Et si dictum casale de Psimolofe cum omnibus iuribus et pertinentiis suis habundaret seu valeret plus in redditibus, fructibus, et obventionibus quam V^m biz., quod illud plus, deductis honeribus et expensis persone dicti fratris Bernardi et scribe sui et duorum famulorum et duarum bestiarum pro persona sua, debeat applicari dicto domino patriarche aut eius mandato. Et si minus habundaret in anno predicto, ut est dictum, quam de V^m biz., nichilominus dictus frater Bernardus teneatur perficere V^m biz. predictorum domino patriarche predicto aut eius certo nuncio. Et de hiis tenetur dare bonam cautionem de personis secularibus in Secreta regali de restituendis et reddendis pro anno predicto dicto domino patriarche aut eius certo nuncio pro redditibus, fructibus, et obventionibus⁴ dicti casalis de Psimolofe V^m biz., si dictus frater Bernardus defecerit

4 [obventionibus] obventionibus MS.

in toto vel in parte. Et si contingeret quod infra annum predictum dominus patriarcha scriberet vel aliquo modo predictum fratrem Bernardum ab amministrazione predictorum revocaret, quod fideiussores qui erunt pro eodem fratre Bernardo, ab eodem die quo dictus frater Bernardus quomodocumque fuerit a dicta amministrazione amotus, sint totaliter a fideiussione predicta absoluti ac etiam liberati, ita tamen quod dictus frater Bernardus teneatur reddere ratiocinium sicut ballivus dicti casalis cuicumque dictus dominus patriarcha voluerit de toto tempore quanto steterit in dicto casali, et reddito ratiocinio quod fideiussores sint tunc absoluti.

Item, quod dictus frater Bernardus ultra quantitatem V^m biz. predictorum teneatur solvere decimam Nicossiensis ecclesie et etiam decimam domini pape, et debet facere omnes expensas que pertinent dicto casali.

Item, si dictus dominus patriarcha mittet aliquem procuratorem sive nuncium in Cipro, quod dictus frater Bernardus teneatur dicto procuratori seu nuncio dare sibi competentes expensas pro dicto procuratore et pro alio, ita quod respondeat duobus in victu tantum sufficienti modo quamdiu steterint in regno Cipri.

Actum Nicossie, in domo predicti domini episcopi, presentibus discretis viris dominis Goberto Arquegeire, Georgio Pasquali, Guillelmo Petri, Johanne Spin, et Bernardino de Jenoulayco, testibus ad predicta specialiter vocatis et rogatis.

Et ego, Jacobus Lamberti, sacrosancte matris Romane Ecclesie publicus auctoritate notarius, predictis omnibus interfui rogatus, scripsi, et in hanc publicam formam redegi, meoque signo consueto signavi.

Document 2

Instrumentum Miscellaneum 6204

Pope Innocent VI to King Peter I, Avignon, 16 April 1360

(underlined = changed in next version; italics = changed from last version)

Version 1	Version 2	Version 3 (Reg. Vat. 241, pars 2, ff. 20v-21v)
<p>Carissimo in Christo filio Iohanni regi Silicie illustri.</p> <p>Pietatis movemur officio ac debito colapsis ecclesiis per universa orbis climata longe lateque diffusis cunctisque Christi fidelibus oppressis seu laborantibus in adversis nos appostolice servitutis obligat perurgemur.</p> <p>Tuique, inclite fili, regii honoris et fame consideratio nos inducit ut apud celsitudinem tuam quemadmodum penes clare memorie Hugonem genitorem tuum cui, dum vitam gereret in humanis, invenimus alias instituisse, prout sub transumpto presentibus intercluso plenius continetur, ut ad <i>casale de Symuloffa</i>, cuiusdam casalis ecclesie Jerosolimitane,</p>	<p>Carissimo in Christo filio <i>Petro</i> regi <i>Cipri</i> illustri.</p> <p>Pietatis movemur officio ac debito colapsis ecclesiis per universa orbis climata longe lateque diffusis, cunctisque Christi fidelibus oppressis seu laborantibus in adversis nos appostolica servitus obligat, <i>eiusque ad hec permaximis excuriis</i> perurgemur.</p> <p>Tuique, inclite fili, regii honoris et fame consideratio nos inducit ut apud celsitudinem tuam quemadmodum penes clare memorie Hugonem genitorem tuum cui, dum vitam gereret in humanis, invenimus alias instituisse, prout sub transumpto presentibus intercluso plenius continetur, ut ad <i>casale de Symuloffa</i>, <i>Nicosiensis diocesis</i>, ecclesie Jerosolimitane,</p>	<p>Carissimo in Christo Petro regi Cipri illustri, <i>salutem etc.</i></p> <p>Pietatis movemur officio ac debito colapsis ecclesiis per universa orbis climata longe lateque diffuctis cunctisque Christi fidelibus oppressis seu laborantibus in adversis nos apostolica servitus obligat, eiusque ad hec permaximis excuriis perurgemur.</p> <p>Tuique, inclite fili, regii honoris et fame consideratio nos inducit ut apud celsitudinem tuam quemadmodum penes clare memorie Hugonem genitorem tuum cui, dum vitam gereret in humanis, alias instituisse, prout sub transumpto presentibus intercluso plenius continetur, ut ad casale de Symuloffa, Nicosiensis diocesis, ecclesie Jerosolimitane</p>

<p>propter subversionem <u>cuiusdam</u> naturalis aquae defluentis noviter arcescentes, tuos intuitus reformatorios et pietatis propiciis oculos inclinare, quos ad dilecti filii nobilis viri Jacobi Tricoplerii, militis, familiaris tui, hucusque, quod vix credimus, diceris elongasse, pro simplici iusticia que deberetur postulanti cullibet prompte reddi via regia redderes meram iusticiam super hiis inter eos, in quibus, et si nos more patris benivoli dampnosa <u>dissidia</u> [rimina a.c. s.l.] unitatis Ecclesie Sancte Dei, dampnosaque discrimina et profunda cordis amaritudine recensemus, tuamque serenitatem non mediocri anxietate vexatam forsan inter ambiguitates huiusmodi circumplexam. Speramus autem quod tui solii iustitie plenitudo non concidat, nec concassabitur in premissis, quin immo quia virtus in infirmitate perficitur ut virtutes resumas virtuosius et adhibeas diligentem providentiam in agendis.</p>	<p>propter subversionem eiusdem naturalis aquae defluentis noviter perarescens, unde casale <u>prefatum ad presens aridum et consueverat irrigari</u>, et ubertates fertiles propagare, tuos intuitus reformatorios et pietatis propiciis oculos <u>eidem Jerosolimitane ecclesie ministrare, alias collapse, permaximum [dicitur] ministrare</u> viri Jacobi Tricoplerii, militis, familiaris tui, cuiusmodi <u>interventu idem alveus dicitur commutatus</u>, hucusque, quod vix credimus, diceris elongasse, quemadmodum idem progenitor tuus contemplatione consimili distulisse dicitur quoad vixit, pro simplici iusticia que deberetur postulanti cullibet in sepefate ecclesie, ut premititur, permaximum dispendium et iacturam, tui et tuorum fortasse, si veritas relati- <u>bus fulciatur, non modicum periculum animarum,</u> prompte reddi via regia reddi faceres meram super hiis iustitiam inter eos.</p>	<p>propter subversionem <u>cuiusdam</u> naturalis aquae defluentis noviter perarescens, unde casale <u>prefatum presens aridum consueverat irrigari</u>, et ubertates fertiles, tuos intuitus reformatorios et pietatis propiciis oculos eidem Jerosolimitane ecclesie, alias collapse, permaximum ministrare dicitur inclinare, quos ad dilecti filii nobilis viri Jacobi Tricoplerii, militis, familiaris tui, cuiusmodi <u>interventu idem alveus dicitur commutatus</u>, hucusque, quod vix credimus, diceris elongasse, quemadmodum idem progenitor tuus contemplatione consimili distulisse dicitur quoad vixit, pro simplici iusticia que deberetur postulanti cullibet in sepefate ecclesie, ut premititur, permaximum dispendium et iacturam,</p>
		<p>prompte reddi via regia faceres meram super hiis iusticiam inter eos.</p>

<p>Nos autem, <u>malis</u> huiusmodi obviare, quantum cum Deo possumus, cupientes, celsitudinem tuam rogamus attentius et ortamur attente quatinus huiusmodi iustitiam inter partes previas seu aliud <u>promptum</u> et debitum <u>ac</u> salubre remedium procurare festines, ita quod venerabilis frater noster . . . patriarcha Jerosolimitanus, cui eius exigentibus meritis afficimur non indigne, celsitudinis tue presidio in commisso sibi regimine ecclesie prelibate possit assidue procurari, et tibi exinde a Retributore bonorum perempnis vite premium rependatur, ac a nobis condigna proveniat actio gratiarum.</p>	<p>Nos autem, <i>dispendiis</i> huiusmodi obviare, quantum cum Deo possumus, cupientes, <i>preces continuantes precibus et exhortationes exhortationibus cumulant</i>, celsitudinem tuam rogamus attentius et ortamur attente quatinus, <i>ob dignam Dei reverentiam, apud quam non est acceptatio personarum nec obubratio vicissitudinis aliqualis. et Apostolice Sedis reverentiam. cui afficaris ut devotus intermis visceribus caritatis, ac nostram utilitatem quoque rei publice interventus</i>, huiusmodi iustitiam inter partes previas seu aliud debitum <i>et</i> salubre remedium procurare festines, ita quod venerabilis frater noster . . . patriarcha Jerosolimitanus, cui eius exigentibus meritis afficimur non indigne, celsitudinis tue fultus presidio in commisso sibi regimine ecclesie prelibate possit assidue Deo propicio prosperari, et tibi exinde a Retributore bonorum omnium perempnis vite premium rependatur, ac a nobis condigna proveniat actio gratiarum.</p>	<p>Nos autem, dispendiis huiusmodi obviare, quantum cum Deo possumus, cupientes, preces continuantes precibus et exhortationes exhortationibus cumulantes, celsitudinem tuam rogamus attentius et hortamur attente quatinus, ob dignam Dei reverentiam,</p> <p>huiusmodi iustitiam inter partes previas seu aliud debitum et salubre remedium procurare festines, ita quod venerabilis frater noster . . . patri archa Jerosolimitanus, cui eius exigentibus meritis afficimur non indigne, celsitudinis tue fultus presidio in commisso sibi regimine ecclesie prelibate possit assidue Deo propicio prosperari, et tibi exinde a Retributore bonorum omnium perempnis vite premium rependatur, ac a nobis condigna proveniat actio gratiarum.</p>
<p>Datum Avinione, XVI Kalendas Maii, anno octavo.</p>	<p>Datum Avinione, XVI Kalendas Maii, anno octavo.</p>	<p>Datum Avinione, XVI Kalendas Maii, anno octavo.</p>

REFERENCES

- Bullarium Cyprium I: Papal Letters Concerning Cyprus 1196–1260* (2010a). Ed. C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Bullarium Cyprium II: Papal Letters Concerning Cyprus 1261–1314* (2010b). Ed. C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Bullarium Cyprium III: Lettres papales relatives à Chypre 1316–1378* (2012). Eds. C. Perrat & J. Richard, avec la collaboration de C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Coureas, N. (1997). *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195–1312*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Coureas, N. (2010). *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1313–1378*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Coureas, N. (2020). Fluctuating Territoriality. The Military Orders and the Crown of Cyprus: 1191–1313. In M.-A. Chevalier (ed.), *Ordres militaires et territorialité au Moyen Âge: entre Orient et Occident*. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 125–158.
- Chronique d'Amadi* (1891). Ed. R. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantium. Sive acta et diplomata res Venetas, Graecas atque Levantis illustrantia*. Vol. II: 1351–1454 (1889). Ed. R. Predelli. Venice: Deputazione Veneta di storia patria.
- Dunbabin, J. (1991). *A Hound of God. Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Edbury, P.W. (1991). *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191–1374*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eubel, C. (1913). *Hierachia catholica medii aevi*. Münster: Libraria Regensbergiana.
- Florio Bustron (1886). *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- 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: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Kouroupakis, A. (2018). *Η Κύπρος και το Μεγάλο Σχίσμα της Δύσης (1378–1417)*. Nicosia: University of Cyprus (PhD dissertation).
- Leontios Makhairas (2003). *Χρονικό της Κύπρου. Παράλληλη διπλωματική έκδοση των χειρογράφων*, eds. M. Pieris & A. Nicolaou-Konnari. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Logan, F.D. (2020). *The Register of Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1375–1381*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- Lusignan, É. de (1580). *Description de toute l'isle de Cypre*. Paris: Guillaume Chaudiere.

- Lusignan, É. de (1586). *Les généalogies de soixante et sept très-nobles et très-illustres maisons*. Paris: Guillaume le Noir.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1852–1861). *Histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1881). *Généalogie des rois de Chypre de la famille de Lusignan*. Venice: Marco Visentini.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1882). *Documents nouveaux servant de preuves à l'histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1893). Les patriarches latins de Jérusalem Mas-Latrie. *Revue de l'Orient latin*, 1, 16–41.
- Richard, J. (1947). Le casal de Psimolofu et la vie rurale en Chypre au XIV^e siècle. *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École Française de Rome*, 59, 121–153. Reprinted in idem (1976). *Orient et Occident au Moyen Âge. Contacts et relations XIIIe-XIVe siècles*. London: Variorum, no. IV.
- 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., with Papadopoullos, T. (1983). *Le Livre des remembrances de la secrète du royaume de Chypre: 1468–1469*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Richard, J. (1984–1987). Les comptes du collecteur de la Chambre Apostolique dans le royaume de Chypre (1357–1363). *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 13–16, 1–47. Reprinted in idem (1992). *Croisades et états latins d'Orient*. Aldershot: Ashgate, no. XV.
- Richard, J. (1999). La levée des decimes sur l'Eglise latine de Chypre. Documents comptables de 1363–1371. *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 25, 11–18. Reprinted in idem (2003). *Francs et orientaux dans le monde des croisades*. Aldershot: Ashgate, no. XX.
- Setton, K.M. (1976). *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*. Volume I. *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: American Philological Society.

Christopher David Schabel – PhD in History, University of Iowa, 1994, works 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.