

# Methods and Sources

## Methods and Theoretical Considerations

The examination of social developments and of processes of identity construction requires a theoretical framework that covers the requirements of both paths of analysis. I will therefore draw on theoretical considerations belonging to two different movements of scholarship that have often been seen in contradiction to each other: historical sociology and culture- and identity studies. These two traditions have deviating perspectives on the »historical reality« of past societies<sup>46</sup>, and it is necessary to discuss this problem before turning to their use for the present study.

According to historical sociology, which bloomed in the 1960s in particular, the historical reality of past societies is an externally verifiable and objective entity. It can be understood through the (mostly quantitative) analysis of social and economic structures based on careful theoretical considerations. The historian is supposed to collect social and economic data from the sources and interpret them with the help of modern heuristic tools. The history of ideas and mentalities played only a marginal role for these studies<sup>47</sup>. However, in the wake of the linguistic and cultural turns, scholars questioned the existence of an »objective« historical reality and preferred to analyse the way historical subjects perceived their society, context and identities<sup>48</sup>. Reality, they maintained, was always a subjective process of discourse and construction, negotiated between individuals and groups<sup>49</sup>.

Therefore, such a thing as one social coherent reality in the past had never existed, and historians could only ever analyse the representation of past discourses within the discourse of their own time<sup>50</sup>. This perspective is strongly related to an emphasis on deconstruction, fragmentation and hybridization: reality, identities and cultures are not seen as essential, unified, unchanging entities, but rather as a conglomeration of hybrid, ever-changing discourses<sup>51</sup>.

On first glance, these two opposites seem irreconcilable. However, some historians maintain that taking both perspectives into account can be fruitful for historical research<sup>52</sup>. The Byzantinist John Haldon, for example, from whose work this study takes its main theoretical basis, has recently stated that an analysis of past societies should ask how social differences were expressed and conceived by the past society itself but also examine the social structures underlying the contemporary narratives. Such an analysis should not forget the historian's positionality in modern discourse that has been so much emphasized by the postmodernists, but neither should it deny the external social reality of the past<sup>53</sup>. The results of the modern sociological analysis do not necessarily coincide with the perception of past observers: we may for example find common traits and characteristics in social groups which would not have considered themselves as belonging to the same social strata<sup>54</sup>. In this approach, therefore, a picture of »reality« arises in the tension between the two perspectives.

46 Gotter, *Akkulturation* 378-381.

47 Gotter, *Akkulturation* 379. For literature discussing this opinion, see Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* esp. 74. 77. 86. 98; Hanisch, *Die linguistische Wende* 219-221; Wehler, *Historische Sozialwissenschaft* passim.

48 Haldon, *Byzantium after 2000*, 6. The cultural turn had its origins in postcolonial studies, which were closely connected to the political and cultural situation from the 1950s onwards, when parts of the so-called Third World were de-colonialized and a range of liberation movements questioned universalist political theories, focusing on fragmented and marginal societies and counter-discourses to the leading discourses of the »Western« world. The cultural turn and postmodernism (originating in postcolonialism) are therefore terms which encompass a number of different and sometimes contrasting movements, ranging from political to more academic discussion, see Haldon, *Byzantium after 2000*, 5 and Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns* 7-8. The broadness of these movements makes it impossible to offer a comprehensive bibliographical list here. However, among the most important postcolonial and postmodern works are Bhabha, *Location of Culture*; Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora*; Brah, *Hybridity and its Discontents*; Fanon, *Peau noire, masques blancs*; Hall, *Cultural Studies*; Hall, *Questions of Cultural Identity*; hooks, *Ain't I a Woman*; Mbembe, *Les jeunes*; Said, *Orientalism*. Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns* provides an interesting theoretization and overview of all the turns in the humanities. For other introductions, cf. Jameson, *The Cultural Turn*; Do Mar Castro Varela/Dhawana, *Postkoloniale Theorie*; Ashcroft et al., *The Empire Writes Back*; Megill, *Prophets of Extremity*; Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*; Culler, *On Deconstruction*.

49 Gotter, *Akkulturation* 378-380. For discussions on (historical) reality viewed from a postmodernist perspective, see Fischer, *Wirklichkeit des Konstruktivismus*; Keller, *Diskursanalyse*; Daniel, *Clio unter Kulturschock*; Iggers, *Geschichtswissenschaft im 20. Jh.*, esp. 124-127. For Medieval studies, see especially Borgolte, *Mittelalterforschung und Postmoderne*; Goetz, *Moderne Mediävistik*.

50 Haldon, *Byzantium after 2000*, 8.

51 See Bhabha, *Location of Culture* esp. 1-3; Medick, *Missionare im Ruderboot*; Heinz, *Ethnizität*; Lipp, *Kulturtypen*; Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* esp. 12-14; Hall, *Who Needs Identity?* 1. 4.

52 See e.g. Oexle, *Aspekte*; Gotter, *Akkulturation* 383-384; Haldon, *Social Élités*; Haldon, *Callinicos*.

53 Haldon, *Byzantium after 2000*, 9; Haldon, *Social Élités* 168-169.

54 Haldon, *Social Élités* 172. The divergence of the two perspectives is evident for example from Padgett and Ansell's discussion of the rise of the Medici family in the fifteenth century: while contemporaries perceived the Medici family as representing the »new men« in society, their party was actually »a heterogeneous mixture of contradictory interests and crosscutting networks«. See Padgett/Ansell, *Robust Action* 1262. Cf. also Carpenter's study on the gentry of Warwickshire, who warns from perceiving all the people who called themselves *gentry* as one group, since there were significant differences between families' riches and social standing (Carpenter, *Locality and Polity* 38).

However, considering the two perspectives as unrelated would also be mistaken. In a 1990 essay on the development of nobility in Western Europe, the German medievalist Otto Gerhard Oexle pointed out that the mentality prevailing in a society also influences its social reality, and vice versa<sup>55</sup>. Haldon has discussed this crucial point recently in more depth. Based on work by Alex Callinicos, he argues that human consciousness and identity construction are closely connected to social structures through identity narratives and can be responsible for social change<sup>56</sup>.

Callinicos had thought about the possibilities and limitations of human agency itself<sup>57</sup>. He turned against those thinkers who see human agency as the outcome of rational decisions only. However, he also rejected the assumptions put forth above all by Althusser that human beings are basically results of the social structures<sup>58</sup> they live in and always act according to the constraints of the social system<sup>59</sup>. As a middle way between these two positions, Callinicos proposed a perspective that takes social structures into account without assigning them the absolute power over human agency. Rather, he argued that social structures limit human agency, but also facilitate action. Humans can use the prevailing social structures to further their ends, either by reasserting said structures or by using the possibilities inherent in the social system to forward social change<sup>60</sup>.

Haldon uses these basic assumptions to think more about the relationship between perceptions of society and social structures themselves. According to Haldon, this relationship is dialectic. While society and social structures produce an awareness of self in human beings, they also set the framework and the conceptual apparatus for humans to express what they know and understand about the world, and to act back on this world according to their self-awareness<sup>61</sup>. This thinking offers a workable connection between the past reality that the historian unearths, and the perspective of contemporaries on their own world.

How, though, should we analyse both outside reality and contemporary thinking? For both questions, specific considerations and analytical tools are necessary. First, let us consider

the terms culture and identity, both of which are crucial for understanding the contemporary perspective. I will follow up with a discussion of various sociological terms such as nobility, aristocracy, social groups and social mobility and finally consider prosopography and social network analysis as methods for the analysis of the historical reality of the Cypriot élites.

## Identities and Culture

As we have just seen above, social structures can be seen as producing an awareness of self in human beings, setting a framework for their actions and at the same time enabling people to act back on the world. How, then, can we grasp both the social structures as well as people's awareness of self? According to Haldon, social realities produce a society's culture, its *symbolic universe*, »the totality of cultural knowledge and practice in a social formation, within which and through which regular everyday life is carried on<sup>62</sup>«. This definition, which is based on the important sociological work of Berger and Luckmann in the 1960s<sup>63</sup>, is similar to the one by Clifford Geertz, who »believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, [...] take[s] culture to be those webs<sup>64</sup>«. Geertz emphasized that this web of significance not only took place on a cognitive level but was also present in social practices, which according to him are connected to the various layers of meaning that depend on the semiotic structures of a society<sup>65</sup>. Other scholars writing about semiotics have offered similar views of culture and defined it as a communication system based on meanings that are connected to practices and to specific signs which explain the world to men. Different societies build different symbolic universes using varying discourses in which their members move<sup>66</sup>. These views tie in well with the conviction expressed in the various cultural turns that reality is not an unchangeable entity, but disintegrated into various perceptions, and therefore culture must be based on perceptions and discourses, and is a continuously mixed and renegotiated system<sup>67</sup>.

55 Oexle, *Aspekte* 19-20.

56 Haldon expressed many of these thoughts already in Haldon, *Towards a Social History*, albeit without explicitly referring to Callinicos' concepts.

57 Callinicos, *Making History* xx. xliii. 213-225. 277-278.

58 Haldon, *Callinicos 2* defines social structures as »the socially-determinate results of past human actions repeated on a regular basis sufficient to determine certain behavioural forms and social practices«.

59 Callinicos, *Making History* xvii, and esp. 5-16. 33-37. Cf. Althusser, *Idéologie*.

60 Callinicos, *Making History* xxii-xxiii. 85-102. Similar positions have been taken by Martschukat, *Freitod* and Sarasin, *Subjekte*, both coming from the tradition of discourse analysis.

61 Haldon, *Callinicos* 6.

62 Haldon, *Callinicos* 6.

63 Berger and Luckmann used the concept to explain the legitimation of social institutions within a society. Accordingly, »the symbolic universe is conceived of as the matrix of all socially objectivated and subjectively real meanings; the entire historic society and the entire biography of the individual are seen as events taking place within this universe« (Berger/Luckmann, *Social Construction* 114).

64 Geertz, *Thick Description* 5. Accordingly, in his overview of cultural research the historian Ulrich Gotter later defined culture as »die Summe aller Sinnbezüge

und Tiefendimensionen [...], die der Dingwelt und den sozialen Konstellationen zugewiesen werden« (Gotter, *Akkulturation* 380).

65 These layers can be analysed through an interpretative process which Geertz called »thick description«, see Geertz, *Thick Description* 6-12.

66 Coming from the semiotic discourse and based on the philosophy of Ernst Cassirer, Morris, *Zeichen*, and Eco, *Semiotik*, have discussed communicative sign systems as cultural formations.

67 See e.g. Bhabha, *Location of Culture* esp. 1-3; Medick, *Missionare im Ruderberoot*; Heinz, *Ethnizität*; Lipp, *Kulturtypen*; Brah/Coombes, *Conundrum of Mixing* 9. Earlier uses of the term contrasted culture as the product of human activities that shaped the world around them, from nature. In the nineteenth century, this definition had been used to construct a hierarchy of higher, more civilized cultures, and lower cultures, which were supposed to be closer to nature. Later, cultures were thought of as equivalent, but homogeneous entities which stood side by side without mixing (Gotter, *Akkulturation* 376). Important ethnological works which designed cultures as homogenous entities existing parallel, without assigning any values were Kroeber, *The Superorganic*; Kroeber, *The Nature of Culture*; Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*; Herskovits, *Cultural Relativism*. However, with the cultural turn, these ideas were criticized, and the definitions that are used in this study substituted the older ideas. The definition

The concept of the *symbolic universe*, then, encompasses social structures and cultural practices as well as the meaning attached to them in a specific society, and expresses the understanding of human beings as part of an all-encompassing social and cultural context that acts on them and influences their perception of the world. I shall therefore use the *symbolic universe* to define what is understood as culture in this study.

The question remains how we are to deal with the awareness of self and to grasp its connection to culture and social structures. We have now arrived at the crucial concept of identity. Needless to say, this term has a long history of debate in the scholarly community. I shall refer to these discussions shortly, in order to contextualize the use of the term in this study.

Before the various turns, scholars largely understood identity on two, sometimes contrasting, levels. On the one hand, they saw identity as a personal project, the development of the concept of self during an individual's lifespan. On the other hand, identity was understood as a group phenomenon, that is how certain social groups determined personal identities. In both directions, scholars viewed identity as a basically stable and consistent concept of self<sup>68</sup>. With the arrival of postmodernism, this changed radically. Scholars now started to focus on the fragmentation and multiplicity of identities within a single individual, as well as within groups<sup>69</sup>. Identity was no longer a stable self-concept that *existed*, but something changeable that could be *constructed* differently according to the discourse and the context an individual or a group moved in. An important part of this shift focused on the crucial role played by language. Following an important work by Goffman (*Forms of Talk*, 1981), scholars now acknowledged language as the basic vehicle of identity construction and social interaction<sup>70</sup>.

Within this general trend, scholars focused on different levels of identity construction, ranging from broad views that were influenced by historical philosophy to more minute analyses of discourse and descriptions of self in conversation. These approaches differed not only in the scale of research. The broader approach often built on the tradition of Althusser and Foucault who had found that social structures produced subjects and identities through their cultural and administrative power<sup>71</sup>. It therefore focussed on the influence of the social system on personal identities. The most well-known approach of this sort until today is Judith Butler's work on

the performativity of sexual identities and gender<sup>72</sup>. In Butler's work, »an identity based on gender [...] is nothing other than persistent regulatory performances materialized over time<sup>73</sup>«.

Small-scale research, on the other hand, concentrated more on the self-determined action of the individual. According to Stuart Hall, one of the most important scholars in this area, it is necessary to analyse why people take up one discursive position instead of another<sup>74</sup>. Stuart Hall's much read essay *Who Needs Identity?* from 1996 therefore analyses the construction of identity as the result of an individual's identification with a certain discourse within a given moment. This identification can vary depending on the context and the choice of discourses involved<sup>75</sup>. It has been stressed that it is not the discourse itself which forms identity, but that people themselves form their identities by choosing, negotiating and »speaking into shape« various discourses<sup>76</sup>. The individual therefore is not only hailed by discursive structures but has the possibility of choosing between various discourses and creatively shaping them. Matching this concept from a psychological perspective, Ryan and Deci have recently explained that individuals develop identities by accepting roles in order to help them secure a sense of relatedness and belonging. Thus, a person may have multiple identities, depending on the various contexts to which they relate, and not just one identity consisting of everything they believe themselves to be<sup>77</sup>.

This last approach to identities suits the concept of this study best, since it ties in with the concept that human beings live in a symbolic universe which awards them varying discourses in order to construct their identities and interact with the social structures they encounter. Using the possibility of different discourses, people may choose to construct their identities in different ways according to the moment and situation.

How, then, are we to analyse these constructions of identity? A crucial limitation for historians is that human consciousness, and therefore self-awareness is never directly accessible. However, according to Haldon, the expression of consciousness, and therefore the connection between consciousness and social practice, is provided by narrative. According to Haldon, narrative is »a specifically socio-linguistic definition, a series of linked clauses or statements with an evaluative – and therefore structuring – element, arranged temporally<sup>78</sup>«. Narratives are reconstructions of experience. They function as »means of identifying the individual self within a social and

of culture as contrast between nature and human production, however, is still used in a modern way by Barzen et al., *Kontakt* 197. They define culture as the results of humans »being in the world«, which can be categorized into various sectors, such as religion, economy, or law.

68 Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 6-12. The most prominent scholar working on personal identity development was Erik Erikson (*Erikson, Childhood and Society*; Erikson, *Identity: Youth, and Crisis*). For group identity on the other hand, Norbert Elias did influential work (*Elias, Gesellschaft der Individuen*).

69 For surveys on this debate, see Hall, *Recent Developments* 157-162 and Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 12-18.

70 Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 13-14; Goffman, *Forms of Talk*.

71 Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 13-14. See Althusser, *Idéologie and Foucault, Archéologie*. This discussion was closely intertwined with the Marxist debates about structure and agency discussed above. However, in later works Foucault allowed for more freedom of individual action, see Foucault, *La volonté de savoir*.

72 Butler, *Gender Trouble*; Butler, *Bodies That Matter*.

73 Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 17.

74 Cf. Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 16.

75 Hall, *Who Needs Identity?* 5-6.

76 Wetherell, *Field of Identity Studies* 17.

77 Ryan/Deci, *Multiple Identities* 226-227.

78 Haldon, *Callinicos* 7.

cultural context, of providing a reality – they answer the question ‘who am I?’<sup>79</sup>«. Narratives therefore construct identities, and on this basis, they are guides for future action. Narratives may act in different directions. If evaluation of social reality changes in a narrative, this may call for making changes in society. However, social change may also influence the narrative, again calling for changes in the constructed relationship between self and society<sup>80</sup>. It will therefore be the task of the chapters on identity construction to unearth these narratives from the various sources at our disposal.

During this analysis, we have to keep in mind that identity narratives are usually connected to various contexts and social roles. Hugh Kennedy and John Haldon as well as James Schryver (for Cyprus) offer categorizations of these contexts or roles, listing the following: religion, race and language, region, public function, perceived social origin and solidarities, as well as gender. These contexts make for sets of overlapping and mutually intersecting identities, which may even come into conflict with each other<sup>81</sup>. We will therefore have to ask which identity sets or discourses were important to people in fifteenth-century Cyprus<sup>82</sup>, and if and how these identities overlapped, intersected or came into conflict with one another.

Identifying with different discourses or social roles often means identifying with different groups. Therefore, we will have to ask to which groups individuals felt they belonged. A fundamental postmodernist approach that tackles this issue is the felt difference to others. By asking who is seen as the *Other*, we may find out about the perceived boundaries between groups<sup>83</sup>. In the case of this study, this will be an important question for the identification of different groups within the Cypriot élite: how did they see themselves and each other? Moreover, did social changes and contact between different groups lead to new group constructions or changing patterns in group identities<sup>84</sup>? I shall attempt to answer these questions both while discussing the aristocratic groups themselves in chapter one and aristocratic identity construction in chapters five and six.

The examination of the various élite groups and their processes of identity construction cannot, however, do without clear sociological definitions of the groups in question. I therefore now proceed to discuss the various modern terms used for medieval élite societies, and their usefulness for the present study.

## Nobility, Aristocracy, and Élite

In European history, the terms *nobility* and *aristocracy* (as well as *élite*) are used for the higher echelons of medieval society. Discussing these terms will help us define the Cypriot groups under consideration.

*Aristocracy* and *nobility* are often used synonymously<sup>85</sup>. However, developments throughout Western European societies from the beginning of the Late Middle ages onwards have prompted historians of this periode to differentiate between the two terms. Depending on the line of interpretation, societies in Western Europe started to define higher social groups in legal terms from about the middle of the thirteenth century onwards, but at the latest in the fifteenth century. Being noble in these societies not only meant occupying a high position with access to wealth and power but also being in possession of legal privileges inherited from one generation to the next<sup>86</sup>. Consequently, scholars of Late Medieval Western Europe have used the term *nobility* to denote higher social strata that were separated from the rest of society by legal privileges. This notion occurs as early as Paul Guilhiermoz’s essay on the origin of the nobility in Medieval France (1902)<sup>87</sup>. In accordance with these thoughts, Marc Bloch defined nobility in his highly influential work *La société féodale* from 1939 as follows:

toute classe dominante n’est pas une noblesse. Pour mériter ce nom, elle doit, semble-t-il, réunir deux conditions: d’abord la possession d’un statut juridique qui confirme et matérialise la supériorité à laquelle elle prétend; en second lieu, que ce statut se perpétue par le sang – sauf toutefois à admettre en faveur de quelques familles nouvelles la possibilité de s’en ouvrir l’accès, mais en nombre restreint et selon des normes régulièrement établies<sup>88</sup>.

Others followed this line of thought<sup>89</sup>. In a research overview on medieval nobilities in 1997, Timothy Reuter opined that a noble is, strictly speaking, a person whose (normally privileged) status is legally defined, which means that one can be a noble without exercising power. An aristocrat, by contrast, is someone who exercises power as a result of being well-born in a socially rather than a legally defined sense: this implies the inheritance of wealth, power and social (but not legal) status, and it does not preclude some degree of social mobility<sup>90</sup>.

79 Haldon, Callinicos 7.

80 The arguments in this paragraph are all taken from Haldon, Callinicos 6-9.

81 Haldon/Kennedy, Regional Identities 319 and most recently Haldon, Concluding Remarks 3. Cf. also Schryver, Excavating Identities 8-9.

82 Cf. Schryver, Excavating Identities 9.

83 See Brah, Non-binanzed Identities, esp. 137-138; Hall, Who Needs Identity?. In 2000, a whole collected volume on the question of alterity and its influence on identity construction was published, resulting from the Sonderforschungsbereich 541 »Identitäten und Alteritäten – Die Funktion von Alterität für die Konstitution und Konstruktion von Identität«, see Eßbach, Wir/Ihr/Sie.

84 This is a question which Ulrich Gotter poses similarly in his acculturation discussion of contact between groups with different culture. However, Gotter defines groups as such only if they saw themselves as an (identity) group, see Gotter,

Akkulturation 395. As exposed above, I shall approach groups both from their own view and from the view of the modern scholar.

85 These English terms are equivalent to *Adel* and *Aristokratie* in German, *noblesse* and *aristocratie* in French, *nobiltà* and *aristocrazia* in Italian, *nobleza* and *aristocracia* in Spanish.

86 Aurell, Western Nobility 264-265.

87 Guilhiermoz, Essai noblesse 1.

88 Bloch, Société féodale II 1-2.

89 Philippe Contamine for example applied Bloch’s definition to his seminal work on *La noblesse au royaume de France. De Philippe le Bel a Louis XII* in 1997, see Contamine, Noblesse esp. 6.

90 Reuter, Medieval Nobility 178-179.

However, Reuter also concluded that this definition is almost never used coherently. Instead, nobility is usually described »as a set of individuals whose status is legally defined and an aristocracy as that same set perceived as a sociologically defined group<sup>91</sup>«. David Crouch has recently used Reuter's strict definition and concluded that »as a group, (the aristocracy) is usually wider than the nobility in any generation, and its nature is more often evident to historians than to the contemporaries<sup>92</sup>«. Thus, according to Crouch, the aristocracy is not the same set of individuals as the nobility, but a broader group of people with political and economic influence who were not necessarily part of the nobility<sup>93</sup>.

The terminological differentiation between aristocracy and nobility can also express the differences in social realities between Western Europe and the Byzantine Empire. As has been widely discussed, the Byzantines never developed a legal separation between the upper social classes and the rest of the population. Scholars therefore nowadays avoid the term *nobility* for the Byzantine upper social strata. In his recent study on the representation of the Byzantine higher classes, Michael Grünbart for example uses the term *aristocracy*<sup>94</sup>. John Haldon abandons this term altogether and speaks of *social élites*, which he separates from *power élites*. According to him, the former

notion has historically been applied to an economically distinct group, whose access to and greater degree of control over the basic means of production in a society ensures their exercise of political power and implies also an increasing exclusiveness and inaccessibility with respect to those with restricted or no such access at all. The definition of power élite requires, in contrast, that while remaining exclusive in its control of political authority, it needs to remain open to the influence of other groups and even recruit new personnel therefrom, in order to safeguard its dominant position<sup>95</sup>.

Haldon thus distinguishes between the élite as a broad socio-economic group and the power élite as the small circle of persons who wield executive power<sup>96</sup>. He adds that, while we can generally distinguish the élite from other parts of society by its culture and values, it »usually comprises a number of

separable elements or factions. [...] There are generally layers or levels of élite status and identity, involving also vertical as well as horizontal solidarities<sup>97</sup>«. Members of different élite groups may not perceive themselves as belonging to one and the same élite, but »see themselves rather as independent, autonomous groups in competition with other similar groups<sup>98</sup>«. Haldon's definition of élite is thus very close to Crouch's *aristocracy*, in terms of the socio-economic distinction as well as the group's perception by its contemporaries<sup>99</sup>.

This insistence that contemporaries may not see themselves as members of the same group but perhaps even as members of competing groups is an important point. However, it also provokes a question concerning the definition of *social group* itself. In sociology, the most important criterion for the definition of a *social group* is that its members be aware that they belong to a defined group, be it a club, an informal group of friends, a political party or a whole society<sup>100</sup>. By identifying social groups according to their common traits and not only by their shared identity, historians depart from the sociological definition. In this study, I will use both sociological notions of self-definition and the outside perspective of the historian. I will discuss which of the various terms describing social groups are effective for the Cypriot upper strata in more detail during the description of Cypriot élite groups in chapter one.

## Social Mobility

Until now, we have thought about social groups in a static manner, trying to discern which terms are effective to describe social structures. However, this study will be very much about social change and the dynamics between social groups<sup>101</sup>. It will be especially concerned with *social mobility*, that is with the movement of actors (or social objects or values) from one social position to another<sup>102</sup>. The term was first introduced into sociological thinking by Pitirim Sorokin, a Russian-American sociologist, in his monography *Social Mobility* in 1927. Sorokin examined social mobility in general, with regard to objects or values as well as individuals and

91 Reuter, *Medieval Nobility* 179.

92 Crouch, *Birth of Nobility* 3.

93 Some scholars have transferred this differentiation to the earlier Middle ages and have argued that there was no nobility in the strict sense in these times, because the upper classes had no legal privileges. Others, such as Karl Ferdinand Werner, have argued strongly against this claim, opining that it is not possible to negate the existence of a nobility when the sources themselves continually mention nobles. Nobility in the early Middle ages should instead be connected to the ruling class character of the group who represent the power of the state. According to Werner, transferring a definition of nobility derived from the later Middle ages to earlier periods is anachronistic, see Werner, *Naissance* 126. 135. We shall therefore keep in mind that the definition of the term is closely connected to the period under study.

94 Grünbart, *Inszenierung* 15. For other references, see e.g. Cheynet, *Aristocracy 2*; Magdalino, *Court Society and Aristocracy* 219. Other scholars, especially in older studies, have not differentiated between nobility and aristocracy, such as Každan, *Social'nyj sostav*; Kazhdan/Ronchey, *L'aristocrazia bizantina* or Weiss, *Kantakuzenos*.

95 Haldon, *Social Élités* 170-171.

96 Haldon's concept of power élite goes back to the important US-American work by C. Wright Mills, *Power Élite*. Cf. Haldon, *Social Élités* 172 and n. 10.

97 Haldon, *Social Élités* 171.

98 Haldon, *Social Élités* 172. This notion can also be found in Contamine, *Noblesse* 7, who sees the nobility as one of these élite groups. Cf. also Burkhardt, *Der hansische Bergenhandel* 32.

99 Its similarity to the use of aristocracy in other works such as Kazhdan's well-known study on the Byzantine aristocracy is explicitly mentioned by Haldon himself, see Haldon, *Social Élités* 171, n. 9; cf. Každan, *Social'nyj sostav*, passim.

100 Maconis/Plummer, *Sociology* 126; Korte/Schäfers, *Hauptbegriffe der Soziologie* 154-159.

101 Cf. Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 279, who emphasizes that a society is never static, but is always involved in processes of change.

102 Sorokin, *Social Mobility* 133 and Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 280.

groups<sup>103</sup>. However, this study is interested in the movement of persons between social groups and within the hierarchical structures of society, examining social upwards and downwards movements. Sociologists call this type of movement *vertical social mobility*<sup>104</sup>, as opposed to *horizontal social mobility*, which describes for example a change of profession between two hierarchically equivalent sectors. According to Rössel, these movements not only concern the individuals involved, but the whole social structure, which develops through the changes made in individual positions<sup>105</sup>.

Sorokin considered seven channels through which individuals or families could achieve social mobility: the army, the church, school (or education), governmental groups or political organizations, professional organizations, wealth-making organizations and family<sup>106</sup> or »marriage with a person of another social stratum<sup>107</sup>«. He also differentiated between three independent levels of vertical social mobility: economic, occupational and political<sup>108</sup>. For example, individuals who rose on the economic level by enhancing their yearly income might not make gains on the political level<sup>109</sup>. Other sociologists instead examine status or prestige, economic position and military or political power as the three levels of inequality on which social mobility can occur<sup>110</sup>. With these differentiations in mind I shall examine the levels and channels through which Cypriot families or individuals climbed or descended.

Nowadays, a vital sociological distinction is drawn between *intra-* and *intergenerational social mobility*<sup>111</sup>. *Intergenerational mobility* describes the social mobility of children with respect to their parent's social position. A typical example of this in German post-War society would be the farmer's son who goes to university and becomes a doctor, thus moving up the social scale as far as prestige and probably income are concerned. This is the most classical type of social mobility and formerly the only social movement included in the term *social mobility*. However, today, *intragenerational social mobility* is also part of the social mobility concept. This term describes the social movement of an individual within their own lifespan. It is therefore connected with the concept of career, and compares an individual's standing during different phases

of their life<sup>112</sup>. I will consider both these aspects of social mobility. While intergenerational social mobility will play an important role in the analysis of the various groups and their social development in chapter two, intragenerational mobility will stand in the foreground in the analysis of power élites in chapter four. However, the latter is obviously connected to intergenerational social mobility, as the careers analysed here are exceptional compared to the parent generation<sup>113</sup>.

## Prosopography and Social Network Analysis

Now that the theoretical framework of the social analysis is set, the methods of the analysis deserve some consideration. Timothy Reuter postulated in his research survey on medieval nobility in 1997 that a detailed examination of nobility must begin with genealogy and prosopography, »for these supply historians with their raw material<sup>114</sup>«. Prosopography will accordingly figure as the basic method adopted by this study, though some genealogy will also be involved.

Prosopography is a method often implemented by historians today<sup>115</sup>. However, several modern definitions of prosopography exist. In an introductory essay to the most well-known prosopographical lexicon of ancient history, the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (PIR), Marietta Horster points out that

prosopography is a modern word for the study of individual persons in a larger context. Although no agreed definition exists, in classics and ancient history it is often used to give a name to a lexicon, or a study, that includes all persons relevant to a specific and fixed period, or to a political structure or other entity. Prosopography is also used to denote the prosopographical method, which arranges and discusses persons according to their names and aims to establish the social contexts of groups, such as their ethnic and regional origin, family connections and careers<sup>116</sup>.

Horster introduces prosopography as a dual method, consisting of two steps: first, prosopography is a collective bi-

103 Sorokin, *Social Mobility*. See especially 133. Already in 1959, when his study was reprinted, the sociological community had frequently used Sorokin's concept, as he proudly mentioned in his foreword to this second edition. The concept is still widely accepted and used today. Newer introductions to the concept may be found in Kerbo, *Social stratification* 12-14. 325-366; Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* (ch. four) as well as in Groß, *Klassen, Schichten, Mobilität* (chs four and five). For surveys on sociological research in this field, see Ganzeboom et al., *Comparative Intergenerational Stratification Research and Breen/Jonsson, Inequality of Opportunity*.

104 Sorokin, *Social Mobility* 133 and Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 281.

105 Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 279.

106 Sorokin, *Social Mobility* 164-181.

107 Sorokin, *Social Mobility* 179.

108 Sorokin, *Social Mobility* 136.

109 This difference of standing on different levels is usually coined as *status consistency*. If an individual has the same rank concerning wealth, power and prestige, their status is comparatively consistent. If, on the other hand, an individual has e.g. an advanced university degree and therefore a high social standing, but receives a modest income, their status is inconsistent. See Macionis/Plummer, *Sociology* 184. Cf. Grusky/Weisshaar, *Questions about Inequality* 2-3.

110 See Kerbo, *Social Stratification* 50-51. Grusky and Weisshaar in *Questions about Inequality* 3 even set up a table of eight levels or assets for social inequality (and therefore, mobility): economic, power, cultural, social, honourific, civil, human and physical assets. However, many of these assets are not visible in our sources and I shall therefore not use this model.

111 Kerbo, *Social Stratification* 328-329; Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 281.

112 Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 281.

113 Sociological studies often use so-called *social mobility-matrices*, tables listing for example parents' and childrens' social positions in matrix, which allow to calculate the percentage of social mobility in a given sector of society, see Rössel, *Sozialstrukturanalyse* 284; Erikson/Goldthorpe, *Intergenerational Inequality* 31. I will not use this method, as there are not enough data to provide a statistically sound analysis.

114 Reuter, *Medieval Nobility* 184.

115 The term prosopography itself already existed in the sixteenth century, although then it meant the study of personal appearance. Either in the eighteenth or the nineteenth century, it first appeared in its modern meaning. See Beech, *Prosopography* n. 1.

116 Horster, *The Prosopographia* 231.

ography<sup>117</sup>. It researches all available biographical data for members of a specific group, such as date and place of birth, family origin, friends and acquaintances, wealth, career or religious faith, in an attempt to, second, »explore and explicate the lives of people who, when treated as individuals, often remain obscure<sup>118</sup>«. Other definitions of prosopography differ from this description. Sometimes the second, analytical step is left out and data collation remains the focus, while at other times agreement on the nature and limits of the group of people under consideration cannot be reached. However, scholars usually agree that prosopography investigates groups of people along biographical lines and uses the data to suggest social explanations for historical phenomena that transcend the mere information about the life and careers of individuals<sup>119</sup>.

Nevertheless, prosopographical research has attracted some critics. Historians from various fields lament that prosopographical studies often do little more than collecting data. The Byzantinist Dion Smythe points out: »one major fault of prosopographers is their belief that the completion of the prosopography marks the completion of their work; in fact it marks the start of their analytical work<sup>120</sup>«. The reverse phenomenon also exists: sometimes historians forget the importance of diligent work during the first phase of data collection and simply focus on the special methods of computing the data<sup>121</sup>.

However, if the historian manages to avoid both pitfalls, prosopography is an effective method of historical research. I intend to implement it using the collection of data on families, individuals, careers, values and religious affiliations to highlight social structures and social change within the Cypriot élite. To this end, I have created a database and collected all the data available on members of aristocratic groups in Cyprus between 1374, the end of the Genoese-Cypriot war, and the 1460s, when James II's reign began. The database

registers every member of the élite mentioned in the sources more than once<sup>122</sup>. It comprises ca. 800 individuals<sup>123</sup>. The analysis officially ends before James II came to power, since many changes in the ruling classes occurred during his reign, posing altogether different questions. Nevertheless, I shall also use data and sources pertaining to James II's reign to develop a picture of the preceding years. The database itself will not be published here, as this would exceed the frame of the study<sup>124</sup>. However, its publication is a project to be undertaken in the future.

The database registers data such as name (and therefore family connection), ethnic origin, social standing<sup>125</sup>, an individual's contacts with other people on both business and private levels, and all other relevant biographical information. In this way, I hope to gain a more systematic insight into the development of Cypriot aristocratic groups than previous studies which used selective sources such as lists of nobles for the analysis of the Cypriot élite<sup>126</sup>. It is obvious that even with this method I am still far from recording every aristocratic individual or family in Cyprus at the time. Data always remains partial and incomplete, even without considering individuals who I may have failed to register, so I will approach any kind of statistical analysis with care<sup>127</sup>. Moreover, the sources all have their own characteristics and limitations, which I will discuss later<sup>128</sup>. Despite all this, this systematic overview reveals some interesting tendencies in the development of the various groups during the fifteenth century<sup>129</sup>.

As may be expected, family will play an important role in this analysis. When George Beech wrote a first survey on prosopography in medieval studies in 1976, he reminded the reader that prosopography is based on the assumption that family and interpersonal relationships in general played a crucial role in medieval societies and are usually important for the explanation of personal careers and advancements<sup>130</sup>. Padgett and Ansell in their study on Florentine élites in the

117 Cf. Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 4-5. 15-16.

118 Website of the Journal *Medieval Prosopography*, published by Medieval Institute Publications at Western Michigan University. <https://wmich.edu/medievalpublications/journals/prosopography> (01 December 2020).

119 For other definitions of the method, see Verboven et al., *Short Manual* 39, with many references to other works, and cf. Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 18-24. Bulst/Genet, *Medieval Lives*, first page of the introduction (unnumbered) leave out the analytical step of prosopography and rather contrast it to biography, stating that in contrast to the latter it does not aim to describe personalities. Ridder-Symoens in turn speaks of a well-defined group of people while Bulst just talks about persons from a specific milieu, see Bulst, *Zum Gegenstand 3* and Ridder-Symoens, *Prosopografie* 96.

120 Smythe, *A Whiter Shade* 129-30. The Romanist T. F. Carney shares the same opinion, cf. Carney, *Prosopography* 174 and Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 6. Cf. also Reuter, *Medieval Nobility* 184; Nelson et al., *Medieval Prosopographies* 157.

121 Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 7.

122 However, members of known families who are mentioned only once are taken into consideration, while individuals who are found in the sources only once, and whose family is otherwise unknown, are usually excluded from the database. Individuals without a last name are also not included.

123 For the database, I have used Microsoft Access, a well-known database computer programme which scholars frequently use for such purposes, cf. Padgett, *Open élite* 360 and n. 7.

124 The study therefore follows an approach often taken in prosopographical research. Only some publications actually include the database, see Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 8.

125 I usually use emic terminology in the database.

126 For the lists, see the discussion on the sources, p. 29. The only exception is the work by Wilpertus Rudt de Collenberg, which I have discussed in the research overview, see p. 12. Rudt de Collenberg actually collected a lot of data on the Cypriot upper classes, but his work methods were unreliable, so that his work has to be approached with care. Cf. also p. 25 on the notarial documents which Rudt de Collenberg collected. – Scholars of other regions have pointed to the usefulness of systematic studies for data on the nobility. Both Christine Carpenter, *Locality and Polity* 35-36, for Warwickshire, and Mario Damen, *Knighthood in Brussels*, esp. 258, for the district (*ammanie*) of Brussels, have for example used documents that provide cross-sections of the respective groups under consideration, thus providing a »full« picture of the groups in the respective moments of time.

127 This is the case with most historical prosopographical studies, cf. Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 12. Bruneau, *Toward a New Collective Biography* 67 calls this the »statistical modesty« of historical research, which according to him does not deny its historical value.

128 See p. 23.

129 Cf. also Kazhdan/Constable, *People and Power* 177 who discuss the pitfalls of statistical analysis, but come to the conclusion that »despite its many limitations and restrictions, statistical evidence provides better, clearer, and more reliable conclusions than the accumulation of occasional and separate examples«.

130 Beech, *Prosopography* 185-186. For the importance of family in Byzantine society, cf. Haldon, *Towards a Social History* 13.

early 1400s offer an effective definition for *family* in this period. They conceive of family as a clan subsuming people with a common last name (and therefore a common male ancestor), rather than a household, thus tying together members of numerous nuclear families<sup>131</sup>. This also seems the best perspective on Cypriot elite families, judging from the way family and lineage are represented in the sources: Isabelle Ortega has recently shown how the sense of lineage reaching back to a common ancestor characterizes the well-known *Lignages d'Outremer*, a genealogy collection on Cyprus and the Holy Land which is preserved in different versions from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries<sup>132</sup>. A source from fifteenth century Cyprus illustrates that this perception did not change during the period under consideration: when Philippe Podocataro petitioned the pope so that Latin churches might be erected on the Podocataro family estates in 1472, he requested this licence for all the members of his family, male and female. In this instance, Philippe intended as family all those who were descendants of his father Jean, as well as their partners:

and so this same petition applied to himself and to the others mentioned above, and to their brothers and sisters and to their spouses from the family Podocataro of Podoris and to the descendants of the late Jean Podocataro, the same Philippe's father, of either sex<sup>133</sup>.

The text explicitly mentions descendants of either sex, and indeed, one of Philippe's co-petitioners was Gioffredo Babin, the son of his sister Marie, who had married a certain Jean Babin. The families daughters married into should therefore not be forgotten<sup>134</sup>. An important part of chapter three will consider the marriage alliances of important aristocratic families. However, for practical reasons, the basic prosopographical analysis will be structured around family members with the same surname. This does not mean that I will not consider individuals as well. Though families remain central to my study, individual careers will contribute greatly to the analysis, and illustrate how social mobility worked.

The more traditional concept of prosopography and research of family histories will be accompanied by a newer method

of representing and analysing prosopographical data: *Social Network Analysis* (SNA). This method originated in social sciences and allows the systematic registration and graphic representation of contacts within a group. Therefore, it is even mentioned as a constitutive part of a »new-style« prosopography: »traditional prosopography links individuals to a variety of objects – offices held, for example – whereas »new« prosopography is equally concerned with the networks of which each individual forms a part<sup>135</sup>«. Social Network Analysis is based on the assumption that relationships between people matter<sup>136</sup> – for the analysis of social structures within a group, but also for identities or careers and social mobility. In their introduction to *Social Network Analysis and PAJEK* (a computer program employing this method), De Nooy and his fellow editors specify: »the *main goal* of social network analysis is detecting and interpreting patterns of social ties among actors<sup>137</sup>«. Interpreting relationship patterns in fifteenth-century Cypriot elite groups is one of the major goals of this study, and I shall make use of Social Network Analysis to illustrate these patterns graphically.

Social Network Analysis uses computer programs such as ORA, PAJEK or Node-xl to compute graphs representing the connectedness within groups. A graph usually consists of a number of so-called *nodes* (points, or vertices) representing individuals or groups which are connected by lines (in some cases called *edges*<sup>138</sup>) that symbolize relationships between the group members (see e. g. **fig. 5**)<sup>139</sup>. In this way, a graph illustrates a *network*, which can be understood as a group of actors and their social relationships with each other<sup>140</sup>.

Additionally, the graphs may be fed with certain measurements, mathematical processes that analyse various aspects of the group. For example, they can compute and visualize the density of a network, i. e. how tightly people within a group are connected to each other, by taking the average of the node's *degrees* (i. e. the number of edges connecting a node to other nodes<sup>141</sup>). The graphs may furthermore pinpoint individuals with multiple connections within a group (one way to do this would again be to compute a person's degree). Social Network Analysis presupposes that those individuals with many contacts also have a special standing and importance within the group<sup>142</sup>. Depending on the measures

131 Padgett/Ansell, *Robust Action* 1267; cf. Perroy, *Social Mobility* 27, who uses the same definition.

132 Ortega, *Réflexions* 352-353. For the *Lignages*, see *Lignages d'Outremer* (Nielen).

133 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro 173-174: Et sicut eadem peticio subiugebat sibi et aliis supradictis eorumque fratribus et sororibus ac consortibus huiusmodi de familia Podocatora de Podoris et ex quondam Ioanne Podocataro ipsius Philippi genitore descendentes utriusque sexus*.

134 Ortega, *Réflexions* 353 also emphasizes the importance of the marriage alliances of daughters.

135 Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 13. Cf. Smythe, *A Whiter Shade* 132-133.

136 De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 3.

137 De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 5. The term *actor* is usually used in SNA to denote an individual (or group) involved in a social network, see Burkhardt, *Der hansische Bergenhandel* 43, n. 39.

138 Lines can be directed or undirected (in the second case symbolizing reciprocal relationships). Undirected lines, which will interest us here most, are called *edges*, see De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 7.

139 De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 1-7. This is a useful textbook explaining SNA and its practical application with the computer programme PAJEK. For further introductory literature, see the classical Wasserman/Faust, *Social Network Analysis*, but also Jansen, *Einführung in die Netzwerkanalyse*; Jackson, *Social and Economic Networks*; Vega-Redondo, *Complex Social Networks*.

140 Burkhardt, *Der hansische Bergenhandel* 43. Cf. De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 7.

141 De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 62-64.

142 Some scholars even go as far as attributing more importance for successful agency to the position occupied within the network than to personal attributes, see Keats-Rohan, *Chameleon or Chimera* 23. As has been exposed above, I shall not follow this approach, but rather conceive of agency as balanced between identity construction and social structures in the way explained by Haldon.



computed in the graph, it can also render information on subgroups within a larger group, or on an individual's *betweenness*, the measure in which a person connects other individuals within the group<sup>143</sup>. These measurements assign certain mathematical values to the nodes and edges, which are then visualized by varying both the colour and size of the edges and nodes (see e.g. **fig. 6** for a network showing the centrality of its members by their degree).

Medievalists and other historians have successfully applied Social Network Analysis in a wide range of topics<sup>144</sup>. Despite these successful studies, Social Network Analysis has also been criticised – and rightly so – for its various pitfalls, such as valuing the aesthetic qualities of a graph above the actual information presented or comparing relationships which are in fact not comparable. Similarly, scholars have sometimes treated the relationships described by the graphs as unchangeable and have forgotten that such ties are always renegotiated over time and depend on the roles, identities and beliefs of the actors. Some studies have also used so much information for their graphs that they become unintelligible<sup>145</sup>. Therefore, I shall try to apply Social Network Analysis carefully. I will use it for two purposes, firstly for visualizing marriage alliances between aristocratic families, and secondly for the visualization and, partly, computation of the structures of the Cypriot power élite in the fifteenth century. For each graph, I shall use appropriate sets of information: the graphs on the power élite, for example, will compare only sources pertaining to a certain set of relationships, such as sessions of the Haute Court and official state acts, which refer to the same professional context of statesmen acting as witnesses for important transactions<sup>146</sup>.

The aim of the graphs is foremost to visualize the information contained in the sources. In general, the sources are too scarce and chronologically too far between, especially for the end of the fourteenth century, to compute measurements such as an individual's centrality. This changes slightly in the middle of the fifteenth century, where more sources have been preserved from a shorter period. I shall therefore use some of the measurements, such as degree centrality, there.

Even considering these restrictions, my study benefits greatly from the use of network graphs, because they help present complicated sets of prosopographical information lucidly and clearly. Each graph will be associated with an analysis that considers its actors' cultural identities and social roles.

I will make use of timelines as a complementary tool to illustrate the development of the groups under analysis by visualizing the periods in which we can grasp certain families and individuals in the sources (chapter two, see e.g. **fig. 1**)<sup>147</sup>. Moreover, in chapter four I will analyse the composition of the Cypriot power élite in various periods by registering the time spans in which certain men were members of the power élite (see e.g. **fig. 13**). However, the timelines do not show how many sources concern a family or individual and how many years lie in between the sources. A family mentioned only two or three times in the whole century will have the same line as a family mentioned more than twenty times in the same period. Therefore, the text commentary will complement the graphs and discuss these differences. For the chapters on the various foreign groups, such as Venetians or Catalans, I have not provided graphs, as information is generally too fragmentary to make a visualization of these groups sensible.

## The Sources

The sources on fifteenth-century Cyprus are fascinating, manifold, and at the same time, quite fragmented. The Lusignan state archives in Cyprus were lost during the Ottoman conquest of the island in 1570<sup>148</sup>. Scholars of the Lusignan period therefore must rely on sources that were preserved in other archives, above all in Venice, Genoa and the Vatican. Louis de Mas Latrie made a substantial effort to publish many of these sources at the end of the nineteenth century. Scholars took up his work particularly in the second half of the twentieth century and have published modern editions of the essential sources on the Lusignan period during the last decades<sup>149</sup>. Nevertheless, some sources still lie unpublished in the Italian archives. The present study therefore builds on various ex-

143 De Nooy et al., *Exploratory Analysis* 131.

144 M. Burkhardt for example has used SNA to describe the network of Hanse-merchants in Bergen (Norway) in the fifteenth century (Burkhardt, *Der hansische Bergenhandel*). R. Gramsch has recently thought about the German empire in the thirteenth century as a network of princes (Gramsch, *Netzwerk der Fürsten*). As early as 1993, J. Padgett and C. Ansell published a now classical study on the rise of the Medici in Florence, using SNA to demonstrate how the Medici faction differed structurally from their opponents. Padgett wrote a more general study on social mobility in the Florentine élites in 2010. He successfully applied SNA as well as other statistical tools, creating a broad overview of Florentine élites on the basis of a dataset including 60,000 individuals (Ansell/Padgett, *Robust Action*; Padgett, *Open Élite?*). Moreover, G. Christ and F. Apellániz have recently studied Venetian merchant trading and information networks in Alexandria and have examined how these networks profited Venice by breaking the very rules imposed by the republic (Christ, *Beyond the Network*; Apellániz, *Venetian Trading Networks*). In Byzantine studies, M. Mullett presented a pioneer study in 1997 on Theophylactos of Ochrid's ego-network by examining his letters with the help of network theory (Mullett, *Theophylact*). J. Preiser-Kapeller has presented a number of studies over the last years employing SNA. For example, he studied the politics

of the patriarchate of Constantinople by analysing the members of the synod participating in its sessions. In more recent studies, he has used network analysis to explain the connectivity of harbours, not only in the Byzantine empire, but also reaching out to Southeast Asia, and has studied border networks between actors from various cultural groups (Preiser-Kapeller, *Der Mehrheitsbeschluss in der Synode*; Preiser-Kapeller, *Harbours and Maritime Networks*; Preiser-Kapeller, *Harbours and Maritime Mobility*; Preiser-Kapeller, *Webs of Conversion*; Preiser-Kapeller, *Complex Historical Dynamics*; Preiser-Kapeller, *Großkönig, Kaiser und Kalif*). Most recently, Niels Gaul has written about networking strategies at the court of Andronikos II Palaiologos (Gaul, *All the Emperor's Men*).

145 See e.g. Malkin, *Small Greek World 18-19*; McLean, *Art of the Network 16*; Mische, *Relational Sociology 81*; Emirbayer/Goodwin, *Network Analysis 1446*.

146 The only exception will be lists of addressees of state letters, which can be seen as equivalent in analytical function to the lists of witnesses, see ch. 4 and p. 106 for the letters in particular.

147 I have used the standard Microsoft programme *Office Timeline* to visualize the graphs.

148 Grivaud, *Literature 226*.

149 Cf. p. 11 ns 18. 19.

cellent source editions as well as on unpublished documents particularly from the Venetian archives.

Though fragmentary, the sources for fifteenth-century Cyprus are rich in comparison, for example, to those on the Byzantine empire, where notarial documents and particularly privileges granted by the authorities have often not survived. However, compared to other cases such as medieval Florence, Venice or Genoa, our collection of sources is very small. In 2010, John Padgett published a study on the élites in Renaissance Florence between 1282 and 1494. His dataset comprised economic, political and kinship information on over 60,000 individuals. He was able to access information on the location of family homes in specific neighbourhoods as well as political office and marriage alliances. Padgett could link 76,1 % of the individuals directly to their fathers, a high percentage of certainty on genealogical connections<sup>150</sup>. In comparison to these data, the information on the aristocracy in Cyprus is much more limited. Some Cypriot families appear in the sources only twice in the century under consideration with a long interval in between the mentions. In these cases, we cannot be sure that the individuals belonged to the same family at all, and we will have to treat this information with care<sup>151</sup>. Other families, in contrast, are very well documented.

In general, the distribution of the sources is a crucial factor for the possibilities of studying social developments among the Cypriot élite. The sources for prosopography are unevenly distributed and offer more details on some groups and periods than on others. Members of the aristocracy generally appear in the sources either in their relationship to the king or to the Church. We discern the private level of aristocratic society less clearly, since the sources in this section are limited. The higher echelons of nobility are better documented than the lower strata, since they feature in sources concerning state affairs as well as other, more personal documents, such as testaments. However, fief privileges and other transactions of the Haute Court, as well as tombstones, provide information on individuals and families of lesser aristocratic circles. Chronologically, the end of the fourteenth century is well documented, while the first two decades of the fifteenth century lack substantial sources. The 1430s to 1450s, in contrast, feature the densest collection of notarial documents, though the chronicles have next to no information at all on this period.

The study will naturally focus particularly on the groups and periods which provide the most information. For example, chapter four will attempt a comparison of the power élites at the end of the fourteenth century and the 1430s to

1450s. The general prosopographical analysis in chapter two, however, will cover the whole period, using all information available, while keeping in mind that the scarce documentation of some periods must be taken into account.

As is common for prosopographical studies, the present analysis builds on a great variety of sources that range from archival documents such as state treaties, fief privileges or testaments, to chronicles and other more specific text sorts, such as lists of nobles. The sources present particular characteristics and problems that are crucial for their interpretation, especially in the case of the chronicles and the lists. I will therefore provide an overview of the sources and discuss their particularities in the following pages.

## Archival Documents

Archival documents are crucial for prosopographical analysis, as they allow us to collect data about individuals and families. Under this category, I consider a wide variety of documents that we may roughly divide into four groups. First, they may be state treaties or other documents of importance for the Lusignan kingdom, such as appointments of royal procurators, which were usually witnessed by high state officials or the Haute Court<sup>152</sup>. These documents provide insight into the kingdom's power élite. Many of them were published as early as the nineteenth century in Louis de Mas Latrie's extensive collections<sup>153</sup>. Where he summarizes information which he considered less important, I have sometimes been able to counter-check this information in the Italian archives<sup>154</sup>.

A second group of documents comprises privileges awarded by the Haute Court or the king himself. They offer information on the composition of the Haute Court, but also on royal vassals, buyers and sellers of land, or the king's creditors, and illustrate everyday relations between the king and his subjects<sup>155</sup>. Jean Richard has published a great number of them in the last decades, including the *Livre des remembrances de la secrète du royaume de Chypre* from the years 1468-1469. This crucial source contains the largest collection of administrative documents from the Lusignan court preserved until today, ranging from orders concerning secretarial salaries to fief privileges and tax payments. It allows insights into the workings of the Lusignan court under James II and is a treasure mine of prosopographical information both on James II's reign and the preceding decades<sup>156</sup>.

A third group consists in documents of a personal nature, such as testaments or procurations between members of the

150 Padgett, *Open Élités* 360-361.

151 Cf. ch. 2.1, p. 56 and 2.2, p. 63.

152 Mas Latrie edited many of these documents, see Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire II*, e.g. 371-372, 420-423, 434-436 and the further explanations below.

153 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire II*, III; Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves; Documents nouveaux* (Mas Latrie).

154 Mas Latrie, *Histoire II* 436, n. 3, for example, only summarizes a treaty between Cyprus and Venice from 18 October 1397 and the ambassadors in-

olved. I have been able to counter-check the contents and the ambassador names and titles in ASVen, *Commemoriali*, *Commemoriali*, *Registri* 9 fol. 38<sup>r</sup>.

155 We find these documents in *Documents chypriotes* (Richard) 139-157; Richard, *Une famille; Remembrances de la haute court* (Viollet). A busta in MCC, PDC 2669.2 contains various fief privileges, unedited until now.

156 *Livre des remembrances* (Richard); cf. the older edition in Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire III* 184-306.

aristocracy<sup>157</sup>. These documents contain valuable information about marriage networks, families and their religious affiliations. Jean Richard has published some documents of this type concerning the Syrian Audeth family, which stem from a larger collection of documents in the Venetian state archive that regard the family's inheritance. I have been able to examine this collection and have discovered additional information besides that which Richard rendered available<sup>158</sup>. Even so, the number of testaments in general is rather small in comparison with other sources at my disposal.

In addition to these documents, which pertain directly to affairs of aristocrats under Lusignan jurisdiction, there are very good editions of notarial documents from Genoese Famagusta that offer information both about Genoese and about Cypriot aristocrats who dealt with them<sup>159</sup>. Moreover, a new edition of documents concerning Cyprus from the Hospitaller archives has been meticulously prepared by K. Borhardt, A. Luttrell and E. Schöffler<sup>160</sup>. Although the documents mostly concern Hospitaller business, they are useful for studying the Order's relations to the kingdom.

Finally, a fourth group of documents is preserved in the papal registers. They concern papal privileges such as absolutions and marriage dispensations, and benefices such as canonries. Count W. Rudt de Collenberg collated many of these documents, doing pioneer work in the Vatican Archives<sup>161</sup>. However, Rudt de Collenberg made some mistakes, and he often does not refer to his sources, so that it is sometimes impossible to cross-check his information. Fortunately, C. Perrat, J. Richard and C. Schabel have recently published the papal letters concerning Cyprus up to the year 1378<sup>162</sup>, and A. Kouroupakis has submitted his dissertation on Cyprus and the Great Papal Schism in 2018, which edits all papal letters concerning the island between 1378 and 1417<sup>163</sup>. Thanks to these labour-intensive and diligent efforts, the papal letters until 1417 are now easily accessible. For the period between 1417 and 1471, I have made use of Rudt de Collenberg's *Études de prosopographie*<sup>164</sup>. I have been able to cross-check part of this information in the *Archivio Segreto Vaticano* by controlling samples of the entries. About 90% of the samples proved correct. Thus, a certain trust can be placed in this publication. However, I shall still use all Collenberg's information with caution.

Complementary to the notarial documents, the collection of Cypriot medieval tombstones published by Brunhilde Imhaus is useful for information on the lesser nobility in particular, since lesser nobles are not well documented in other sources<sup>165</sup>.

As a supplement to the edited documents, I have been able to use some as yet unpublished archival material. The most important of these sources is a folder with documents pertaining to the Corner family from the *Museo Correr* in Venice (Manuscript MCC, PDc 2669.2). Inter alia, it contains a compilation of Haute Court documents from the middle of the fifteenth century in an Italian translation by Florio Bustron, which concern estates that were either part of the Corners' possessions or were to become theirs later<sup>166</sup>. Another collection of documents from the Venetian state archive concerns the legacies of a certain Antonio de Bergamo, a Venetian resident in Cyprus, along with his wife's testament<sup>167</sup>.

## The Chronicles

The contemporary and near-contemporary chronicles constitute an important source for the history of Cyprus in the fifteenth century, and especially for Cypriot society, culture, and identity narratives. They may be used as complementary sources for the collection of prosopographical data, although this information must be handled with care, since all chroniclers in question sometimes confuse people and dates.

The two most important chronicles for our discussion are the chronicle of Machairas and a chronicle that is attributed to Georgios Bustron. Both were written in fifteenth-century Cyprus and merit a detailed discussion, since the perspective from which their authors wrote is crucial to determining how we may use these sources, particularly where identity narratives are concerned.

The Greek chronicle attributed to Leontios Machairas is entitled *Exēgēsis tēs glykeias chōras Kyprou, hē poia legetai Kronaka toutestin Chronikon* ('Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus Entitled ›Kronaka‹, Which Is to Say Chronicle'<sup>168</sup>). It is a dynastic and political history of the Kingdom of Cyprus under the Lusignans and at the same time a kind of memoir<sup>169</sup>.

157 Testaments can be found in Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 26-30 (Berenger Albi). 22-24 (Pinadeben de Ferrare, see also ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai b. 101/9); Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* (Hugo Podocataro); ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore 22/19. 53/10. 56/3 (Antonio de Bergamo); Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* II 396-400 (Jean de Brie).

158 Richard, *Une famille*; ASVen, Procuratori d San Marco, Citra, Commissaria Audet Antonio da Cipro, b. 132.

159 Folieta, *Actes* (Balard et al.); *Actes de Famagouste* (Balard et al.); Bliznyuk (ed.), *Genuesen auf Zypern; Ganchou, Rébellion*.

160 *Actes de Famagouste* (Balard et al.) 245-368 for Giovanni Bardi; Hospitaller Documents (Luttrell et al.). For a review of this edition, see Wright, *Mediterranean World*.

161 For the period until 1385, Rudt de Collenberg registered the marriage dispensations in Rudt de Collenberg, *Dispenses matrimoniales*. Until 1378 he registered clerics in Cyprus in Rudt de Collenberg, *État et origine*, and for the time of the great schism, he collected first of all the bishops concerning Cyprus, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Le royaume et l'église*.

162 Bullarium Cyprium III (Schabel et al.).

163 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma*. The dissertation is as yet unpublished.

164 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie*.

165 Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae*.

166 MCC, PDc 2669.2 fols 29<sup>v</sup>-32<sup>v</sup>. 42<sup>v</sup>-44<sup>v</sup>.

167 ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai bb. 22/19. 53/10. 56/3; for Antonio's wife, see ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai b. 101/9.

168 For the title, see Machairas, *Exēgēsis* (Dawkins) 2-3 and Machairas, *Exēgēsis* (Konnarē/Pierēs) 65. There is an Italian translation of this chronicle which is known under the name of Strambali chronicle (Strambaldi, *Chronique* [Mas Latrie]). However, since this translation was made in the sixteenth century and does not have any new information of its own (see Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 186. 251), it will not be used for this study, apart from interpretation concerning the Machairas chronicle in this chapter, see below.

169 Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* 297.

The chronicle focuses on four kings of the Lusignan dynasty: Peter I (1359-1369), Peter II (1369-1382), James I (1383-1398) and Janus (1398-1432). A short appendix collects notes on the reign of John II up to 1458<sup>170</sup>. The chronicle has come down to us in three manuscripts and has been edited several times<sup>171</sup>. In 2003, M. Pieris and A. Nicolaou-Konnari published a diplomatic edition of all three Greek manuscripts, which makes it possible to compare the different versions<sup>172</sup>.

The three manuscripts contain roughly two versions of the chronicle. The first version is presented by the manuscript *Codex Venet. Marc. Gr. cl. VII, 16, 1080* today in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (in the following MS V), which is usually seen as the version nearest to the chronicle's original form<sup>173</sup>. The other version, represented by *Codex Oxon. Bodl. Selden supra 14* in Oxford (MS O) and *Codex Raven. Class. 187* in Ravenna (MS R), is less complete than the V version, although the versions do not differ substantially in the events they narrate<sup>174</sup>. MS V is the reason why scholars attribute the greatest part of the chronicle to Leontios Machairas, since he reveals himself as the author on folio 282<sup>v</sup>, and also refers to members of his family throughout the text<sup>175</sup>. It is, however, common opinion that the short notes on John II's reign from 1432 until 1458 are a later addition by an anonymous author<sup>176</sup>.

Leontios Machairas came from a Greek family that worked in the Lusignan administration. He was born between 1360 and 1380. Together with his brother Nicholas, Leontios worked as secretary (Gr. *grammatikos*) to the noble Jean de Noyes around 1402. His brother Peter was in royal service and their eldest brother Paul was a squire<sup>177</sup>. During the Mamluk invasion of 1426, Leontios was responsible for the provisioning of wine to the soldiers, and as such was likely in royal service in this period. In 1432, he went as royal ambassador to the Grand Caraman in Asia Minor. Since he does not

mention this embassy himself, scholars have deduced that he must have written his chronicle before 1432<sup>178</sup>.

However, even if the original form of the chronicle is attributed to Machairas, Gilles Grivaud sounded a note of caution: while in his opinion Machairas was one of the constitutive authors of the chronicle, he argues that the version of the chronicle existing today took shape in the sixteenth century<sup>179</sup>. This question is of importance for an adequate interpretation of the chronicle, especially when it voices opinions of cultural, ethical, and religious nature. If the text was fundamentally reworked in the sixteenth century, then it would be difficult to ascribe its world view to Machairas himself as a representative of the Greek aristocracy.

However, the text preserved in MS V in my opinion does not seem to have undergone a major reworking in the sixteenth century. Two facts support this view. First, the style of the chronicle is not typical for the sixteenth century. The text of MS V features a great percentage of direct speech. It is therefore a very lively account and was most probably composed for reading aloud. The chronicles of the sixteenth century, in contrast, are texts meant for silent reading. Florio Bustron and Amadi, for example, though they follow Machairas almost verbatim for long stretches, consistently omit the verbal speech acts contained in MS V<sup>180</sup>.

A second crucial hint that MS V is actually a version very close to Machairas' text is that it features a consistent system of ideological comments of its own, which the sixteenth century chronicles do not reproduce. Machairas' opinions on religious matters, for example, which express his strong adherence to Orthodox faith and culture (and which scholars have consistently noticed<sup>181</sup>), are omitted by the sixteenth century chronicles. Machairas' negative comment on the conversion<sup>182</sup> of a certain Thibault Belfardge from the Orthodox to the

170 Cf. Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) 3. For a summary of the contents in headlines, see Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) xi-xiii. Concerning the question of the appendix, see Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 188 and below.

171 A fourth manuscript (MS Harley 1825, British Library, London) from the seventeenth century has been recently found that contains extracts copied from one of the other manuscripts (O, see below). However, the extracts do not offer any new information and therefore shall not concern us here. Cf. Nicolaou-Konnari, *New Manuscript*; Nicolaou-Konnari, *History of Manuscripts*. The first edition from 1873 is by Sathas, see Machairas, *Chronikon Kyprou* (Sathas). Dawkins' edition from 1932 constituted the leading edition for a long time, see Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins). For the manuscripts used in this edition, see Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins), vol. 2 p. 1. For comments on the older editions, see Anaxagorou, *Narrative Structures* 27-28; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 186-187; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës) 60.

172 Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës). For a detailed bibliography concerning the chronicle, see Pierës/Nikolaou-Konnarë, *Bibliographikos Odëgos*.

173 For a description of all the manuscripts, see Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës) 27-42; Anaxagorou, *Narrative Structures* 21-27; cf. Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) 1-3.

174 Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) vol. 2 p. 1-2; Anaxagorou, *Narrative Structures* 140; Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* 294.

175 See Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës) 424-425 and Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 630-631.

176 See Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) 3 for Dawkin's opinion that MS V is Machairas' work and cf. Pierës, *Gyrö* 35-36; Kyrrës, *Ideologia* 97-98; Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* 294-295. It is possible that the appendix was originally written in the fifteenth century, although it is tempting to place its composition into the sixteenth century, making it a part of a process of historical synthesis that was going on in the sixteenth century (cf. Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 188. 208). Dawkins'

edition and translation indicate that the appendix reveals a substantial ignorance of fifteenth century Cypriot history, as they place Charlotte of Lusignan's burial in the monastery of St Dominic in Nicosia instead of in Rome (Machairas, *Exëgësis* [Dawkins] § 713). This would have been a good argument to place the composition of the appendix into the sixteenth century. But a look into the new diplomatic edition shows that only MS R makes this mistake, while MS V and MS O relate that Charlotte was announced as queen after her father's death, and do not talk about her death at all, although the phrase is a bit clouded. See Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës) 461-462. For the question of the author of the appendix, see the summary in Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 188.

177 Nicolaou-Konnari, *Ethnic Names* 260; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 110. 475. 495. 612. 630-631. 697.

178 For 1426, see Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) § 674. The embassy met with the traveller Bertrandon de la Broquière, who commented on Machairas, see Broquière, *Voyage d'Outremer* (Schefer) 106-107. For the family of Machairas in general, see Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 188-189; Nikolaou-Konnarë, *Diplomatics* 295-296; PLP nos 17516. 17517. 17519-17522.

179 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 188.

180 See the chronicles *passim*, for example Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 345 and Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Konnarë/Pierës) 401, where the herald in Machairas announces the king's will, and Bustron reproduces the same text in indirect speech. Cf. Anaxagorou, *Narrative Structures* 27. 140-142; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 269.

181 Pierës, *Gyrö* 37-38 with references to older works; Kyrrës, *Ideologia* 97-99; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 189; Anaxagorou, *Narrative Structures* 16-17.

182 Concurrent with recent literature, I will call the changing between Latin and Orthodox or Oriental rites conversion, although it is not a change between different religions. Cf. Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 312.

Latin rite, for example, is absent in both the chronicles of Amadi and Bustron, although they reproduce the rest of the story concerning this man faithfully<sup>183</sup>. Florio Bustron even replaces Machairas' religious comment with a moral reference to the story of Pericles from antiquity, using the typical sixteenth century Renaissance cultural system of references<sup>184</sup>. Together with the authorial comments in the first person mentioned above, this permits us to ascribe the opinions in the chronicle to Machairas, a Greek aristocrat from Cyprus who lived at the end of the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth centuries<sup>185</sup>, even if the text itself is not an autograph and may have undergone minor changes up to the sixteenth century.

Another question of importance are the sources used by Machairas and the way they influence our interpretation of the text. A. Nicolaou-Konnari has shown that Machairas must have had access to the Lusignan state archives and that he used an impressive number of official documents to compose his narrative, in addition to many events of which he was an eyewitness<sup>186</sup>. This should give his account high credibility. However, Nicolaou-Konnari has also shown that Machairas made mistakes<sup>187</sup>. Therefore, we must treat Machairas as a source for events and prosopography with caution.

For the present study, I will use MS V in Pieris/Konnari's edition as the version which is nearest to the text composed by Machairas. I will keep in mind that it was copied in the sixteenth century, though I consider many of the ideological statements Machairas' own. I will discuss each statement during analysis. Quotations will be taken from the older leading edition by Richard Dawkins as far as their reading coincides with MS V. Where they differ, I will quote the new edition. This strategy will guarantee the readability of the quotations, since the spelling in the diplomatic edition is the medieval

one and is difficult to read. As this study is not primarily interested in the linguistic properties of the chronicle, this strategy seems best suited to the interest of the reader.

The second chronicle under consideration is the *Diēgēsīs Chronikas Kyprou archeugonta apo tēn echronian aynst Christou* ('A Narrative of the Chronicle of Cyprus, Begun from the Year of Christ 1456'<sup>188</sup>), which is usually attributed to Georgios Bustron, a civil servant from either a Greek or a Syrian family<sup>189</sup>. The *Diēgēsīs* will not be as crucial as the Machairas chronicle, since the period covered by it is not as central for this study, but it is still valuable for tracing the development of identity issues in the second half of the fifteenth century. The first part of the *Diēgēsīs* describes the rise and rule of James II until his death in 1473, and James is the great hero of this section. The second part discusses his widow Caterina Corner's rule and the contentions over power on the island until its official take-over by the Venetians<sup>190</sup>.

After an early edition by Sathas, Giorgos Kechagioglou published a diplomatic edition together with a traditionally edited text in 1995<sup>191</sup>. Its manuscripts transmit the chronicle as an anonymous text. The first person known to attribute it to Georgios Bustron, one of James II's followers<sup>192</sup>, was his descendant Florio Bustron in his own *Historia*, who cites him as one of his most important sources<sup>193</sup>. It is possible that Florio Bustron had proof of Georgios' authorship, considering that he was his relative, although a certain family bias could also have been involved. The second historian to mention Georgios Bustron as the author of the *Diēgēsīs* was Antonio Colbertaldo. He originated from Asolo near Venice, where Caterina Cornaro had spent the last years of her life, and he wrote her biography in the years between 1586 and 1592<sup>194</sup>.

183 Machairas, *Exēgēsīs* (Konarē/Pierēs) 394-430, esp. 430 for the comment; Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 486-487; Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 339-346.

184 Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 346. Bustron reflects that Thibault, who was executed for murder on the same gallows he himself had erected, recalled the classical story of the Athenian Pericles. Pericles had given a huge bronze bull to the tyrant Phalaris as an instrument for torture, whereupon Phalaris had Pericles himself burnt in it. Another episode is Machairas' comment on the languages of Cyprus, where he deplors the 'barbaric' use of Greek under Lusignan rule. Both the Amadi chronicle and Florio Bustron omit this comment, see Machairas, *Exēgēsīs* (Dawkins) § 158; Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 262; Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 414.

185 Cf. Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* 295.

186 Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* passim.

187 For example, he confused the ambassadors' names when describing a peace treaty between Genoa and Cyprus from 18 April 1365. The men he names as ambassadors really witnessed the renewal of Genoa's privileges accorded by Peter I in 1363, see Nicolaou-Konnari, *Diplomatics* 320-321. Konnari's impression is confirmed by other mistakes found during this study. For example, Machairas presents Jean Soulouan as Antonio de Bergamo's direct successor in the office of chamberlain after 1393. However, a document from 1395 shows that Hodrade de Provane was chamberlain in that year. Soulouan may have taken over the office in 1397, when he is attested as *ordinatus sub officio camere* in a treaty between Venice and Cyprus (Machairas, *Exēgēsīs* [Dawkins] § 625; Mas Latrie [ed.], *Histoire* II 428. 436 n. 3; ASVen, *Commemoriali*, *Commemoriali*, *Registri* 9 fol. 38').

188 See Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou), and Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 67 for the English translation of the title.

189 Documents chypriotes (Richard) 30; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 204; Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 25; Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 255\*.

190 For a summary of the contents, see Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 201\*-220\*; Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 48-53.

191 For Kechagioglou's edition, see Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou). For Sathas' edition, see Boustronios, *Chronikon Kyprou* (Sathas). A newer edition prepared by Papadopoulos was never finished. There is an edition by Paulidis from 1982 (see Boustronios, *Diēgēsīs* [Paulidēs]), which is a reprint of the Sathas edition with a translation into Modern Greek. Cf. Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 269\*-275\*; Kechagioglou, *Paratērēseis* 15-18. Like the chronicle of Machairas, the *Diēgēsīs* has come down to us in three manuscripts which contain two versions of the chronicle. According to Kechagioglou, the oldest manuscript *Codex London. Arund. Gr. 518* (in the following MS A) differs from the other two manuscripts (*Codex Venet. Marc. Gr. VII, 17, 1268*, in the following MS B, and *Codex Venet. Marc. Gr. VII, 16, 1080*, in the following MS V) in its phrasing and sometimes even in the content, although the latter differences are marginal. All three manuscripts were copied roughly in the middle of the sixteenth century. For a detailed analysis of the manuscripts and their differences, see Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 45\*-60\*. 107\*-120\*. Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) also gives an overview of the manuscripts, but it is based on Kechagioglou's description, see Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 13, n. 1. Sathas in Boustronios, *Chronikon Kyprou* (Sathas) ρμθ'-ρνα' also described the manuscripts which had been found when he made his edition.

192 Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 98. 251\*; Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 27-28.

193 Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 8-9. For a detailed analysis of the relationship between Florio's text and the *Diēgēsīs*, see Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 120\*-126\*.

194 Sathas in Boustronios, *Chronikon Kyprou* (Sathas) ρμζ' and Kechagioglou in Bustron, *Diēgēsīs* (Kechagioglou) 247\* place Colbertaldo and his work at the beginning of the sixteenth century, which would have been quite an early identification of the author. But the new edition of the text by Perocco (2012) proves that his biography dates from the end of the sixteenth century (Colbertaldo, *Storia* [Perocco] 18). For Colbertaldo's comment on Bustron, see Colbertaldo, *Storia* (Perocco) 108.

Colbertaldo does not seem to have known Florio Bustron's work. He identified Georgios Bustron as the chronicle's author independently from Florio<sup>195</sup>. Thus, Georgios was certainly seen as the author of the *Diēgēsis* in the second half of the sixteenth century.

The text of the chronicle itself does not give any direct clue as to its authorship. Georgios appears in the chronicle various times, but he is referred to in the third person and the text's perspective does not change when he is involved<sup>196</sup>. However, Georgios was well versed in the proceedings at the Lusignan court and appears in the chronicle as James II's faithful servant with insider information during the same period in which the historical Georgios served the king<sup>197</sup>. Georgios' later function as *chevetain* of Larnaca and his sojourn in Nicosia accord with the perspective in the second half of the chronicle, which describes events from a Nicosian view even when Famagusta became the centre of events in the early 1470s<sup>198</sup>. There is no conclusive evidence for Georgios' authorship, but many signs suggest that the sixteenth-century identification was correct. This identification has consequences. If Georgios Bustron was the author of the chronicle, we have a second fifteenth-century source written by a representative of the group of ascending Greek and Syrian families. But even if the author was not Bustron, he came from the world of the royal court and therefore his opinion is relevant to our analysis.

The *Diēgēsis* was written between 1489 and 1522<sup>199</sup>, when Cyprus was already under Venetian domination, and this may have influenced the ideology present in the chronicle. According to Nicholas Coureas, Bustron »may have chosen a generally dispassionate and annalistic manner of recording events to keep himself out of trouble<sup>200</sup>«, given the fact that some of James II's most ardent supporters had been exiled by the Venetians. However, Bustron reported many arrests

executed by the Venetian republic, as well as for example the replacement of the Cypriot palace guards with Venetians, events which were symptomatic for the Venetian takeover<sup>201</sup>. He does not conceal these developments. Furthermore, the annalistic style probably also has textual reasons<sup>202</sup>. In any case, the direct political events and opinions do not seem to affect the expression of identity and culture this study is interested in.

As in the case of Machairas, the *Diēgēsis* needs to be treated with caution where prosopographical information and events are concerned. Although it is probable that the author described a time of which he was an eyewitness, he made many mistakes<sup>203</sup>. Even at the end of the chronicle, the time nearest to its composition, the author confuses whole years<sup>204</sup>. Therefore, prosopographical information from the chronicle should generally be treated with the utmost care<sup>205</sup>.

Both the *Exēgēsis* and the *Diēgēsis* are especially useful for this study, since they contain clues to their authors' world of thought and social mental maps. Both authors were probably members of Greek or Syrian families studied here, and they were connected to the Lusignan court. Their opinions are therefore of the highest interest for the analysis of these circles.

During a movement of historical synthesis in the middle of the sixteenth century, scholars used both Machairas and Bustron in order to reconstruct Cypriot history under the Lusignans, and created collations of the two chronicles as well as other material<sup>206</sup>. Three of these chronicles, the so-called chronicle of Amadi, Florio Bustron's *Historia* and the *Description/Chorografia* by Stephen of Lusignan will figure to a lesser extent in this study<sup>207</sup>. They reflect society and worlds of thought from almost a century later, but are able to add information in a few cases.

195 He does not mention Florio Bustron nor follow him concerning the contents of his work (Colbertaldo, *Storia* [Perocco] passim). Perocco, who edited his work, does not mention Florio among Colbertaldo's sources. Colbertaldo, *Storia* (Perocco) 43-44.

196 Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 30. 46. 60. 64. 250\*. For the third-person perspective, cf. Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 220\*.

197 Cf. Tivčev, Bustron 60. 79-80.

198 Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 98. 251\*; Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 27-28 for Bustron's functions. For the perspective in the second half of the chronicle, see Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 154. 178. 180. 182. 212. 218. 258.

199 This is the earliest possible date for the copying of the first manuscript A, see Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 48\*.

200 Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 48.

201 Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 278. 282-288. 308-310.

202 Generally, the *Diēgēsis* is constituted by a mixture of longer episodes and shorter, annalistic passages, duly noted by Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 205. However, annalistic passages appear not only under the new Venetian domination, but also much earlier in the chronicle, when the author describes James II's invasion of Cyprus. Longer episodes characterise the very beginning of the chronicle, which describes James' rise to power (Bustron, *Diēgēsis* [Kechagioglou] 2-98), but are also to be found in between, e. g. when the chronicle describes the Catalan coup d'état, and at the end of the chronicle after the Venetian takeover, when disputes between nobles are described (Bustron, *Diēgēsis* [Kechagioglou] 180-194. 242. 270-272. 280-282. 294-310). It is therefore very unlikely that the author used the annalistic passages to veil his opinion. Rather, he wrote longer episodes when a good story could be told, such as the coup d'état or scandalous conflicts between nobles.

203 See the argumentation in Hill, *History III* 589. For example, Bustron places the conquest of Famagusta on 29 August 1464, although it must have taken

place at least eight months earlier, see Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 134 and in comparison Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 415.

204 For example, Caterina Corner's mother visits her to try to convince her to abdicate and to return to Italy in 1487, although we know from other sources that the conspiracy which is cited as the reason for the visit only took place in 1488 (Bustron, *Diēgēsis* [Kechagioglou] 316; Hill, *History III* 741).

205 It is not clear which kind of sources the *Diēgēsis* relied on. Contrary to Machairas and Florio Bustron, the author did not explicitly comment on his sources, but he probably used archival documents. He cites a list of Charlotte of Lusignan's followers and gives a detailed account of the goods which were pillaged from Nicosia after James II's ascension to the throne (Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 86. 104-108. See also Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 47 and Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 206). He also seems to have seen the document reinstating James as archbishop of Cyprus, as he knows the names of the witnesses (Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 24). The chronicle mentions numerous letters, but it is not clear which letters the author had seen, and which he invented or borrowed from other sources. As far as I know, none of the letters mentioned by the author is extant today. Thus, direct control of their contents is not possible. For comments on the letters, see also Boustronios, *Narrative* (Coureas) 47 and Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 206. It is also possible that he relied on other narrative texts. Florio Bustron mentions that there were numerous narratives about the time of James II, but they are lost today and a comparison is therefore impossible (Bustron, *Historia* [Mas Latrie] 8-9). Only a short chronicle is still extant, but it is very brief and presents dates which differ from the *Diēgēsis*, see Naoumidēs (ed.), *Symmektika* 383.

206 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 248-249.

207 See Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie); Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie); Lusignan, *Description/Chorografia*.

The anonymous chronicle of Amadi is a sixteenth-century compilation of historical works on Cyprus<sup>208</sup>. It was probably written around 1520, but certainly before 1566, and treats Cypriot history in Lusignan times up until 1442. For the period under consideration, it relies heavily on Machairas. It digresses in a few cases from the latter, especially for the time after Janus' captivity, but does not offer any interpretation of historical events of its own<sup>209</sup>. I will therefore use this chronicle in some rare cases where it differs from Machairas.

Florio Bustron's chronicle is more interesting for this study. Dating to between 1560 and 1567<sup>210</sup>, it seems to rely on the same source as Amadi or even used the Amadi chronicle itself extensively<sup>211</sup>, and therefore also follows Machairas almost verbatim in many passages<sup>212</sup>. For the later period, Florio expressly follows his ancestor Georgios Bustron<sup>213</sup>. However, Florio Bustron worked as a clerk for the Venetian administration of Cyprus for many years. He therefore has some information of his own, which he gained from the study of original Lusignan administrative documents such as the *Livre des remembrances*, which he explicitly mentions in his preface<sup>214</sup>. I therefore use his chronicle complementary to Machairas and Georgios Bustron.

Stephen of Lusignan's (1527/1528-ca. 1590<sup>215</sup>) works, in contrast, are notoriously unreliable<sup>216</sup>, and I do not use them except in rare cases, such as the discussion of the lists of nobles below. This sixteenth-century member of the Lusignan family published his encyclopedic work on Cyprus<sup>217</sup> after the Ottoman conquest of the island in 1570 in Italian exile, following it up by an extended French version of the work seven years later<sup>218</sup>. His work is valuable for an analysis of Cypriot Renaissance identities<sup>219</sup>; however, it is marginal for the analysis of the fifteenth century and only of interest because it provides information on the genealogy of the Lusignans in

the second half of the fifteenth century<sup>220</sup>. Since Lusignan's work is full of obvious mistakes, this information, too, must be treated with the utmost care.

## Lists of Nobles

Lists allegedly enumerating nobles are a special source for the analysis of the Cypriot nobility in particular. Count Rudt de Collenberg, but also Benjamin Arbel have used them to assess the composition of the nobility<sup>221</sup>. Some of the lists are part of the chronicles I have just discussed, others have been passed down separately, others again were created as part of administrative processes during Venetian rule. Three such lists have come down to us from the end of the fourteenth century, while four lists were compiled in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. They merit detailed discussion since some of the lists are problematic.

The lists pertaining to the beginning of our period are quite clear. Machairas has enumerated the Cypriot knights who were exiled to Genoa or other places after the Genoese victory over the Cypriots in 1374, and the knights who stayed on the island, in two lists<sup>222</sup>. Judging from their designation as knights, these men must have belonged to the nobility<sup>223</sup>. Benjamin Arbel has taken Machairas' lists to »presumably represent the entire Cypriot nobility in the 1370s<sup>224</sup>«, though we will have to discuss this during the definition of nobility in chapter one. A second list is contained in a sixteenth-century manuscript, now in the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München*. It designates as its author Hugh de Montolive, brother of two exiled noblemen. The list enumerates all »the Cypriot knights and squires whom the false Genoese have taken [captive] and put in prison<sup>225</sup>«. If Hugh de Montolive really was the author

208 Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie). Cf. Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 252-255.

209 For the dating and a detailed analysis of Amadi's sources and its connection to Machairas, see the introduction to the new translation of this text, Amadi, *Chronicle* (Coureas/Edbury) xiv-xix, xxv-xxvi. For the time after Janus' captivity, see Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 514-515; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 698-702. Cf. Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 255; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) 9-11: Dawkins shows how Machairas and Amadi (and Florio Bustron) are often verbally identical, although the later Italian chronicles leave out some episodes which had been of special local interest to the Cypriots in the fifteenth century but had lost significance a century later.

210 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 260 and n. 124.

211 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 261-262 does not mention Amadi among Florio's sources, but Dawkins was convinced that Florio had actually »paraphrased and abridged the work of Amadi« (Machairas, *Exëgësis* [Dawkins] 8), though he does not give a reason for his argument. However, a look into the works shows that Florio Bustron and Amadi must actually either have followed the same source, or Florio must have used Amadi among other sources. Edbury in Amadi, *Chronicle* (Coureas/Edbury), xxvi, makes quite a convincing argument that the latter was the case. For the years between 1426 and 1441, when Amadi's chronicle ends, Florio Bustron and Amadi have an almost identical text, which digresses from Machairas, see Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 369-371; Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 514-515; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 698-702. Cf. also Edbury, *Machaut, Mézières* 351.

212 See e.g. Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 268-269, 349-352; Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 234-241, 599-610.

213 See Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 9 and esp. 373-405.

214 Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 8-9; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 261-262.

215 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 288, 290.

216 Arbel, *Nobility* 179; Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 287-288 gives an overview of the bad press Lusignan has enjoyed because of his frequent mistakes in facts and tries to rehabilitate him as an important source for the sixteenth century.

217 Lusignano, *Chorograffia*. The full title is *Chorograffia, et brevis historia universale dell'Isola di Cipro principiando al tempo di Noè per in sino al 1572*.

218 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 287-290, 292-293. For more general information on Stephen and his works see Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 287-299. For the French version, see Lusignan, *Description*.

219 Grivaud, *Entrelacs* 288, 298-299.

220 For the passages on fifteenth-century Cyprus, see Lusignano, *Chorograffia* fols 48'-75'. For Lusignan genealogy, see Lusignano, *Chorograffia* fols 76'-80'; Lusignan, *Description* fols 189'-208'.

221 See Rudt de Collenberg, *Domē kai Proeleusē* 813; Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* 550-551; Rudt de Collenberg, *Le déclin* 71; Arbel, *Nobility* 178-179, 185. The lists in discussion here all stem from the end of the fourteenth century onwards. I have also used the *Lignages d'Outremer* in the new edition by A. Nielen (*Lignages d'Outremer* [Nielen]) in order to determine the existence of noble families in Cyprus before the period under analysis, see ch. 2.1, p. 51. However, this source is different from the fourteenth to sixteenth century lists and is used only very ephemerally, therefore it will not be discussed here.

222 Machairas, *Exëgësis* (Dawkins) §§ 542, 563; cf. Strambaldi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 229-230, 238. Machairas numbers some of the knights again in § 548, when he describes their attempt to flee from Genoa, including two names the former lists lack, see below.

223 For the discussion of the nobility vis-à-vis the aristocracy, see ch. 1, esp. from p. 42.

224 Arbel, *Nobility* 185.

225 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* I 72-76, quote on 72: *les chevaliers et escuers chipriens que les faus Jenevois ont pris et mis en prison*.

of the Munich list, it was drawn up much nearer to the events than Machairas' list, perhaps even by an eyewitness.

A comparison of the lists yields interesting results. First, Machairas did not copy Hugh's list. His enumerations lack fourteen names from Hugh's document<sup>226</sup>, and he does not follow Hugh's order of names. Moreover, Machairas has nine extra names in his list of exiled sent to Genoa and nine men exiled to Chios which Hugh's list lacks. Finally, Machairas enumerates nine men who went to Genoa on their own accord, six of whom Hugh included in his list. However, the two documents do not necessarily contradict each other. Hugh only specifies that he enumerates those knights who were taken captive in Famagusta, while Machairas offers a more general list. Many names are mentioned in both documents, and Machairas does not include anyone in his list of remaining knights or squires whom Hugh numbers among the exiled. The only contradiction is that Machairas calls Eudes de Milmars the marshal of Cyprus, while in Hugh's document Thomas de Montolive holds this position – probably Machairas' mistake<sup>227</sup>. The comparison supports the credibility of the sources, although we should still be careful with the names in Machairas' list not corroborated by Hugh.

Whereas the two early lists hence discussed raise only minor concerns, the later lists from the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that allegedly name nobles pose graver problems. Benjamin Arbel has rightly warned that they do not exactly specify social status and can therefore be misinterpreted easily<sup>228</sup>. Such is the case with Florio Bustron's list of people holding estates from James II. Since individuals who held estates from the crown were not automatically noble, it is of limited use for ascertaining members of the nobility, although it is of course interesting to see who obtained estates from the king<sup>229</sup>. The same is true for a list of estate-holders from the early Venetian time, which George Hill has convincingly dated into the first decade of the sixteenth century<sup>230</sup>. This is an interesting source for the transition from Lusignan to Venetian rule, but it is not useful for determining which families possessed noble status under the Lusignans. However, it hints to potential holders of estates in Lusignan time, as

many estate holders are mentioned as heirs, suggesting that their ancestors must have possessed an estate earlier<sup>231</sup>.

Another list which Rudt de Collenberg used for the end of the Lusignan period comes from the papal registers and enumerates all of Queen Charlotte's followers who were granted absolution of sins in the year 1467<sup>232</sup>. Collenberg used this list to argue that many Italian, Catalan and Greek families had by then become part of the Cypriot élite<sup>233</sup>. However, we cannot be sure that all Charlotte's followers were noble. More importantly, none of the Italian families on the list (Amadora, Bardo, Bertrandi, Chianibra, Foya, Pernessini, Sansali, Venatico) apart from three (Pelestrini, Scarama, Bernardini) appear anywhere in Cypriot sources before 1467<sup>234</sup>. Thus, most of the Italian families must have joined Charlotte's entourage only in Italy (or perhaps Rhodes, which was her base until about 1474<sup>235</sup>), and never lived in Cyprus. The same applies to the Catalan Baret's family.

The last list in question is by Stephen of Lusignan. He enumerates all those »noble families, old and new, that sat in the great council in our time<sup>236</sup>«. Scholars have used these lists for establishing nobility in Venetian times, but also for discussions of Lusignan reign<sup>237</sup>. Benjamin Arbel has approached this problem and proven that families belonging to the urban council which Lusignan refers to were not automatically noble<sup>238</sup>. Moreover, Lusignan explicitly refers to all those families extant in his own time, and therefore the lists do not make any statement whatsoever on nobles in the fifteenth century.

Therefore, we may indeed use the fourteenth-century lists, although we must be careful with information transmitted solely by Machairas' lists. The lists from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in contrast, are highly misleading and should be treated with the utmost care.

## Spelling of Names

The overview of the sources has shown that texts on Cyprus at the end of the middle ages were composed in many languages. Consequently, personal names appear in Latin, Old

226 The list in Machairas, *Exègèsis* (Dawkins) § 542 actually even lacks sixteen names of Hugh de Montolive's list, but Machairas mentions two of the knights, Guy de Milmars and Raymon Visconte, later in his description of knights who attempted to escape from Genoa, Machairas, *Exègèsis* (Dawkins) § 548; cf. Edbury, *Kingdom of Cyprus* 208 and n. 40.

227 See Machairas, *Exègèsis* (Dawkins) § 542 and Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* I 73.

228 Arbel, *Nobility* 178-179.

229 Bustron, *Historia* (Mas Latrie) 417-424; cf. Arbel, *Nobility* 178.

230 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* III 498-501; Hill, *History* III 765, n. 1. *Livre des remembrances* (Richard) xxi designated the persons on the list as *fièffés*, which is criticized by Arbel, *Nobility* 179, because they were not all royal vassals.

231 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* III 498-501.

232 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 209.

233 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* 551-552.

234 The Pelestrini and Scarama had long been established in Cyprus: the Scarama at least in the beginning of the fifteenth century (Machairas, *Exègèsis* [Dawkins] § 679. 685), and the Pelestrini family already in the fourteenth century (Machairas, *Exègèsis* [Dawkins] § 665; Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae* no. 114; Bustron, *Historia* [Mas Latrie] 357. 360. 377. 388; *Documents nouveaux* [Mas Latrie] 380; Mas Latrie [ed.], *Histoire* III 16; Mas Latrie [ed.], *Histoire* II 436;

*Documents chypriotes* [Richard] 140-141. 151; Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* 525. 541; Boustronios, *Narrative* [Coureas] § 11 and n. 31). The Bernardini are not as well known, but one Jean Bernardin, probably one of Charlotte's later followers, received a stipend from the Caffran foundation in 1446 (Blizn'uk, *Gumanitarnyj fond* 126-128).

235 Hill, *History* III 597-598.

236 Lusignan, *Description* fol. 83<sup>v</sup>: *noble familles tant anciennes que nouvelles, lesquelles entroient de nostre temps au grand conseil*. Cf. Lusignano, *Chorograffia* fols 82<sup>v</sup>-83<sup>v</sup>.

237 See for example Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae* no. 262; Rey, *Familles de Ducange* 592. Both refer to the Scaface family (whose status is not clear even in the fourteenth century) missing from Lusignan's list – which is no wonder, because Lusignan registered only the families still living on the island in his time, while the Scaface family does not reappear in the sources after 1408, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 37.

238 Arbel, *Nobility* 179-181. Lusignan himself knew that, too. He states during the explanation of the list: *or, n'ay-ie pas voulu, en nombrant toutes ces races, dire [...] ceste maison est noble, celle-là ignoble, & roturiere [...] afin que ie ne face rougir, & entrer en colere plusieurs Cypriots, ou plustost blesmir & pallir: pource qu'il y en a beaucoup pour le iourdhy, qui se glorifient estre descendus des plus anciennes races de Cypre* (Lusignan, *Description* fol. 82<sup>v</sup>).



French, Middle Greek, or various Italian forms. The Syrian viscount of Nicosia in the 1440s/50s for example is called *Jacques Urry* in French notarial documents, *Giakoumo Gourē* in the Greek Bustron chronicle, and *Jacobus Urri* or *Urrius* in Latin sources<sup>239</sup>. Spelling can even vary in one and the same source. In a privilege issued to her in 1432, Jacques de Caffran's wife is first spelled Ysabeau and then Ysabiau<sup>240</sup>. The scholar therefore has to decide which spelling to follow.

It is of course possible to unify name forms into English. However, I have decided to do justice to the multi-cultural character of the people in this study by rendering names in the version which appears most frequently in the sources. If there are hints on the form of name a person would have used themselves, such as signatures, I will follow these versions. This means that the same name such as Peter may appear in the French forms of *Pierre* or *Perrin*, but also in the Italian form *Piero*. I will render French names in modern French spelling, which is more agreeable to the reader's eye<sup>241</sup>. Syrians or Greeks will be described by the French or Italian

version of their first names, which, as we will see in chapter five, they used themselves (or if the Greek version is indeed more common in the sources, in transliterated Greek) and the transliterated Greek or Arabic version of their last name. The transliteration of these surnames is generally in French spelling, which conforms to the majority of the sources. I will render Venetian, Genoese or Spanish names in the version appropriate for their respective language. For the readers' convenience, an exception will be made for the members of the royal family. The English version of their names is so widespread in modern literature that to spell John II as *Jean II* in an English text would be confusing. I shall therefore use English first names and the designation of *Lusignan* for all the members of the royal family<sup>242</sup>. The multi-lingual names among the aristocrats of Cyprus give a taste of the complex multi-cultural environment which will be the subject matter of this study. Following this thread, the next chapter will discuss the various aristocratic groups in Cyprus, their origins and social standing.

239 Documents chypriotes (Richard) 152. 154; Bustron, Diēgēsis (Kechagioglou) 10; Rudt de Collenberg, Études de prosopographie nos 153. 158; Imhaus, Lacrimae Cypriae no. 291.

240 Documents chypriotes (Richard) 139-140.

241 The Old French spelling also differs often, so that there is more than one form for each name. The name *Jean* for example can be found as *Johan* or *Jehan*, but the second form is more frequent. See e. g. Documents chypriotes (Richard) 141-157, esp. 155; Mas Latrie (ed.), Histoire II 400; for *Johan*, see

e. g. Imhaus, Lacrimae Cypriae no. 129 (p. 66): *ci git le noble chevalier monseigneur johan de tabarie* as well as Mas Latrie (ed.), Histoire II 396 (*Johan de Brie*) or Ibelin, Livre des Assises (Edbury) 736 (*Johan dou Morf*).

242 Similar to names of persons, I will render place names in English, when they are well-known, and in the spelling of the sources, where they are less well-known. I have generally used Plechl, Orbis Latinus for the identification of Latin place names.