

# Chapter 6 – Choosing the Right Church: Religious Identity Construction as a Social Statement

Among the factors forming personal identities, belief is of great importance, especially in medieval societies<sup>1392</sup>. The Cypriot aristocracies were no exception, and the following chapter will be dedicated to the analysis of religious identity construction among the Cypriot élite. Religious identities offer vital information for understanding aristocratic identities in fifteenth-century Cyprus. They were strongly intertwined with both the social and ethnic identities that have been analysed in the preceding chapter, and will complete our picture of the intermingling levels of identity construction in Cypriot aristocratic circles.

We have been dealing with different religious groups and affiliations now and again during the preceding analysis. This has offered a glimpse of the complicated religious situation in Cyprus, where many religious groups came into contact. However, in order to arrive at valid conclusions about the significance of religious identity construction, I start this chapter with an overview of the highly complex religious situation in Cyprus in the fifteenth century. On this basis, I will examine religious identity construction among aristocrats. Since information on the royal family in particular is abundant here, and the royals were surely an important example for other noble families, I dedicate subchapter 6.1 to their religious activities, followed by the analysis of religious life among the old nobility (6.2). Chapter 6.3 discusses the intriguing religious choices of Syrians and Greeks, while chapter 6.4 is dedicated to religious identity construction among Western immigrants. The chapter ends with a conclusion on religious identity construction among the Cypriot aristocracies and its relation to other identity discourses.

At the end of the fourteenth century, Lusignan Cyprus was an extremely hybrid religious space, formed by a rich variety of different religious rites. At the same time, the island was

officially governed by a strict religious hierarchy with the Latin Church taking pride of place<sup>1393</sup>. Religious identities were therefore constructed in the tension between this hybrid situation and the hierarchy mechanisms put into place by the Latin Church<sup>1394</sup>.

The history of the Latin and Orthodox Churches on the island in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been variously treated<sup>1395</sup>. I will therefore refer to this period only cursorily before turning to the fifteenth century. Religious lives were already manifold when the Lusignans came to Cyprus. The various population groups whom we have met in the course of this study belonged to different churches. Apart from the Byzantine Orthodox, the Oriental Christians numbered Nestorians, Maronites, Melkites and Armenians. Similar to the crusader kingdoms of the Holy Land, the new Latin dynasty provided for a Latin Church hierarchy, which was set up after 1196<sup>1396</sup>.

In the course of the thirteenth century, the Greek Church, which had had an autocephalous status in Byzantine times, was subjugated to the Latin Church of Cyprus. Following a series of conflicts, Pope Alexander IV and Germanos, then Greek archbishop of Cyprus, agreed on the so-called *Bulla Cypria* in 1260. This treaty defined the relationship between the Greek Orthodox and the Latin Churches of Cyprus. From that point on, the Greek Church of Cyprus was considered part of the Latin Church, their bishops being subordinate to the Latin bishops. At the same time, the Greek Church maintained its own rituals, thus constituting a different rite under the roof of one and the same church<sup>1397</sup>. In 1340, most of the Oriental Churches, such as the Armenians, Maronites, Nestorians and Jacobites (Syrian Orthodox) followed suit and agreed to a similar contract<sup>1398</sup>. Thus, by the middle of the fourteenth century, in the perspective of Rome at least, reli-

1392 Parts of this chapter have been published in 2018 as an article in the study volume accompanying the exhibition »Byzanz und der Westen. Tausend vergessene Jahre« (Schallaburg, 17.06.-07.10.2018), see Salzmann, (Re) constructing Aristocratic Identities.

1393 Cf. Nicolaou-Konnari, Encounter 311-314, who also emphasizes the importance of the hierarchical situation in the religious contact between Greeks and Franks due to the conquest of Cyprus in the thirteenth century.

1394 Cf. Coureas, Conversion passim and esp. 86.

1395 For recent literature on the subject, see Coureas, Latin Church I and II; Coureas, One Faith; Coureas, Religion and Ethnic Identity; Coureas, Conversion; Fedalto, Latinikē ekklēsia; Grivaud, Pèlerinages; Grivaud, Les Lusignans

patrons; Grivaud, Minorités; Kyrris, L'organisation; Kyrris, Cypriot Identity; Nicolaou-Konnari, Encounter, esp. 311-386; Papadopoulos, Ekklēsia Kyprou; Richard, Bulla Cypria; Schabel, Religion; Schabel, Elias of Nabinaux; Schabel, Inquisition; Synodicum Nicosiense (Schabel). For relevant older literature, see the research overview in Synodicum Nicosiense (Schabel) 36-44 and the bibliography in Coureas, Latin Church II 504-511, but especially Hackett, History (for the Orthodox Church); Hill, History III 1041-1104; Magoulas, Study.

1396 Coureas, Latin Church I 3-4; Schabel, Religion 164-170.

1397 Coureas, Latin Church I 297-301; Nicolaou-Konnari, Encounter 316-327.

1398 Synodicum Nicosiense (Schabel) 248-259. Cf. also Coureas, Latin Church II 444-445.

gious matters on the island were governed by a strict Church hierarchy at the top of which stood the Latin rite<sup>1399</sup>. However, although the *Bulla Cypria* and the subsequent treaties meant official submission to Rome, they also gave the Greek and Oriental communities some autonomy<sup>1400</sup>. I will therefore treat these communities as different Churches in a social and cultural sense, even though they were legally part of the Latin Church<sup>1401</sup>.

As we have seen in the introduction to this study, the exact degree of autonomy and the balance between peaceful contact and conflict between the various religious communities, especially in the earlier phases of Lusignan rule, has been disputed. However, most recent research has focused on peaceful every-day contacts<sup>1402</sup>. Scholars have found that parallel to the official submission to the Latin Church, and often contrary to Church politics in Rome, contacts between individuals of the various denominations on the island thrived from the beginning of Lusignan rule, but especially from the end of the thirteenth century onwards<sup>1403</sup>.

Latins for example commissioned icons from Greek painters as early as the end of the thirteenth century, such as an icon of St Nicholas that depicts the donor, clearly a knight, at the feet of the saint, or a votive mural icon displaying a Latin family<sup>1404</sup>. Latins also donated money and estates to Greek Church institutions<sup>1405</sup>. From the fourteenth century on, we hear of various religious processions held together by the different rites. After a great flood in 1330 for instance, the Latin archbishop John of Conti led a procession of all denominations, which, as Machairas reported, was still repeated every year in the fifteenth century<sup>1406</sup>.

A number of pilgrimage places were frequented by Christians of all denominations. One of the most important centres was the monastery of the Holy Cross at Stavrovouni, but there were others such as the church of Santa Maria de la Cava outside Famagusta<sup>1407</sup>. It also seems that Latins sometimes visited Orthodox churches and even received sacraments from

Greek priests, and vice versa. The Latin archbishop of Cyprus Philippe de Chamberlhac prohibited the latter phenomenon in 1350. The same document regulated marriages between Latins and Greeks: whenever such a marriage took place, it had to be conducted in the Latin manner, and children issuing from it had to be brought up according to Latin customs<sup>1408</sup>. The Latin Church was concerned about losing its faithful to the Greek rite<sup>1409</sup>. In 1368, Pope Urban V *inter alia* complained to the archbishop of Nicosia about the women of Cyprus who frequented the churches of the Greeks and the »schismatics<sup>1410</sup>«. Greek clerics and lay persons worked in Latin religious foundations and concluded commercial transactions with the Latin Church. Such was the case with the *casale* Psimolofu, which belonged to the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem. Its scribe, overseer of the granary and *catepano* (village overseer) were all Greek, and it had business with Greek priests. Nicholas Coureas offers many other examples of such economic contacts<sup>1411</sup>.

The contact phenomena were not restricted to the rural population and lower social strata. Rather, Pope Urban V complained about noble women as well as non-nobles, and, as we shall see, the Lusignan family was not only party to such contact phenomena, but even protected Greek Church institutions at least from the middle of the fourteenth century onwards<sup>1412</sup>. Among others, they seem to have co-sponsored the well-known cathedral St George of the Greeks in Famagusta. This Greek-rite basilica, which was built between ca. 1349 and 1374, combines Byzantine, Gothic and Crusader traditions in both architecture and murals. Among the patrons of this church seem to have been members of the Greek and Melkite élite<sup>1413</sup>.

This is not to say that syncretism ruled in Cyprus and religious differences were not felt anymore. Chrysovalantis Kyriacou for example has recently shown how members of the Greek clergy managed to maintain their Orthodox identities in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, all while being loyal

1399 Edbury, Franks 77-80.

1400 Richard, *Bulla Cypria* 19-31; Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 312. 320. 324-330 argues that the submission of the Greek Church was more a matter of institutional than of spiritual submission. The goal was to cut down Greek Church institutions, but at the same time the Greek Church could organize its internal structure itself.

1401 Following usage in recent literature, I will also speak about conversion when a change between the Greek and the Latin rites is meant, see Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 312.

1402 For a summary of the discussion, see the already mentioned overview in *Synodicum Nicosiense* (Schabel) 36-44. For the more recent bibliography on contact phenomena see Grivaud, *Pèlerinages*; Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons*; Coureas, *Conversion*; Weyl Carr, *Art in the Court*. Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 467-476 and Coureas, *Latin Church II* 435-459 as well as Schabel, *Religion* 157-160. 182 give overviews of the research as well as contributing new ideas. Cf. also the research overview on pp. 10-11.

1403 Weyl-Carr, *Art in the Court* 243 emphasizes that Latin art patronage for Orthodox workshops only really appears after the fall of Acre in 1291 and proposes that a »group of practiced patrons« must have come to Cyprus at the time. For the parallel existence of religious hierarchy and everyday contacts, see first Papadopoulos, *Frontier Status* 22 and later the newer literature used below.

1404 Enlart, *Art Gothique* 158, pl. IX, X figs 66. 161. Both instances are discussed by Weyl Carr, *Art in the Court* 242-243, where more examples are given.

Contacts on the level of religious art were numerous and more frequent than on other levels, given that art was less controlled by ideology, see e. g. Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 369-375. 381-382. However, for contacts also in the heart of the Orthodox bishopric at Famagusta (St George of the Greeks) visible in the artwork, see the new article Paschali, *Negotiating Identities*.

1405 See e. g. Lamberto di Sambuceto, *Atti* (Balard) no. 82, where a Genoese leaves money to St George of the Greeks in Famagusta. Cf. Schabel, *Religion* 182 and Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 381 with other examples.

1406 Amadi, *Chronique* (Mas Latrie) 405; Machairas, *Exègèsis* (Dawkins) § 65. For a summary of the processions, see Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 467-468.

1407 Grivaud, *Pèlerinages* 71-73; Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 467.

1408 *Synodicum Nicosiense* (Schabel) 268-271.

1409 Coureas, *Latin Church II* 446.

1410 *Cartulary of the Cathedral* (Coureas/Schabel) 313: *Quotque magna pars nobilium et plebearum mulierum de civitate prefata, fidem catholicam quam voce profitentur contrariis moribus et operibus impugnando, Grecorum et schismaticorum frequentant ecclesias*. Cf. Coureas, *Conversion* 83.

1411 Richard, *Psimolofu* 140-142. 145-148; Coureas, *Latin Church II* 435-437.

1412 Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons* 258-260; cf. Coureas, *Latin Church II* 437-440.

1413 Kyriacou, *Orthodox Cyprus* 81-84; Kaffenberger, *Tradition and Identity* 164-198. Among the numerous recent studies on St George of the Greeks are also Kaffenberger, *Harmonizing the Sources*; Papacostas, *A Gothic Basilica*; Papacostas, *Byzantine Rite*; Bacci, *Patterns*; Paschali, *Mural Decoration*.

to the Lusignans and concelebrating with Latin prelates<sup>1414</sup>. The religious situation on Cyprus was therefore rather a web of contacts between different communities, riddled with interacting loyalties and hierarchies.

This multi-layered and hierarchically complex situation was complicated even further by the wider church political events of the time. From 1378 until 1417, the Latin Church suffered under the Great papal schism<sup>1415</sup>, which had a direct impact also on the Cypriot Latin Church (see below). It was followed twenty years later by the small schism between Eugene IV and Felix V from 1439 until 1449<sup>1416</sup>, which had its own consequences for the Cypriot archbishopric and the relationship between Cyprus and the papacy. Related to the small schism was also the important business of the council of Ferrara-Florence which declared the union between the Greek and the Latin Churches<sup>1417</sup>. All these events formed religious life in Europe in the fifteenth century, and although these external factors will not be the focus of this chapter, I will nonetheless ask in how far they influenced the religious lives of the Cypriot aristocracies.

Above all, however, I will analyse how the multi-religious, hierarchic Church situation on Cyprus itself influenced the religious lives of aristocratic Cypriots. In the situation of great social mobility in which many members of the aristocracy found themselves, the construction and representation of religious identities was an important issue which could be used for political and social aims. It was, however, also influenced by personal ties and backgrounds. Since I have decided to analyse identities as moments of identification with different discourses<sup>1418</sup>, I will examine how aristocrats constructed their religious identities in a given moment by choosing from the various possibilities of identification with a certain religious rite, rather than trying to define who »had« which faith. I will especially ask if they used religious identities for social representation and ascension. I will analyse instances of aristocratic identity construction on the personal level where possible, using documents such as testaments for the interpretation. Where no personal documents exist, I use other sources such as papal registers and tombstones.

## 6.1 The Lusignan Family

The Lusignan royal family was not only part of the nobility but may also have served as example for other nobles' conduct in religious questions. At the same time, they are a special case, since they were public figures and the construction and representation of their religious identities would have been even more strongly intertwined with politics than other nobles'. Thus, an analysis of the Lusignans' religious identity construction will deal also with royal religious politics.

As a ruling family in a state that was recognised by the papacy and other Western kingdoms, the Lusignans firstly adhered to the Latin rite. The kings were usually crowned by the Latin archbishop, and Latin friars and clerics were often members of the royal council throughout the fourteenth century<sup>1419</sup>. The Lusignan family burial site was the Dominican monastery, which was adjacent to the royal palace. After some building activities in the time of Peter II, the monastery even became an integral part of the palace<sup>1420</sup>. At the same time, it has been convincingly shown that the Lusignans successfully styled themselves as protectors of the Greek Church and its institutions<sup>1421</sup>. In some cases, the dynasty protected the Greek clergy against the claims of Latin clerics, who aimed to convert them or to induce their stricter subjection to the Latin Church. It has been stated that the aim of this policy was social peace between the various population groups on the island, as an active oppression of the Greek Church would have furthered social unrest<sup>1422</sup>.

Gilles Grivaud has gone even further and stated that from the middle of the fourteenth century onwards, the Lusignans not only protected other religious groups, but even promoted certain local cults. According to Grivaud, they played an important part in the development of a mixed religious tradition located somewhere between the existing churches, which created a new, inclusive local religious identity. Such was for example the case with the cults of St Mamas and the cross of Tochni<sup>1423</sup>.

The kings continued this policy at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. In either 1400 or 1406, King Janus awarded the little-known Greek Orthodox monastery of the Priests (Gr. *tōn hierēōn*) two more clerics, and in 1406 he reduced its taxes<sup>1424</sup>. In 1411, he filed a petition with the papacy to officially recognise a particular office for the Cypriot Saint Hilarion, whom the Latins had started venerating in the thirteenth century<sup>1425</sup>. In

1414 Kyriacou, *Orthodox Cyprus* esp. chs 3 and 4, pp. 81-110. 131-164.

1415 Cf. Tüchle, *Abendländisches Schisma* esp. 19-20.

1416 Cf. Helmroth, *Basel Konzil* 54.

1417 Cf. Helmroth, *Basel Konzil* 54.

1418 Cf. pp. 16-18.

1419 Schabel, *Religion* 180.

1420 Schabel, *Inquisition* 123-124.

1421 Schabel, *Religion* 181; Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons* 258-260.

1422 Schabel, *Religion* 179. Schabel himself points out that the nobles' and the crown's missing cooperation with the Latin Church probably also had a very practical reason: they wanted to keep their revenues for themselves instead

of paying tithes and were not interested in either avoiding marriages with near relatives or having their morals reformed by the Latin Church. Cf. also Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 315-316.

1423 Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons* 262-269.

1424 Darrouzès, *Obituaire* 31. 35; cf. Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons* 260-261.

1425 *Acta pseudopontificum VII* (Tautu) 229-231; Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume I* 695; Edbury, *Hoi teleutaioi Louzinianoï* 196; Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma ap. β-65*, pp. 494-506 (John XXIII). For the saint's veneration in the Latin Church in the thirteenth century, see *Synodicum Nicosiense* (Schabel) 170-173.

1412, Janus' mother Helvis de Brunswick donated an estate to the Greek Kykkos monastery in the Troodos mountains<sup>1426</sup>. And in 1432, the Greek bishop of Nicosia<sup>1427</sup> was one of the many godparents to the new born Jacqua of Lusignan, the daughter of Janus' cousin Peter of Lusignan. Thus, the Lusignans styled themselves as the rulers and protectors of various religious traditions on the island also in the fifteenth century.

In the traditional view, the arrival of Queen Helena Palaiologina in 1442 turned this development into an explicit strengthening of the Greek Church. As we have seen before, Helena, who was the daughter of the Morean despot Theodoros II Palaiologos and the Italian princess Cleopa Malatesta, herself came from a hybrid background<sup>1428</sup>. However, she was described as a perfidious Greek by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (later Pope Pius II), who said she favoured the Greek Church, replaced the Latin officials with Greeks and even changed the Latin rite to the Greek<sup>1429</sup>. Modern Greek historiography took this up and made her a Greek heroine who gave the Greek population a much-needed respite and even political power through her protection of the Greek Church<sup>1430</sup>. More recent research, especially by Jean Richard and Christina Kaoulla, has convincingly shown that this picture is not at all accurate. Helena adhered to the Greek rite herself – according to Georgios Bustron, her confessor lived in the Greek Mangana monastery<sup>1431</sup> – and she supported the same monastery financially. Inter alia, she accommodated refugee monks from Constantinople there. However, there is no evidence on her side for any hostile politics against the Latin Church and clergy<sup>1432</sup>.

The earlier historiography relates that Helena wanted to appoint Thomas of Morea, about whom we have already heard<sup>1433</sup>, as archbishop in 1442. However, Christina Kaoulla has proven that this hypothesis is untenable. It is true that there was an argument about the newly appointed archbishop. Helena and King John II certainly did not want to accept the candidate appointed by Eugene IV, Galesius de Montolive. The ensuing conflict lasted several years, and in the course of it, Eugene even excommunicated the royal couple for not obeying his commands<sup>1434</sup>. However, the con-

temporary sources do not say anything about Helena's alleged attempt to appoint Thomas of Morea in Galesius' place. Moreover, chapter four of this study has shown that some of Helena's most faithful followers came from old noble Cypriot families, such as Thomas de Verny and his wife<sup>1435</sup>. Therefore, though Helena indeed supported Orthodox institutions, there is no reason to assume that she followed anti-Latin politics, and turned the royal family's inclusion-politics into pro-Orthodox ones. However, her marriage into the Lusignan family illustrates how far hybrid religious identities were an acceptable phenomenon for the royal family at the time<sup>1436</sup>.

While Lusignan ties to the Greek Church and its institutions were positively connoted before and after Queen Helena, the royal relationship to the Latin Church underwent some changes. These changes were mostly caused by Church political events. Between 1378 and 1417, the Great papal schism rocked the foundations of the Latin Church and influenced Church politics even in Cyprus. Though King Peter II supported Avignon, his successors James I and Janus, while officially tending first to Rome and later to Avignon and Pisa, used the chaos induced by the schism for their own ends. They took possession of the Cypriot archbishopric, and thus began a policy of appropriation of the Latin Cypriot Church which the family pursued throughout the fifteenth century<sup>1437</sup>.

From the late 1380s onwards, an administrator chosen by the crown managed the archbishopric, and there are accusations that the crown benefited from the tithes, even if the extent of this appropriation is not clear<sup>1438</sup>. In 1409/1410, King Janus chose his brother Hugh as the archbishopric's administrator<sup>1439</sup>. In 1413, the king managed to secure the Cypriot Hospitaller commandery for his five-year-old illegitimate son Alois, although this papal decision was already reversed in 1414<sup>1440</sup>. In the same period, the king promoted the Church careers of other Cypriots, such as Jean Petit, who became archbishop of Tarsus in 1407 and in 1413 bishop of Paphos, when he was also the king's confessor, or Jacques de Margat, who rose from treasurer of Famagusta to the important post of deacon of Nicosia and later papal collector<sup>1441</sup>.

1426 Grivaud, *Les Lusignans patrons* 259-260; cf. Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 381 and n. 1732.

1427 *Documents nouveaux (Mas Latrie)* 367.

1428 Kaoulla, *Queen Elena* 112, cf. pp. 98, 123.

1429 *Pius Secundus, Commentarii* (Göbel) 176.

1430 For a detailed overview of the opinions on Helena in modern historiography, see Kaoulla, *Queen Elena* 109-111.

1431 Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 12.

1432 Richard, *Culture franque* 400-404; Kaoulla, *Queen Elena*, passim, for the monastery especially 142-144; Ganchou, *Rébellion* 114-115.

1433 Cf. esp. ch. 4.2.2, p. 123.

1434 Kaoulla, *Queen Elena* 131-132.

1435 Cf. chs 4.2.2, p. 123, 5.1.3, p. 136 and Ganchou, *Rébellion* 131.

1436 An earlier attempt at a marriage alliance between Byzantium and Cyprus, initiated by the Byzantine emperor in 1372, had failed according to Machairas, because of the hatred between Latins and *Rhomaioi*, see Machairas, *Exēgēsis* (Dawkins) §§ 344-350. This suggests that attitudes had changed in Cyprus between the end of the fourteenth and the middle of the fifteenth centuries, which would tie in with the political developments. However, Schreiner, *Das vergangene Zypern* 400-401 reports that an even earlier attempt at a marriage alliance in 1294, concerning the son of emperor Andronikos II, Michael, had been a Cypriot initiative.

1437 The appropriation of the archbishopric by the crown is examined by Max Ritter in a recent essay, see Ritter, *Cyprus and the Great Schism*, esp. 224-239.

1438 *Acta Concilii Constanciensis IV* (Finke) no. 548. 762-763: in 1415, John XXIII was accused of being responsible for the Latin Church's devastating situation in Cyprus. One of the charges was that the crown appropriated church tithes, see below. Cf. Kaoulla, *Queen Elena* 133-134 and Ritter, *Cyprus and the Great Schism* 238. As early as 1407, Pope Benedict XIII had reacted to a petition by Janus, who complained that the deceased bishop of Famagusta Luciano had accused the crown of appropriating parts of the revenues from the bishopric of Famagusta, see Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megaloschisma* ap. β-25, pp. 263-265 (Benedict XIII).

1439 Ritter, *Cyprus and the Great Schism* 240.

1440 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megaloschisma* ap. β-61, pp. 486-489, β-64, pp. 493-494, β-77, pp. 519-523 (John XXIII); Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 91.

1441 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megaloschisma* ap. β-23, pp. 260-261, β-24, pp. 261-263 (Benedict XIII) (Margat), β-27, pp. 265-267 (Benedict XIII); β-58, pp. 480-483 (John XXIII) (Petit); Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 25, 28, 33, 67 (both); Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* no. 44 (p. 137: Jacques Margat was nominated papal collector on 25 February 1426).

Hugh of Lusignan, too, made an important career in the Latin Church. After his confirmation as the archbishopric's *commendatarius* (administrator) by John XXIII in 1411, Pope Martin V officially appointed him archbishop in 1421<sup>1442</sup>. It seems that Hugh was also in possession of the revenues of the bishopric of Limassol and of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, having claimed the latter illegally<sup>1443</sup>. Out of reasons that remain unclear, Martin V made him cardinal in 1426. Hugh was therefore supposed to be present at the curia, but since the Mamluk invasion began only shortly after his nomination, he stayed in Cyprus until King Janus was released from captivity in 1427. As we have seen in chapter four, he then went to Rome not only as cardinal, but also as the kingdom's official representative in the West<sup>1444</sup>. Hugh was effectively called the cardinal of Cyprus, not of his designated diocese, until his death<sup>1445</sup>. In the following years, Hugh became an important player in Latin Church politics. He influenced various affairs such as the so-called small schism between Eugene IV and the council of Basle, where he also acted as interpreter for the Byzantine ambassadors in the negotiations for Church union. In the peace negotiations between France, the Bourgne and England in 1435, he was especially sought after as intermediary by the king of France. At the same time, Hugh fulfilled his role as the kingdom's representative in the West, arranging the marriages between Anne of Lusignan and Louis of Savoy as well as between John II and Medea of Montferrat, or leading negotiations with the Genoese<sup>1446</sup>. In various instances, Hugh filed petitions for Lusignan family members and other Cypriots at the curia, such as privileges *super defectum natalium* for the illegitimate Lusignan children Lancelot, Guy and Phoebus, privileges for Alice de Margat and Marie de Vergy, and canonries for his nephew Antonio Soulouan<sup>1447</sup>.

Before Hugh's appointment as archbishop, the Lusignans had never designated members of their family for Church service<sup>1448</sup>. However, now other family members followed his lead. Lancelot of Lusignan, a bastard son of Philippe, one of James I's sons, was lieutenant of the church of Limassol in 1436, and of Paphos in 1438. Thus, in the early 1430s, the Lusignans had access to the revenues of the bishoprics Limassol and Paphos. Lancelot relocated to the West some years later. After Hugh's death in 1442, he followed Amadeus of Savoy, Anne of Lusignan's father-in-law, who had become pope as Felix V. Felix appointed Lancelot Hugh's successor as

abbot of the monastery of St Mary of Pignérol in 1443 and patriarch of Jerusalem in 1444, and made him cardinal of St Laurent of Damascus before August 1447, to name only some of his offices<sup>1449</sup>. Lancelot was not only an important cooperator for Felix V, but also for the latter's son Louis of Savoy, and thus strengthened the connection between the kingdom of Cyprus and the duchy. Moreover, he filed a number of petitions for Cypriot fellow countrymen and thus functioned as their contact to the papacy<sup>1450</sup>. Hugh's and Lancelot's active involvement in Church politics therefore did not only secure Lusignan control of Latin Church politics in Cyprus; it was also an extremely important opening into papal and European politics for the royal family and their retinues.

Other family members entered Latin Church service but stayed in Cyprus. Another of Hugh's nephews, Antonio Soulouan, became canon of Paphos in 1430 and treasurer of Nicosia in 1432 and was archvicar of St Sophia in Nicosia from 1457 onwards<sup>1451</sup>. Following Hugh's death in 1442 and the struggles between the crown and the papacy about candidates for the see, King John II appointed his own candidate in 1451, his bastard son James, who was never acknowledged by the papacy<sup>1452</sup>. James himself appointed another Cypriot, Guillaume Goneme, as his successor when he ascended to the throne<sup>1453</sup>. The last family member to enter church service under Lusignan rule was Hugh of Lusignan, probably son of Phoebus of Lusignan and Isabelle de Fleury. This is evident from a papal bull from 1463 which mentioned that Hugh had left church service and got married, leaving a canonry in Limassol vacant<sup>1454</sup>.

Although this active involvement in Latin Church politics and the appropriation of the posts and revenues of the Latin Church in Cyprus were above all political and financial affairs, one might ask in how far they led to changes in religious identity construction. Rudt de Collenberg (and some newer studies follow him) has postulated that the appropriation of the Latin Church revenues led to a de-westernization of the Latin population and a broad spreading of Greek culture in Cyprus<sup>1455</sup>. This reasoning is probably based on a passage in the protocol of Pope John XXIII's condemnation and deposition as pope in 1415. Among other things, the pope was accused of having squandered »the goods of the Church of Cyprus, from which arose much scandal, which was and is a great peril for the catholic faith, because there are Greeks there and only few Latins who uphold the faith, and they

1442 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 90. 93. Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux*, in general has a detailed description of Hugh as well as Lancelot of Lusignan's careers.

1443 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 94. Unfortunately, Rudt de Collenberg gathers this information from unedited sources which I have not been able to cross-check.

1444 Cf. ch. 4.2.1, p. 113.

1445 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 94-97. Cf. Hill, *History* III 1089. Hill has only a short characterisation of Hugh as cardinal.

1446 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 102-103. 107-108.

1447 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 99. 109-111. 113. Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* nos 57. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 80. 83 (pp. 138-140).

1448 Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 86.

1449 Fedalto, *Latīnikē ekklēsia* 715. Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 118-119; Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* nos 36. 46 (pp. 146-147).

1450 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 121-123. 125.

1451 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 102; Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* nos 83 (p. 140). 16 (p. 143). 26 (p. 166).

1452 Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* 80-81. Cf. Kaoulla, *Queen Elena* 131-132.

1453 Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 78. Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* no. 13 (p. 172); Mas Latrie, *Histoire des archevêques* 293-297.

1454 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 192.

1455 Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume I* 667-668; cf. Daileader, *Local Experiences* 98-100; Kyriacou, *Orthodox Cyprus* 133-134.

must lose ground because of the alienation of the goods of their churches<sup>1456</sup>«. Actors at the papacy were therefore afraid of losing control over the Latin Church in Cyprus and connected this fact to the numerical paucity of Latins on the island, using it as one argument among many to depose the pope. However, this does not say anything about the situation in Cyprus itself, but rather shows how Latin Church politics worked. The sources from Cyprus do not seem to me to show an especially intense de-westernization of the Latins (which I understand to mean a weakening of the Latin faith) in this period, nor could one postulate a specific strengthening of the Greek Church and culture that would surpass the contact processes that were already in course for many years<sup>1457</sup>.

Concerning the royal family itself, in contrast, we might ask if their appropriation of posts and revenues of the Cypriot Latin Church led to a more intense identification with their »own« Latin church on the island, matching the promotion of their »own« local cults<sup>1458</sup>. At least it is evident that the royal mentorship for local cults and Orthodox monasteries did not hinder the family from considering themselves as Latin as anybody else.

This seems to be true for the members of the royal family also on a personal level, though it is of course almost impossible to separate personal identity construction and political representation. While Janus, for example, probably renewed relations to the papacy in 1406 because he hoped for help against Genoa and promoted his brother Hugh to archbishop in order to keep the bishopric's revenues in the royal family, this does not reveal anything about his own relationship to the Latin church. The papal document recognizing the new liturgy for St Hilarion stresses that the king wrote the liturgy himself, because he was devoted to the saint:

Our most beloved son in Christ Janus, the illustrious King of Cyprus, fostered and still fosters a sincere and special devotion to the glorious saint Hilarion the confessor and he (the king) has zealously and commendably composed an office liturgy of this saint to his (the saint's) glory and honour<sup>1459</sup>.

The liturgy, of which only fragments are published, is in verses<sup>1460</sup>. Thus, if the king had actually taken the trouble to

compose them, he perhaps indeed had a special relationship to this saint. At the same time, this was probably a politically clever move, since Hilarion was venerated by both Latins and Greeks, and it could therefore be seen as an expression of the specific Lusignan attitude towards religious politics.

Similar problems arise concerning the personal religiousness of other family members. Hugh for example served in the Latin Church his entire adult life and became an exceedingly able church diplomat, but about his personal opinion on religious matters we can only speculate<sup>1461</sup>. Rudt de Collenberg saw him first of all as a Cypriot patriot who represented a hellenized Cypriot identity. Inter alia, Collenberg cited Aeneas Sylvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, who allegedly described the Cypriots at the council of Basle as »more Greek than Roman«. Since Hugh was one of the important representatives there, Collenberg ascribes this characterization to the cardinal in particular<sup>1462</sup>. However, a look into the source in question, the *Descriptio altera urbis basileae*, shows that this is not entirely correct. Aeneas had sent this short description of Basle to Philippe, the archbishop of Tours<sup>1463</sup>, on the occasion of the latter's imminent arrival in Basle.

Aeneas begins his description of the city with its geographical situation in the middle of Christendom, in the course of which he also mentions the Cypriots: »I will keep silent about the Cypriots who understand Greek better than Latin<sup>1464</sup>«. It is possible that Aeneas judged about the Cypriots from the people he knew and thus also from Hugh of Lusignan, but he speaks only about their language abilities here, and not about their religious identity. Even if he was indeed alluding to religious or cultural identity, this is still an ascription by a third party, and Aeneas was known for his passionately subjective and sometimes anti-Greek statements, as seen in the case of Helena Palaiologina. Thus this statement does not offer any information on Hugh himself.

Hugh's sister Agnes, on the other hand, seems to have been a devoted Latin Christian. She was even invited by the Latin monastery of Wunstorpen to become their new abbess<sup>1465</sup>. We know nothing about King John II's religiosity. In the end, however, the royals' personal feelings are of minor relevance, since it was the royal family's religious representation that counted for society.

1456 Acta Concilii Constanciensis IV (Finke) 762-763 (no. 548): [...] *dilapidavit bona ecclesie bononiensis et bona Ecclesiarum Ciprie, ex quibus fuit tantum scandalum, quod erat et est magnum periculum de fide catholica, quia ibi sunt Greci et pauci Latini, qui sustinent fidem, et oportet eos recedere propter alienacionem bonorum ecclesiarum suarum*. Cf. also Ritter, Cyprus and the Great Schism 238.

1457 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma 16-17* also sounds a critical note concerning Rudt de Collenberg's conclusions on Latin faith and culture in Cyprus.

1458 The fact that especially in the second half of the fifteenth century, many members of Syrian or Greek families entered the Latin clergy (see below) may have been part of this development.

1459 Acta pseudopontificum VII (Tautu) 229: *Carissimus in Christo filius Noster Janus rex Cypri illustris, ad sanctum Hilarionem gloriosum confessorem sinceræ et specialis gessit prout et gerit devotionis affectum et ad eius gloriam et honorem quemdam tenorem Officii eiusdem Sancti studiose et laudabiliter composuit*. Cf. Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma* ap. β-65, p. 495 (John XXIII).

1460 It begins: *Exultans in praeconio / o felix regnum Cyprium / Tono et semitonis / Patronum lauda proprium. / Puer, crescens, ingreditur / Sicut cedrus in Libano, / Nomen huic indicitur / Angeli vaticinio*. Acta pseudopontificum VII (Tautu) 230.

1461 Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 127.

1462 Rudt de Collenberg, *Cardinaux* 126.

1463 *Thuronensis*, see OL III 529 s.v. Turonum.

1464 Pius Secundus, *Descriptio altera* (Hartmann) 193: *taceo Cyprios magis Graece quam Romane sapientes*. Hill, *History III* 1090 translates the sentence as »I say nothing of the Cypriotes, who are more Greek-minded than Roman«. According to him, this could confirm that in the eyes of the West, the Cypriot Latin Church was »somewhat lax in upholding the supremacy of the Roman Church«. But as mentioned above, the meaning here is certainly restricted to their language skills.

1465 Documents nouveaux (Mas Latrie) 367-369; Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire III* 18, n. 1.

In conclusion, the Lusignan family was involved with both the Latin and the Greek Churches and was very much part of a continually developing mixed local religious tradition. The fifteenth century saw a new, active involvement in the Latin Church and an appropriation of Church revenues and offices, which must have intensified the family's relationship with the Latin Church on the island. At the same time, the Lusignans constructed and represented royal religious identity both as protectors of Greek Churches and monasteries and of new local cults. Unfortunately, we do not know how far they also had relations with the Oriental Churches.

## 6.2 The Nobility

Nobles seem to have followed the royal family as concerns the identification with the Latin Church and with local religious traditions in a generally hybrid religious space. Sources, however, are rather disparate for the fifteenth century: personal documents such as testaments are scarce. Tombstones and papal registers can only partly replace this lack of evidence but are nevertheless valuable sources. They are complemented by fragmentary evidence from other sources such as monastery records (see below).

Various sources indicate that some noble families and individuals constructed their religious identities in a hybrid way. In 1368, Pope Urban V not only complained about the above-mentioned noble women visiting Greek and Oriental churches, but also about nobles celebrating masses and baptisms as well as marriages in their own houses, a custom not unusual for the Greeks<sup>1466</sup>. Probably in the beginning of the fifteenth century, a member of the Greek monastery of the Priests in the diocese of Paphos took note of a donation in the monastery's synaxary. He stated that a certain *archōn ho mensyr* (i. e. sir) *Tzouan te Mtoulif* and his wife had given the monastery a millstone for the benefit of their souls<sup>1467</sup>. The *archōn*, a term designating a member of the ruling class, must have stemmed from the well-known Montolive family, whose relationship with the monastery was obviously strong enough to make this donation<sup>1468</sup>. This hybrid state of affairs was seemingly confirmed by a complaint Pope Martin V had allegedly made about the Cypriots in 1418. According to Rudt de Collenberg, the pope stated that the Cypriots had abandoned Latin customs, followed the Greek rite and

made no distinction between the Greek and Latin Churches. Following Rudt de Collenberg's report, recent literature has cited this complaint as an indication for religious contacts. However, Collenberg misinterpreted the sources. The document he cites turns out to be a Venetian letter addressed to Pope Martin V, not a letter by him, exhorting the pope to make sure that the Latin bishops in the overseas provinces really reside in their sees, because otherwise the Latins there would all become Greeks. Cyprus is not mentioned at all in this passage<sup>1469</sup>. Though this incident turns out to be a false tale, some nobles seem to have continued their hybrid devotional practices and to have fostered relationships with Latin and Greek clerics<sup>1470</sup>, even if we have no direct personal testimonies.

Contrary to these hints, the only testamentary evidence concerning a noble that is edited until now<sup>1471</sup> reveals solely a strong relationship with the Latin Church: Jean de Brie, one of the most influential statesmen under Peter II and James I<sup>1472</sup>, left the cathedral of Nicosia three assignments. The first two were drawn up by the royal *secrète* in 1383. They concerned a very specific sum of money, 300 besants of income from Jean's *casale Piles*<sup>1473</sup>: 250 besants should be paid to a priest who was to sing masses before Jean de Brie as long as he lived. After his death, the priest should serve Jean's wife Phelippe de Verny in the same way, and should both die, the priest was supposed to sing masses for their souls every day. The money was to be paid every three months, and the responsible for the whole affair were the archdeacon and the *maître chapelain* of the cathedral of Nicosia. Jean assigned the remaining 50 besants to the cathedral's chapter for masses to be sung for him every six months after his death. Nine years later, in 1391, Jean left the cathedral his houses in Nicosia in a third assignment. After his death, the cathedral was supposed to rent out the houses and maintain them from the income. From what remained, they should pay a priest to sing masses for the souls of the deceased couple. Again, the archdeacon and the *maître chapelain* were responsible for administering the business<sup>1474</sup>.

Jean de Brie thus not only desired that daily masses be sung for him by a Latin priest in his lifetime, he even left the cathedral church in Nicosia a substantial legacy comprising his immobile property in the capital. This was probably allodial property, i. e. possessions that were not held as fief from the crown but belonged to Jean personally. He was concerned

1466 Synodicum Nicosiense (Schabel) 371. Cf. also Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 469.

1467 Darrouzès, *Obituaire* 39.

1468 L. Voisin has recently asked whether relationships such as these hint at Latin nobles possessing the *jus patronatus* over Greek monasteries, but she concludes that no sources allow us to confirm this idea, see Voisin, *Jus patronatus* esp. 397.

1469 See Setton, *Papacy and the Levant* II 44 for the document cited by Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume I* 671, who then in turn is cited by Delacroix-Besnier, *Dominicains* 74, who is cited by Coureas, *Latin Church* II 453, who is cited by Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 469-470. I would like to thank Chris Schabel for mentioning this error to me. Cf. also Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megaloschisma* 16-17, who also discusses this passage.

1470 Whether this devotional hybridity was accompanied by a blurring of dogmatic differences, is unfortunately impossible to say, since we do not have any personal faith statements.

1471 Thierry Ganchoy has found Jacques de Caffran's testament in the State Archive of Genoa. Once it is edited it will be very interesting to see whether this document offers any clues as to Jacques' religious life. See Ganchoy, *Rébellion* 113 and n. 42.

1472 Cf. ch. 4.1, where I have analysed his career.

1473 This must be the same *casale* as Pilez/Pyla, which was in the hands of Isabeau Visconte in the 1430s, see p. 59.

1474 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* II 396-400.

with his and his wife's salvation, and in the manner typical of his time, he had masses sung in order to ensure his soul the best possible way into heaven. Since we do not have Jean's whole testament, it is difficult to say whether this relationship with the cathedral was exclusive or whether he also maintained ties to other churches, be they Latin or otherwise.

Jean de Brie's relationship with the Latin Church is partly mirrored by another important statesman, Jacques de Fleury, two generations later. Jacques requested the papal privilege of having two priests read a private mass for him every day. In his analysis on Jacques' coup d'état, Thierry Ganchou has postulated that Jacques must therefore have been an exceedingly pious Latin Christian who detested the Greek faith<sup>1475</sup>. Moreover, Ganchou opines that Queen Helena Palaiologina most probably forced the count to marry his second wife Zoi Catacouziny, who was a Greek damsel in the Queen's entourage. According to Ganchou, Jacques de Fleury must have objected to this marriage at first on account of Zoi being Orthodox. Ganchou's hypothesis is based on two entries in a Greek short chronicle, which mention that de Fleury left Cyprus on 28 May 1443, and that he was married to Zoi on 8 October 1444. Since the mention of Fleury's absence in the chronicle is curious, Ganchou has taken this incident as an absence without leave<sup>1476</sup> and a first sign of disruption between the count and the Queen – probably on account of the projected wedding. The entry on the wedding itself is noted in the passive voice («the count of Jaffa was married to the damsel who came from Morea<sup>1477</sup>» [my emphasis]), and Ganchou thinks this could mean that the wedding was forced rather than contracted deliberately. However, he also mentions that Jacques called his first daughter by Zoi Carola. According to Ganchou, this was the same name as Charlotte and was therefore a homage to the Queen, since Helena Palaiologina's daughter had the same name. According to Ganchou, Jacques was therefore content with his new wife in the end<sup>1478</sup>.

The count's absence in 1443 may have been connected to discord with the royalties. However, in my opinion, it is impossible to know if the conflict was related to the marriage contracted one and a half years later, let alone if Jacques objected to the latter because his wife was not a Latin. After all, the example of the royal family shows that it was possible to be a pious Latin Christian and have good relationships with Orthodox institutions or even marry a Christian of another rite. Therefore, I would not take this information as a hint for an exclusively Latin religiousness on Jacques de Fleury's

part. However, Jacques' as well as de Brie's examples illustrate that some members of the high nobility maintained intense relationships with the Latin Church and took measures for the salvation of their souls.

This Latin devoutness at the point of death is confirmed by noble tombstones. The great majority of the slabs stem from either the cathedral church St Sophia, the Augustinian church St Mary of Tortosa, or the unknown church which today is the Arab Ahmet Mosque (probably the Carmelite church), all located in Nicosia<sup>1479</sup>. We have seen in chapter five that all tombstones were executed in Western style such as in France and England, expressing a knightly identity<sup>1480</sup>. Their location in various Latin churches together with their stylistic features indicates that many nobles chose to be buried in a typical Latin manner, representing themselves as faithful Latin Christians at the moment of death.

It is impossible to rank the popularity of the churches by the number of tombstones preserved in each house. The most important reason for this is the loss of the Dominican and the Franciscan churches, which were razed by the Venetians for defence purposes at the end of the sixteenth century<sup>1481</sup>. Both orders were popular with the Latin population, and the church of the Dominicans was even the royal family's burial place. It may be assumed that these churches were popular with the nobility, too. With such a great part of the data lost, we cannot sensibly interpret the number of stones in the other churches. What can be said, though, is that the greatest number of slabs come from the cathedral church St Sophia. Generally, the tombstones hint to a noble burial culture that was explicitly Western European.

Papal registers are another source type to offer quantitative information. They illustrate nobles' relationships with the papacy, since they document petitions for papal privileges such as absolutions of sins and appointments to church offices. A first glance seems to suggest that the relationship between Cypriot nobles and the papacy declined during the fifteenth century. Count Rudt de Collenberg registered far less requests for absolutions at the end of the fourteenth and the entire fifteenth century than for the beginning to the middle of the fourteenth century: between 1323 and 1374, 255 absolutions were issued to Cypriot nobles, while Collenberg has found only 24 absolutions from the period between 1378 and 1467. However, Collenberg also mentions that most of the 255 dispensations were issued after the great plague in 1347 and that they should be seen as a pious reaction to it<sup>1482</sup>. Therefore, the declining numbers in

1475 Ganchou, Rébellion 110. For the petition, see Iorga, Notes et extraits IV/I 349.

1476 Grivaud, Petite chronique 328, n. 65 states that he was not allowed to leave the kingdom without the king's consent.

1477 Grivaud, Petite chronique 330: *fo maridato el Conte de Zapho, con la madonna che vene da Morea*. The English translation is my own.

1478 Ganchou, Rébellion 110-112.

1479 See Imhaus, Lacrimae, esp. 5-78. 153. 155. 160. 162 et al. For the identification of the Arab-Ahmet mosque with the Carmelite church, see Schabel et al., Frankish and Venetian Nicosia 191-192.

1480 Cf. ch. 5.1.2, p. 132.

1481 Schabel et al., Frankish and Venetian Nicosia 191-192.

1482 I have not been able to control Collenberg's information on the fourteenth century, but the grand scale of petition numbers should be certain enough. For the numbers between 1323 and 1374, see Rudt de Collenberg, Dispenses matrimoniales 45-46. For the privileges between 1378 and 1460, see Rudt de Collenberg, Études de prosopographie nos 1-228. In 1467, Queen Charlotte attained full absolution for her and her many followers (Rudt de Collenberg, Études de prosopographie no. 209). I have not included this information in the data count, since they would have changed the picture dramatically.



the fifteenth century should not be interpreted as a sign for a less pious Latin noble society<sup>1483</sup>.

In the years of the great papal schism (1378-1417), it is very difficult to make any reliable statements as to the relationship between the Latin Church and the noble families of Cyprus. There are far less petitions for papal privileges in that time, especially in the 1390s<sup>1484</sup>. However, this development was connected with the above-mentioned Lusignan papal policy, which changed affiliation from Avignon to Rome and back again between the 1380s and 1400 and appropriated the episcopal sees, so that it must have been much more difficult to attain such privileges (cf. ch. 6.1). We cannot therefore assume that this fact reveals anything about noble religiousness in Cyprus during this period, but rather only about church politics and Cypriot relations to the papacy. However, some nobles acquired marriage dispensations from the Avignonese Pope Clement VII in 1387 and 1390, at a time when the crown of Cyprus probably at least officially tended to Rome<sup>1485</sup>. It is unfortunately impossible to discern the reasons for this interesting procedure.

In contrast to the numbers of petitions during the schism, appointments to church offices in the course of the fifteenth century indeed reveal some interesting information concerning the religious culture of noble families on Cyprus. Just as the fourteenth century<sup>1486</sup>, the fifteenth century reveals very few Cypriot nobles among the clergy: only 8 Cypriot noblemen are registered in Rudt de Collenberg's lists as having entered the services of the Latin Church between 1378 and 1470. This probably does not reflect the exact number of clergymen, since we find for example a certain priest called Louis de Verny in a document from 1383 whom Rudt de Collenberg did not register. However, Kouroupakis' new edition of the papal letters concerning Cyprus during the great schism until the year 1417 does not register any clerics from Cypriot noble families that we did not know about<sup>1487</sup>.

Even if we assume that not all Cypriot clergymen appeared in the papal registers (or, indeed, have been found by Rudt de Collenberg), the small numbers of clergymen from Cypriot noble families is noteworthy, particularly since they had good career possibilities: those who indeed entered church service mostly achieved high offices. Guy de Nephim, member of an old family, if not of the first in the kingdom, was archdeacon of Famagusta in 1385. A certain Jacques de Margat, treasurer of Famagusta and canon in Nicosia in 1406, had risen to papal collector and ambassador to the curia in 1426. Jean Petit was appointed archbishop of Tarsus

by the supplication of king Janus in 1407. And Galesius de Montolive first appears in the registers as archdeacon of Nicosia in 1428, to be appointed bishop of Limassol and later archbishop of Cyprus<sup>1488</sup>. Finally, in 1438, a certain Antonius Moustazou was appointed as canon of Nicosia.

These men seem to have followed very individual careers. Only the Montolive and the Nores families show a family tradition of entering the clergy<sup>1489</sup>. From the 1440s onwards, some members of the de Nores-family especially are known as clergymen: Jacques de Nores became bishop of Limassol *in commendam* in 1442, while his relative Amadeus, who was one of Louis of Savoy's counsellors and thus did not live in Cyprus, was made bishop of Vercelli on 20 May 1458. Another Jacques de Nores received the expectative of a canonry in either Nicosia or Limassol in 1447<sup>1490</sup>. Many petitions for papal privileges in these years also come from both the Montolive and the Nores clans<sup>1491</sup>.

Thus, only very few noble families show an active involvement and perhaps also an identification with the Latin Church during and after the Great Schism. This phenomenon is all the more interesting if we compare it with the appropriation of the Latin Church by the royal family, as seen above. Old noble families only rarely followed the royal lead and took the chance of investing in Latin Church careers. Perhaps there was not enough money involved in lower Church offices in order to arouse noble interest, and the bishoprics were often taken by the royals. Nobles' relationships with Greek churches and monasteries at least cannot be adduced as a reason for their distance to the Latin Church. As the royal family's example shows, these two relationships did not exclude each other.

In conclusion, the indications for religious networks and attitudes in the group of noble families create a varied picture. Though some nobles had an intense relationship with the Latin Church, expressed through their desire to attend private Latin masses every day, and nobles generally cared to represent themselves as good Latin Christians at the time of death, their interest in serving the Latin Church was not substantial. In this respect, they reacted differently from the royal family to the events within the greater Latin Church. At the same time, we may assume that nobles continued to construct their religious identities in the hybrid space between the Churches. They cultivated relationships with Greek Church institutions, even if we do not know how far spread this phenomenon was. Thus, the attitude of noble families does not seem to have changed substantially compared to former times.

1483 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma* 110, comes to the same conclusion.

1484 Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* 525-526.

1485 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 13. 14. 16. 17. For the crown's official affiliation with Rome, see Ritter, *Cyprus and the Great Schism* 231-232.

1486 Richard, *Peuplement latin et syrien* 165; Coureas, *Latin Church II* 181.

1487 For Louis de Verny, see Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire II* 398. For the clerics during the great schism, see Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma passim*.

1488 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 10 (Nephim). 24. 25. 90. 91 (Margat). 28 (Petit). 97. 112. 115. 116. 121. 122. 126. 127. 130. 131. 135. 136. 142. 143. 153. 162 (Montolive); Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma* ap. β-24, pp. 261-263 (Benedict XIII) (Margat).

1489 For their family traditions, see Coureas, *Latin Church II* 212.

1490 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 116 (Moustazo). 143. 146. 147. 163. 171. 194. 209 (Nores); Rudt de Collenberg, *Royaume II* no. 49 (147).

1491 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 170. 175. 201. 202. 203.

### 6.3 Syrians and Greeks

Ascending Syrian and Greek families lived even more hybrid religious lives than the nobles. While Syrians and Greeks mostly seem to have been faithful to their own religious traditions until the end of the fourteenth century<sup>1492</sup>, the social ascension in the fifteenth century brought about important changes within the religious lives of this group. With social rise came the possibility of conversion<sup>1493</sup> to the Latin rite, which could further the integration into the nobility<sup>1494</sup>. Families and individuals made varying decisions in this matter.

Many ascending Syrians and Greeks eventually converted to the Latin rite. This phenomenon often seems to have been connected to the last step of social ascension into the highest echelons of society. Particularly from the 1440s onwards, some of the families involved in the highest social rise appeared regularly in the papal registers or elsewhere as Latins, such as the Podocataro, the Chimi, Salah, Mistachiel, Sincritico and Urri families<sup>1495</sup>. However, even as early as the end of the fourteenth century, those men who rose high seem to have regularly converted to the Latin rite. Machairas commented on Thomas Barech in the 1380s that he had been a Greek (i. e. Melkite<sup>1496</sup>) Orthodox burgess and had then converted and become a Latin knight<sup>1497</sup>. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the important official George Capadoca and later Hugo Podocataro and Giacomo Urri were Latins. About others, such as Piero Podocataro and Philippe and Jean Salah, we do not know anything. However, many of their nearest relatives had converted, so probably they had, too<sup>1498</sup>.

We have special information about George Capadoca. A papal privilege from 1411 not only proves that George adhered to the Latin rite, but also suggests that he may have been recently converted<sup>1499</sup>. The Capadoca family had been

known from at least the early fourteenth century on<sup>1500</sup>, but George was the first of his family to become royal counsellor. A treaty with the republic of Genoa from 1414, when he was part of the Haute Court, proves that he had also been knighted<sup>1501</sup>. At some point before 1411, George had rented an estate from the bishopric of Limassol. In 1411, Pope John XXIII confirmed this procedure. The privilege is addressed to »[our] esteemed son the nobleman George Capadoca, *domicellus* from Nicosia<sup>1502</sup>« and thus confirms George's noble status. Moreover, the pope stated explicitly that he gave his assent in order to further George's love for the Latin Church: »we therefore wish, since you are – as you say – councillor to our well-beloved son in Christ the illustrious King of Cyprus Janus, that your devotion to us and the Roman Church shall grow ever so much greater<sup>1503</sup>«. The pope would surely have desired to further every Latin Christian's love to the Roman Church. However, it is notable that it is explicitly mentioned here, and perhaps it indicates that George had not been a Latin Christian for long.

Only two cases seem to indicate that the men in question might have ascended the social ladder without converting, and they are very uncertain, since they are adduced by Wilpertus Rudt de Collenberg, who does not indicate his sources. Collenberg insisted that Nicolas Podocataro, one of the earliest known members of this family, was King James I's counsellor between 1385 and 1398, and that he belonged to the Greek rite. This would be a very interesting case of social ascension without a parallel conversion to the Latin rite. Jean Podocataro, whom Rudt de Collenberg mentions as Nicolas' son, also most probably adhered to the Greek rite<sup>1504</sup>. Jean is called *nobilis* in the inscription lists of the University of Padua, where his sons were enlisted, but it is uncertain whether he was considered as such in Cyprus<sup>1505</sup>. However, as we will see

1492 Examples of conversions in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries exist, but they are very rare, see Nicolaou-Konnari, Encounter 379.

1493 Again, I shall follow literature and speak of conversion from one rite to the other, in order to emphasize the gravity of this step, although technically passing from one rite to another was not a conversion in a legal sense.

1494 Papadopoulos, *Domē kai Leitourgia* 778 postulated that conversion was above all connected to the better possibilities of education which Greek individuals could only find within the institutions of the Latin Church. But since the possibility of studying in Padua existed, this cannot be the most important reason for conversion during the fifteenth century. Rather, the following analysis illustrates that socio-economic rise in general must have played a role. Papadopoulos also postulated that the number of conversions was generally very low, but we will see that this is not the case in the fifteenth century.

1495 For the Podocataro family, see below. For the Chimi, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 222: Jacobus Chimi attained the privilege of full absolution on 7.5.1469, and was thus certainly a member of the Latin Church. Alice Chimi was buried in St Sophia in the second half of the fifteenth century, see Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae* no. 76. For the Salah, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 144: Babin Salah attained full absolution on 24.3.1447, and no. 209: Jacob Salah attained full absolution as one of Charlotte of Lusignan's followers on 18.5.1467. For the Sincritico family, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 209: Elena also attained full absolution on 18.5.1467. For the Urri, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 158: Giacomo Urri was procurator at the curia for his relative Nicolas on 6.7.1451, who became canon in Nicosia after his relative Odet Urri. Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 209: Petrus and Johanna Urri attained full absolution on 18.5.1467.

1496 For a discussion of these designations, see ch. 1.2, p. 37.

1497 Machairas, *Exēgēsis* (Dawkins) § 599.

1498 Coureas, *Ethnicity and Identity* 78 also observed that Greeks and Syrians who attained high state office crossed over to the Latin rite. For Hugo Podocataro and George Capadoca, see below. For Giacomo Urri, see above n. 1495. For Piero Podocataro, see Bustron, *Diēgēsis* (Kechagioglou) 72-74. 78. 82-84 and below. For Jean and Philippe Salah, see Machairas, *Exēgēsis* § 704; Documents chypriotes (Richard) 141-153; Documents nouveaux (Mas Latrie) 380. George Billy, who had become the king's counsellor by 1403, is an uncertain case. He possessed a copy of the Orthodox metaphrastic menologion for January and November in Greek (Darrouzès, *Manuscrits originares* 187; for the content of the manuscript and the wording of the French owner's note, see Paschke, *Klementinen-Epitomen* 135-136). However, this does not necessarily reveal anything about his official affiliation.

1499 See Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 41, and ASVat, Reg. Lat. 145 fols 169<sup>r-v</sup>.

1500 Nicolaou-Konnari, *Greeks* 50. Cf. ch. 2.2, p. 65.

1501 Sperone (ed.), *Real Grandezza* 142.

1502 ASVat, Reg. Lat. 145 fol. 169: *dilecto filio Nobili viro Georgio Cappadoco domicello Nicosien(se)*.

1503 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalo schisma* ap. β-5, p. 419 (John XXIII): *Nos itaque, volentes te, qui – ut asseris – carissimi in Christo filii nostri Iani regis Cypri illustris consiliarius existis, ut eo amplius tua devotio ad nos et Romanam Ecclesiam augeatur* (ASVat, Reg. Lat. 145 fol. 169<sup>r</sup>).

1504 For the question of Jean's religious affiliation, see below. For Nicolas as James' counsellor, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 135. Unfortunately, Collenberg does not state his sources either for Nicolas' office or the postulation that he was Jean's father.

1505 Blizn'uk, *Gumanitarnyj fond* 134. Cf. Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 137 and ch. 2.2, p. 68.

below, Jean's children, who attained fiefs and knighthood, all converted to the Latin rite. Generally, the great quantity of Syrians and Greeks who converted to the Latin rite in the fifteenth century strongly suggests that it was extremely conducive to adhere to the Latin rite in order to find entry into the highest echelons of Cypriot society<sup>1506</sup>. The question now is how this official affiliation was conceived and lived.

Hugo Podocataro's testament, which Rudt de Collenberg edited in 1993<sup>1507</sup>, is an invaluable source for an individual case in this respect. As we have seen before<sup>1508</sup>, Hugo was an important statesman in the 1440s. Together with his siblings, he had reached the highest social rise imaginable at the time, being awarded knighthood, fiefs and offices by the crown. Hugo's sister had married into the well-known noble Babin family. His brothers George and Ludovico made important Church careers. Ludovico, perhaps the most well-known family member, worked as Pope Alexander VI's secretary later in his life and became cardinal in 1500<sup>1509</sup>.

In 1452, Hugo made his testament, which he wrote himself in Italian. The autograph of the testament has been preserved in the Venetian state archives<sup>1510</sup>. The testament was corroborated by the notary Benedict de Ovetariis in the royal palace, as a short paragraph on the outside page informs the reader. It was testified almost solely by members of Syrian families<sup>1511</sup>.

Hugo begins his testament with the usual formulae concerning the uncertainty of the moment of death and the will of the testator to order his affairs that we also find in other Latin Christian testaments<sup>1512</sup>:

I, Hugo Podocataro, the aforementioned testator, healthy in mind and intellect, mindful of the divine decision for which everyone ignores when their life will end, how and when it must happen and that everyone must die without there being anything more certain than death and anything

more uncertain than the hour of death, according [to what] is said in the Holy Evangelium through the mouth of our creator Jesus Christ himself, who says: 'keep alert, because you don't know the day or the hour' etc. Thus, I the aforementioned Hugo, considering and turning my attention to the aforementioned things, fearing that I may die without a testament and wishing to provide for the salvation of my soul and for my possessions [which] the most high creator has given me, have drafted the following testament, written by my own hand<sup>1513</sup>.

The testament continues with the standard phrase that the testator recommends his soul to God, the Virgin Mary and all the celestial court. So far, Hugo could be just any Latin Christian. Then, however, the text becomes interesting. Hugo requests to be buried in the Greek women's monastery of *Le Femene*<sup>1514</sup> in Nicosia, in his father's grave. He leaves the monastery 50 besants, 25 to be given to the nuns who are each supposed to say 25 Paternoster and 25 Ave Maria for his soul, and 25 besants for the decoration of the church. Hugo continues that, since he was married *in francho*, the Latin cathedral church of St Sophia might refuse a Greek burial (»perhaps the cathedral church will make problems at having me buried in the Greek manner<sup>1515</sup>«), and requests all his relatives, testamentary executors and even the king and queen to intervene with the archbishop (or whoever should be in charge of the Latin church<sup>1516</sup>) on his behalf. He requests them to pay 200 besants for the dispensation, and if that is not enough, even up to 30 ducats<sup>1517</sup>. Should the dispensation be denied, Hugo desires to be buried in the Augustinian church, at the top of the stairs leading to the great altar or near the grave of St Nicholas of Tolentino<sup>1518</sup>.

This renders the highly valuable information that Hugo Podocataro had married his – presumably also Greek – wife Theodora Melissini<sup>1519</sup> according to the Latin rite, a procedure

1506 Nicolaou-Konnari, Greeks 45 also asserts that it was necessary to convert to the Latin rite in order to achieve social ascension.

1507 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro.

1508 Cf. ch. 2.2, p. 68 and 4.2.2, p. 121.

1509 Cf. ch. 2.2, p. 68-69 and for Ludovico, see Parlato, Memorie romane 69-70.

1510 See Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 142. I have been able to confirm from the document itself in ASVen, Notarile, Testamenti 14 that Hugo indeed wrote the testament himself.

1511 ASVen, Notarile, Testamenti 14. For a more detailed analysis of the witnesses, see ch. 3.2, p. 89.

1512 See e.g. the corpus of testaments registered at the Parisian parliament (Testaments enregistrés [Chaigne]) and Berenger Albi's testament in Mas Latrie (ed.), Nouvelles preuves II 26-27. The testaments from Venetian Crete edited by Sally McKee also feature similar contents, but use somewhat different formulae, see McKee (ed.), Wills passim.

1513 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 143: *Io Hugo Podocataro testador predito, sano di mente et intelletto havendo nella memoria el divin iudicio che cadaun persona el fin di soa vita ignora, qual et quando esser debe et a cadaun conven che mora non essendo cosa piu certa che la morte et piu incerta che lora de la morte, secundo e dinotado nel sancto evangelio per bocha propria del nostro creator Jhesu Christo dicente: "vigilate et orate quia nescitis diem neque horam" etc. Per tanto considerando et animadvertendo io Hugo predito le cosse predite temendomi di morir senza testamento et volendo proveder ala salute de lanima mia et ali mei beni ma concesso il summo creatore, ho fato questo presente mio testamento inscriptis, de lamia man propria scritto.*

1514 This Greek monastery is mentioned in various sources. According to Florio Bustron, it was situated on or near the street of the Syrians in Nicosia (Bustron, Historia (Mas Latrie) 238). It is also mentioned in some of the documents from the Livre des remembrances in 1468 (Livre des remembrances [Richard] nos 110. 124) and in a document from 1454 published by Cathérine Otten-Froux (Otten-Froux, Investissements financiers 128), which informs us that it was dedicated to St Mary.

1515 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 143: *forse la giesia cathedrale fara difficulta a lasarmi sopellir in grego.*

1516 In 1451, John II's bastard son James had just been appointed to the archbishopric, but had not been confirmed by the pope, see above p. 145.

1517 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 143: *voglio dian al dito superiore et giesia per el quarto bisanti dusero et tanto piu quanto alor parera condecante per fin ducati XXX et non piu.* 30 ducats were around 210 besants, which is not much more than the first sum. But perhaps paying in golden ducats would in itself have given the payment more prestige and thus a better value. For the money rates see Documents chypriotes (Richard) 18 and cf. p. 45.

1518 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 143-144. Nicholas of Tolentino lived in Italy in the thirteenth century and was thus a recent saint in Hugo's times. He was known for his great charity, strict asceticism and untiring pastoral care, and was venerated especially as helper in times of need. Cf. Zumkeller, Nikolaus v. Tolentino 868-869.

1519 Rudt de Collenberg, Les premiers Podocataro 145.

which would presuppose an official affiliation with said rite. This affiliation was probably rather new, since Hugo's father was buried in the Greek women's monastery Le Femene, and one of Hugo's aunts was a nun of the Greek rite<sup>1520</sup>. Thus, at the representative moment of marriage, Hugo had taken care to belong to the Latin Church. However, when it came to the central and very personal matter of burial, he wanted to be buried with his father in a Greek monastery. The matter was so important to him that he was willing to spend a large sum of money on attaining this goal, and even begged for the intercession of the royal couple. Thus, in spite of being an official member of the Latin Church, he had retained an important emotional relationship with his Greek religious heritage, which became important for his identity at the moment of death. Hugo's relationship to the Greek Church is also illustrated by the fact that he knew at least two Greek nuns personally: he bequeathed 25 besants each to Deramera and Magdalini, whom he called his aunt's *compagne* ('companions') and requested them to say 25 Paternosters and Ave Marias for eight consecutive days<sup>1521</sup>.

Beyond his personal ties to the Greek Church, Hugo also related to the Augustinian church, his second choice of burial, and to the cathedral church of St Sophia. To both he bequeathed 150 besants a year. In return, they were supposed to sing a mass for him every day and celebrate an *aniversall/aniversario* every year on the anniversary of his death. Finally, Hugo requested that if the »small new house« originally designated to his second son Janus should by any chance not be inherited by this son nor wanted by any of the defunct's brothers, it should be sold and ten ducats of the proceedings be given to his brother's chapel of the Cross<sup>1522</sup> each year, while the rest was supposed to benefit the Dominicans who should sing masses for his soul like the Augustinians. Hugo therefore left money to a number of Latin institutions. To the monastery of Le Femene in turn he gave 70 besants for singing a mass two times a week and for celebrating a (Gr.) *mnimosino* on the anniversary of his death. The money was supposed to be supplied from his income accruing from the saltlake in Limassol<sup>1523</sup>. The instructions illustrate how Hugo was part of both traditions. He complied with the usual rituals for the dead in both churches and used the familiar vocabulary of *aniversario* on the Latin and *mnimosino* on the Greek side for memorial services on the anniversary of a defunct's death. Although Hugo feared that he might not be

allowed to be buried in the Greek monastery, his ties to the Greek Church were by no means secret. This is an important difference to former centuries, when it seems that those few Greeks who converted to the Latin rite sometimes administered Greek ceremonies in secret<sup>1524</sup>. In the fifteenth century, this was not necessary any more.

It is difficult to tell what Hugo's emotional relationship to the Latin Church may have been. According to Rudt de Collenberg, Hugo did not have a great opinion of ecclesiastics, as he finished his instructions to the churches with the remark that if the said churches should not comply with the requests, the money should be given to the poor instead (»it should be distributed every year [...] to the poor in Christ, that is prisoners, invalids, for marrying virgins and similar pious works<sup>1525</sup>«). Rudt de Collenberg calls this phrase »un peu désabusive<sup>1526</sup>« and argues that Hugo never requested a papal privilege like his co-ambassadeurs did, in spite of having been to Rome five times. He even says that »Hugues, en tout cas, se considérait comme appartenant au rite grec et fut considéré comme tel<sup>1527</sup>«.

I do not think these arguments are enough to assume a negative attitude towards the Latin Church, let alone an identification with the Greek Church alone. Hugo's marriage according to the Latin rite and the requests to sing masses for his soul as well as his anxiety lest he should not be allowed to be buried in a Greek monastery show that he was certainly considered Latin by others. And he indeed identified with the Latin Church at certain points in his life like his wedding, even if this identification may have stemmed more from social and political causes than from personal pious ones. Moreover, the phrase *et simel pie cause* seems to me a normal expression: Hugo tried to include any pious cases he may have forgotten. His numerous embassies to the papal curia also suggest that his relationship to the Latin Church must have been quite good, even if that applied first of all to the political level. Collenberg reports that Hugo was even asked to serve as *custos conclavi*, as guardian of the conclave which elected the pope behind locked doors, along with Phoebus of Lusignan during the papal election in 1447, which was a great honour<sup>1528</sup>. It is true that no requests for papal privileges from his side have been found in the papal registers until now, while his two co-ambassadors Phoebus of Lusignan and Babin Salah each received an absolution in 1447. Perhaps the privileges have just not been found or failed to be registered. But even

1520 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 148. It could of course be possible that Jean Podocataro had been buried in a Greek monastery although he had been a member of the Latin Church, just as Hugo projected for himself, but the fact that Jean's sister Chimarina was a Greek nun suggests that both were actually of the Greek rite.

1521 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 148. It is not completely clear from the testament whether Chimarina and her companions were nuns at Le Femene itself, but it seems a reasonable suggestion.

1522 Obviously one of Hugo's brothers possessed a private chapel dedicated to the Holy Cross. The Podocataro probably had a special relationship to the Cross, as their connection with the monastery of the Holy Cross (Stavrovouni) in the sixteenth century indicates. See *Documents nouveaux* (Mas Latrie) 589-590.

1523 For all the legacies to the churches, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 144 and 146.

1524 Nicolaou-Konnari, *Encounter* 380.

1525 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 144: *se distribuiscia ogni anno [...] in poveri di Christo, zoe prisonieri, infermi, maridar verzene et simel pie cause*.

1526 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 161.

1527 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 160.

1528 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 140. For an explanation of the conclave, see Roberg, *Konklave* 1334.

if that is not the case, a negative attitude to the Latin church cannot have been the reason, particularly as Hugo requested privileges for his relatives on various occasions<sup>1529</sup>. His request to be buried in the Augustine church near St Nicholas of Tolentino on the contrary suggests that he might even have had a special relationship to this saint, and that he knew the church well.

In general, Hugo's testament depicts an individual who related to both the Latin and the Orthodox Churches, even if the nature of these two relationships probably differed. While he certainly had an emotional tie to the Greek monastery of *Le Femene*, the relationship to the Latin Church may have been mostly political, although this is not certain. Counting as Latin at the moment of marriage at least was probably necessary for social ascendance.

Other members of Hugo's family delved even further into Latin religious identity, as they decided to actively serve the Latin Church. The most distinguished was the above mentioned cardinal Ludovico Podocataro. But other family members also joined the ranks of the Latin clergy<sup>1530</sup>. In 1443, Giorgio Podocataro received canonries in Nicosia and Paphos. In 1451, he was appointed papal *protonotarius*, a very high honour which usually led to the cardinalate<sup>1531</sup>. In 1464, a certain Carolus, perhaps Hugo's other brother Carlo, became canon in Nicosia and Paphos as well as cantor in the latter town, and treasurer of Famagusta in 1468 or 1469<sup>1532</sup>. Undoubtedly the service in the Latin Church must have meant at least a certain degree of identification with it. At the same time, it granted the men in question an income.

Later, the association with cardinal Ludovico, who was so close to the popes, must have been another stimulus to use Latin religious identity for the benefit of the family. A papal privilege from 14 May 1472 shows that the family very consciously represented themselves as Latins, probably in order to gain acceptance both with Cypriot noble society and the papacy. The document states that Philippe Podocataro along with his relatives James and Janus, the sons of Peter Podocataro, and Gioffredo, son of Jean Babin (who had married Maria, Hugo's sister) had requested permission to build Latin churches on their respective *casalia* and to pay priests or friars to celebrate Latin masses there. They argued that unfortunately there were too few Latin churches in the countryside<sup>1533</sup>

but on the other hand many Greek, Armenian, Jacobite and even schismatic churches. This afforded them, good Christians living according to the Latin rite, great displeasure<sup>1534</sup>.

One would usually expect an argument of this sort for example from Latin Church officials coming from outside Cyprus or the papacy itself, and it is interesting that this originally Orthodox family appropriated such a discourse. They even went as far as suggesting to take over Armenian, Greek or other church buildings which they call »heretic«, and to turn them into Latin ones as an alternative to building new churches on their *casalia*<sup>1535</sup>. This would most certainly not have increased the family's popularity amongst the local population, so the socio-political benefit of installing these Latin churches must have been considerable for the family to attempt this anyway. This is also illustrated by the fact that the churches were to be built at the family's own expense and later to be endowed with proceeds from their tithes as well as additional family donations<sup>1536</sup>. The Podocataros put a lot of effort into this new Latin identity, styling themselves »more Latin than the Latins«, many of whom probably simply visited the Greek and Oriental churches in the countryside. The profit in terms of social prestige with their fellow nobles and perhaps with the papacy itself must have been worth it. Therefore, it seems that at least this family used their Latin identity as a strong social marker in order to underline their separation from other elements of society. It is worth noting that this still worked in the 1470s, when in 1485 Felix Faber in his travel diary would complain that he had witnessed the shocking event of one and the same priest first celebrating the Latin mass and then the Greek one<sup>1537</sup>. This illustrates how the context and audience of identity representations have to be taken into account<sup>1538</sup>. While on the everyday level, the different rites might be administered by one priest in personal union, the identity a rite entailed might still be highly important on the level of social politics.

Other Syrian and Greek families may have used their newly acquired Latin identities in a similar manner to the Podocataro. Especially from the 1440s onwards, many of them appear as Latin clerics in the papal registers, though not all of these families attained membership in the high nobility. The earliest Syrian registered as a Latin canon is Jean Cadash,

1529 At least according to Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 140, the canonry given to Giorgio Podocataro in 1443 was obtained by Hugo. In 1451, Hugo was procurator for Nicolas Urri along with Giacomo Urri and helped obtaining a canonry for him, see Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 158. Rudt de Collenberg does not register him as procurator for Giorgio Podocataro, who was promoted to *protonotarius* at roughly the same time, but it is very probable that he acted as such.

1530 Cf. ch. 2.2., from p. 68, where I have mentioned these cases of social ascension, too.

1531 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 146.

1532 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 193. 214.

1533 For the scarceness of Latin churches in the Cypriot countryside, see e. g. Richard, *Peuplement latin et syrien* 162.

1534 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 173: *nulle latine sed tantummodo grecorum armeniorum et iacobitarum et quorundam etiam schisma-*

*ticorum ecclesie reperiuntur, ex quo dicto Philippeo eiusque consortibus huiusmodi aliisque Christi fidelibus latinis et catholico more viventibus ad displicentiam cedit non modicum.*

1535 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 174: *in quolibet ex casalibus predictis unam parrochiam ecclesiam cum officiniis et ornamentis necessariis de bonis propriis de novo erigere vel grecorum seu armeniorum aut aliorum non latinorum eretis [sic!] in latinas mutare.*

1536 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 174: *et cuilibet ipsarum viginti ducatos pro redditibus annuis ex fructibus decimalibus qui in dictis casalibus et pertinentiis eorum colliguntur pro perpetuis dotibus earum. Ita tamen quod Philippeus et [...] consortes [...] pro qualibet ecclesiarum de bonis propriis addere et in augmentum dotis huiusmodi assignare teneantur.*

1537 Frater Felix, *Evagatorium* (Hassler) 177.

1538 Cf. Mersch, *Shared Spaces* 463.

who was canon in Famagusta and Paphos in 1375 and also received a canonry in Nicosia in 1378. He died before October 1383<sup>1539</sup>. One Jean Fava of Beyruth was canon of Nicosia in 1408, though we do not know if he really was a Syrian, and in 1421 we first meet Andrea Audeth receiving the expectative to canonries in Paphos and Limassol. After occupying the important post of archdeacon of Nicosia, Andrea was to become bishop of Tortosa in 1451, following the death of a certain Salomon Cardus<sup>1540</sup>. There is a gap of about twenty years without mention of any other Syrian or Greek individuals with canonries after 1421, but from the 1440s onwards, they become more numerous. In 1443, Nicholaos Bezas became treasurer of Paphos and later seems to have been the general vicar of Nicosia. In 1444, Isaach Abrae de Mina became a canon in Paphos. In 1445, Paul Bustron was installed as abbot of the St Mary monastery of Episkopi<sup>1541</sup>. As late as 1451, the famous Urri family appears for the first time. Nicolas Urri became canon in Nicosia, and this canonry, among others, seems to have belonged to his relative Odet Urri before him<sup>1542</sup>. Salomon Gible, Jacques Seba, Philippe and Perrin Urri, a certain Franciscus de Leya (probably Laiazzo), and Jean Bustron all received canonries in one of the Cypriot dioceses in the years between 1458 and 1470<sup>1543</sup>. Petrus Careri, Moyses Gible<sup>1544</sup> and Antonius Cariote even obtained the offices of archdeacon of Paphos, Antioch and Famagusta in 1458, 1459 and 1469, respectively<sup>1545</sup>.

We cannot prove that these men followed an active strategy of representing their »Latinized religious identity« in order to attain social ascendance. However, the correlation between the occupation of church offices and social ascendance in some of these families such as the Urri, the Seba and the Bustron families is striking.

The question arises whether this development was in any way connected with the council of Ferrara-Florence and the union between the Latin and Greek Churches it had proclaimed in 1439. Did the union encourage these families to enter active service in the Latin Church, even if the Orthodox and Latin churches in Cyprus had officially been united since the thirteenth century? As is well known, the union was not accepted by the clergy and population in the Byzantine Empire. A part of the Greek Cypriot clergy, in contrast, tried

to use the union in order to gain control of the revenues from Latin Church ceremonies. They complained to Pope Eugene IV in November 1441 that the Latin clergy refused to implement the union and did not let Greeks take their communion nor participate in Latin marriages or funerals (thus excluding them also from the revenues deriving from these ceremonies). Thus, at least part of the Greek Cypriot Church would have welcomed the union's implementation, but it did not take place<sup>1546</sup>. Other documents, most of them cited above, also clearly show that the union did not change the way the different rites were perceived on the island. In 1452, Hugo Podocataro was still afraid he would not be able to be buried in the Greek manner, and in 1471, it was still very important to his relatives to erect Latin churches on their *casalia*. Moreover, the observed parallelism of conversion to the Latin rite and social ascension in itself suggests that the difference between the rites was still felt. Thus, it is highly improbable that the union had a lasting effect on Greeks' and Syrians' decisions to convert to the Latin rite<sup>1547</sup>. Other, social reasons as illustrated above were probably much more important. However, this does not exclude that some people may have been encouraged in their decision to enter Latin Church service directly after the union, if they believed that the churches on Cyprus would come to grow together even more than before.

In spite of all the possibilities an affiliation with the Latin Church entailed, there were also members of the same Syrian and Greek circles who opted for other modes of religious identity construction. In 1451, for example, a certain Paulinus Zacharias, one of Queen Helena Palaiologina's followers, used the possibility of papal privileges quite differently from the afore mentioned cases. He and his sons were awarded the privilege of conducting marriages and burials in the Greek rite, although Paulinus had been married to Latin women twice<sup>1548</sup>. In spite of his two mixed marriages he seems to have been intent on retaining his Orthodox traditions. The same can very probably be said for the chronicler Leontios Machairas. Given the composition of the work, it is highly probable that the religious statements in the chronicle can be attributed to Machairas himself<sup>1549</sup>. As Jean de Nores' secretary and even ambassador to Konya in 1432<sup>1550</sup>, Machairas

1539 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma* ap. α-1, pp. 4-6, α-61, pp. 99-101 (Clemens VII); Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 1.

1540 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalō schisma* ap. β-33, pp. 277-279 (Benedict XIII); Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 32. 82. 154. Cf. also Richard, *Une famille* 90.

1541 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* nos 131. 134. 139.

1542 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de Prosopgraphie* no. 158.

1543 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de Prosopgraphie* nos 173. 188. 192. 199. 205. 206.

1544 Moyses especially carries the epithet *de natione Syria* in the register, thus differentiating this family from the old noble Gible families. See Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 174.

1545 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de Prosopgraphie* nos 172. 174. 216.

1546 Eugene IV wrote to Andrew, the archbishop of Rhodes, in order to inform him of the complaint in form of a supplication he had received from some of the Greek bishops of Cyprus, and ordered him to see into the matter. Bullarium (Ripoll) 143-144. Cf. Kyriacou, *Orthodox Cyprus* 153-154. Hack-

ett, *History* 151-152 doubted the truth of this document, arguing that the Orthodox clergy would never have wanted the union to be implemented, an argument which stemmed more from his will to protect the Orthodox Cypriot church against any charges of fraternization than from the reality of the fifteenth century. Cf. Hill, *History* III 1090 who also sees the argumentation as unjustifiable, and also Coureas, *Conversion* 84.

1547 Richard, *Une famille* 91 suggests that the union facilitated the interpenetration of the various rites, but then backtracks and says that at least between the Latin and Greek rites, the interreligious phenomena were already to be seen in the fourteenth century.

1548 Rudt de Collenberg, *Études de prosopographie* no. 157.

1549 See for example the story of the cross of Tochni, Machairas, *Exégèsis* (Dawkins) §§ 67-77, especially §§ 72-73; Machairas, *Exégèsis* (Konnaré/Pierés) 101-107, and the story of Thibault's conversion below, and cf. p. 26.

1550 Bliznyuk, *Machairas* 58.

moved in the same circles as many of the individuals and families who opted for a changing of rites, but the author of the chronicle defined his religious identity as Orthodox. In a well-known passage, which is contained in somewhat differing versions in the three existing manuscripts, he commented on Thibault Belfaradge's conversion, which he made responsible for the latter's downfall and death<sup>1551</sup>. MS V states:

all this happened (to Thibault), because he ceased to have his hope in God, and put his trust in his wit and in the king's love for him, and because of worldly pride deserted the faith of his fathers and became a Latin. Now I am not condemning the Latins, but what is the need for a Greek to become a Latin? For should a good Christian despise the one faith and betake himself to the other<sup>1552</sup>?

If it is Machairas who is speaking here, then he maintained the opinion that everyone should stick to their own tradition, and that Belfaradge did not convert out of religious conviction, but out of »worldly pride«, i. e. for social distinction – a likely opinion given the very probable connection between conversion and social ascension. It is to be expected that there were others who thought in the same way, intent on retaining their Orthodox heritage.

However, the adherence to one's original religious traditions did not prevent good relationships with other rites or churches. The Audeth family is an interesting case in point. The three testaments preserved in the Venetian state archive concerning Gioan (16 September 1451), his uncle Antonio (13 July 1453) and the latter's wife Giaca Audeth (30 May 1468) create a fascinating picture of this family's relations with various churches. It is evident that these three members of the family, in contrast to their relative Andrea, by then Latin bishop of Tortosa, belonged to the Jacobite (Syrian Orthodox) church, since they mention its institutions as *nostra giesia* (»our church«)<sup>1553</sup>. All three wanted to be buried in a Syrian Orthodox church. It is not clear whether the same church building is meant in every case, since Gioan and Antonio both just speak of the church of the Jacobites (»the church of the Jacobites« / »the holy temple of the Jacobites<sup>1554</sup>«), while Giaca designates the church as »Our glorious Lady of

our Church<sup>1555</sup>«. However, since the Syrian Orthodox bishops ordained their priests in the Syrian Orthodox church of Our Lady<sup>1556</sup>, we can be fairly sure that this central community church of the Syrian Orthodox is meant in all three cases. Antonio had even built a chapel in this church, in which he wanted to be buried.

Both Gioan and Giaca left the church money for its expenses, Gioan the substantial sum of 400 besants, Giaca the more moderate amount of 25 besants. All three Audeth left money to various Syrian Orthodox churches and monasteries. Giaca for example bequeathed 250 besants to the church of St Nicholas, and 10 to the monastery of St Croce, Gioan and Antonio left the same churches between 25 and 40 besants respectively. Both Giaca and Gioan bequeathed 7.5 and 15 besants respectively to every Syrian Orthodox priest on the island (Gioan in order for them to commemorate him), and Gioan instructed the executors of his testament to pay the Syrian Orthodox church 600 besants per year for the masses sung for his soul<sup>1557</sup>. Thus, all three members of the Audeth family exhibit an affinity for their own church community.

The Syrian Orthodox is the only church mentioned in Giaca's will. Her husband and his nephew, on the other hand, also show connections to other churches<sup>1558</sup>. They considered the Copts, who had the same creed, as a sister church. Both left the »four Coptic churches« 100 besants, and Antonio bequeathed the same amount of money to Coptic priests attending his funeral as to their Syrian Orthodox brethren, whereas Gioan left 25 besants to the Coptic bishop for the commemoration of his soul. They also thought of other communities. Both left little sums to the churches in their neighbourhood, in Antonio's case Maronite, Armenian and Greek communities. Gioan specified that he wanted to donate to all the Greek communities near his house. He added that he desired to have masses sung for him according to the Italian, Greek and Jacobite rites (*alla italiana et alla greca et alla covitica*<sup>1559</sup>), although he does not specify by which congregation. Jean Richard has suggested that *alla italiana* could be the term for the Latin Church<sup>1560</sup>. However, this is not the only mention of the Latin Church. While Gioan donates 50 besants »to construct the dome in Santa Sophia<sup>1561</sup>« (i. e.

1551 Cf. also pp. 26-27, where I have analysed this episode in the context of the discussion of text transmission and authors.

1552 Machairas, Exēgēsis (Dawkins) § 579. Machairas, Exēgēsis (Konnarē/Pierēs) 403: MS V: οὐλον εγήνετον διατὶ ἐσύκοσεν τὴν ἐλπίδαν ἀπε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐθάρισεν εἰς τὸ νοῦντου καὶ εἰστήην ἀγάπην του ρυγὸς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἔπαρσην του κόσμου ἐγκατέλυπεν τὴν πατρικὴν του πίστην καὶ ἐγήνην λατῆνος το λυπὸν δὲν καταδικάζω τοὺς λατῆνους ἀμμὲ ἦντα χρῦσι ἵνα ρομῖοις ναγενὴ λατῆνος ἐπιδὴ ὀρθόδοξος χριστιανὸς ἵνα χρῦσι να καταφρονῖσι τὴν μίαν μπάισι εἰς τὴν ἄλλην; After the first sentence, MS O and R deviate from V, saying: »and thought that the God of the Latins is different from/greater than the God of the Greeks. And if a man thinks thus and changes his allegiance, God loves him neither in this world nor in the other. Men should therefore not despise the orthodox faith«. MS O: καὶ ἐθάρισεν ὅτι ἦνε ἄλλος θεὸς τοὺς λατῆνους παρά τοὺς ῥομῖοις καὶ ἢ τις πολλομᾶ τίπιαν στήμαν καὶ ἀλλάσση τὸ σέβεται ὁ θεὸς δὲν τὸν ἀγαπᾶ οὐδὲ ὀδε οὐδὲ ἐκὶ καὶ διατοῦτον δὲν πρέπι να κατάφρονουὺν τὴν ὀρθὴν πίστην; MS R only has a slightly differing version from this one. Both O and R give *souperpian tou kosmou* instead of *eparsēn tou kosmou* in the first sentence. The translations here follow Dawkins' translation apart from *eparsēn/souperpian tou kosmou*, 'worldly pride', which Dawkins trans-

lates as »because he was so much lifted up by the world«. I think the sense of the passage is better rendered by the above expression. See Machairas, Exēgēsis (Dawkins) § 579.

1553 Richard, Une famille 113. 127 (docs V, X): *la giesia di Acuviti/santo tempio di Acuviti*. Cf. also Richard's comment on p. 90; Antonio does not use this designation, but from the rest of his testament, it is quite clear that he also belonged to the Jacobite (Syrian Orthodox) church.

1554 Richard, Une famille 112 (doc. V). 118 (doc. VII).

1555 Richard, Une famille 127 (doc. X, Giaca): *gloriosa Nostra Donna della giesia nostra*.

1556 Richard, Une famille 127 n. 1.

1557 Richard, Une famille 113 (doc. V, Gioan). 118-119 (doc. VII, Antonio). 127 (doc. X, Giaca).

1558 Cf. Richard, Une famille 90.

1559 Richard, Une famille 113 (doc. V).

1560 Richard, Une famille 113 n. 2.

1561 Richard, Une famille 113: *per fabricar la cuba in Santa Sophya*. Cf. n. 6: Richard says that there is also a seal from the thirteenth century which seems to suggest that the transept of the Sophia church had a dome.

to restore the dome, probably of the transept in St Sophia), Antonio left the same sum to any Latin priests who paid him their last respects, as to the Syrian Orthodox priests. Both bequeathed 100 besants to their nephew Andrea, the Latin bishop<sup>1562</sup>.

However, by far the greatest part of the money Antonio gave to Church institutions he left in the hands of procurators in Venice: half of his income of Marathassa, which amounted to 4,333.3 ducats (i.e. 2,166.65 ducats) as well as 5,000 ducats which he had invested in the bank of Venice were supposed to be used for donations to monasteries, churches and the poor for the commemoration of his soul<sup>1563</sup>. Thus, although Antonio had a good relationship with his own Syrian Orthodox church, where he wanted to be buried, the really important money went to Venice. Jean Richard has suggested that Antonio made this transaction because he feared King John II would claim the money for himself after his death. The Venetian republic would have been powerful enough to resist against such claims<sup>1564</sup>. This sounds like a good explanation. Still, at least the 5,000 ducats invested in Venice would probably be used for donations in the republic itself, and therefore in Latin churches. The second biggest sum in Antonio's testament and the greatest in Gioan's will went to the poor in general – both men dispensed about 1,000 besants to the poor and the priests on the days of their funeral and commemoration festivities<sup>1565</sup>.

All these details suggest that although the Audeths still belonged to their traditional Syrian Orthodox community, which they saw as their own (*nostra giesa*), they took care to entertain good relationships with the other church communities of their neighbourhood, especially with the Coptic Church. They also seem to have entertained healthy relationships with the Latin Church on Cyprus, although they did not leave too much money there, in spite of their nephew Andrea being an active bishop there. However, the huge amount of money left to Venice illustrates that this cannot have been an aversion against the Latin Church in general. Rather, this could have been just a practical solution, since a lot of the Audeth's money was already invested in Venice. The great sums both Antonio and Gioan left for the care of the poor also suggest that they may have focused on exhibiting pious works in general.

In contrast to the men of the family, Giaca Audeth does not seem to have perceived the relations to other churches as her responsibility. But she had also taken care to transfer most of her money to her relatives in donations *inter vivos*, so she

did not possess great sums at the moment of her death<sup>1566</sup>. Perhaps she saw her own instructions as the only measures which could be undertaken with the money she had left, and this minimal amount went to the congregation she considered her own. To conclude, the Audeths maintained their traditional identity, but had a wide network of contacts to other communities.

The case of the Audeth family also shows very clearly that the lines between different choices in religious identity construction were not clearly cut in circles and families. In one and the same family, there could be individuals who converted to the Latin rite and others who maintained their traditional identities. The legacies to Andrea Audeth suggest that relationships between the family members were good. Other examples hint in the same direction. Machairas for example mentions that a certain Philippe, son of one of his father's cousins, was a Latin priest, while Philippe's mother lived as a Greek nun in the St Mamas monastery<sup>1567</sup>. The Urri family is another case in point. While some Urri actively served the Latin church from the 1450s, a certain Perrin Urri made his testament in 1481 and bequeathed 30 Genoese *luoghi* to the Greek monastery Ai Pandes<sup>1568</sup>. We do not know if Perrin was officially Orthodox or if this is a similar case to Hugo Podocataro's testament. However, the fact that Urri left money only to a Greek monastery points in the first direction<sup>1569</sup>. Moreover, Paulinus Zacharias, who wanted to conduct his weddings and burials in the Greek rite, seems to have belonged to the circle around Hugo Podocataro, if he indeed is identical with the Pol Zacer who witnessed the latter's testament<sup>1570</sup>. Unfortunately, we cannot say whether some families pursued the strategy of just one member converting in order to pursue a career, while the others cultivated their traditional identities. In any case, it was certainly not a problem for different family members to pertain to different rites, although we should not forget that Leontios Machairas still complained about conversion.

Another solution for the choice between the rites can be seen in the *Diēgēsis*<sup>1571</sup>. Its author Georgios Bustron cannot be counted either to the traditionalizing group or to the Latinizing individuals. It is not even possible to discern which rite Georgios belonged to officially. Similar to his unifying strategy with respect to ethnic identities<sup>1572</sup>, Georgios seems to have levelled religious differences in his chronicle. He achieved this through vagueness and disinterest in religious matters. In contrast to Machairas, there are no miracle stories in his text. Religious men such as monks, priests and bishops al-

1562 For all the above legacies, see Richard, *Une famille* 113 (doc. V, Gioan) and 119 (doc. VII, Antonio).

1563 Richard, *Une famille* 120-121 (doc. VII).

1564 Richard, *Une famille* 95.

1565 Richard, *Une famille* 112-113 (doc. V, Gioan). 118 (doc. VII, Antonio).

1566 See Richard, *Une famille* docs VIII, IX, X.

1567 Machairas, *Exēgēsis* (Dawkins) § 566.

1568 Otten, *Investissements financiers* 121-122. For the term *luoghi* and its meaning, see p. 66 and n. 604. Would this be the same Perrin Urri who worked as secretary in the 1450s? Cf. pp. 88-89.

1569 It is also interesting to note that a member of a Syrian family left money to a Greek monastery. This could perhaps be a hint that the family were Melkites and therefore were of the same rite as the Greek.

1570 Rudt de Collenberg, *Les premiers Podocataro* 160 reasonably suggests that Pol Zacer and Paulinus Zacharias were the same person.

1571 See from p. 27 for more information on this chronicle.

1572 Cf. ch. 5.2, p. 138.



most never appear in their religious functions in the story, but only as James II's followers, sometimes even leading military operations<sup>1573</sup>. James' appointment as archbishop of Cyprus is never treated in religious terms. The archbishopric only plays a role as James' fief which renders him a substantial income<sup>1574</sup>. The author distinguishes between Greek (Gr. *Rhomaïos*) and Latin (Gr. *Fragkos*) prelates<sup>1575</sup>, but this is not important for the story. In contrast to Leontios Machairas and Paulinus Zacharias, but also to the conscious Latinizing self-representation of families such as the Podocataro, the author of the chronicle does not seem to have been interested in religious matters at all.

Thus, the religious choices ascending Greeks and Syrians made varied. Many opted for a conversion to the Latin rite. This was rewarding in many ways. Not only does it seem to have furthered their social rise. It was also a method of accessing (monetary) resources such as church canonries and papal privileges. Other climbers chose to retain their traditional heritage, although this did not hinder good relationships with other communities. It cannot be said conclusively whether a decision for the traditional affiliation really decreased the chances for social ascension, but the fact that all those who attained high state office and fiefs as well as knighthood adhered to the Latin rite points strongly in this direction. Nevertheless, Hugo Podocataro's case illustrates that an official conversion to the Latin rite did not automatically entail a complete change in personal identity construction. Rather, Syrians and Greeks continued to construct their religious identities in a hybrid way, depending on the various contexts they moved in.

## 6.4 Western Newcomers

The information on the religious identities of noble Western newcomers living in Cyprus is indeed very individual. Three testaments shed light on the religious sentiments of their testators shortly before their deaths. They stem from Berenger Albi, a Frenchman from the Vivarais, Antonio de Bergamo, and his wife Pinadeben de Ferrara, all of whom we have met already in the course of this study<sup>1576</sup>. Moreover, we have information on one other legacy concerning the Genoese brothers Nicola and Francesco Mussi<sup>1577</sup>.

As we have seen before, Berenger Albi had probably come to Cyprus sometime before 1400 in the wake of his uncles who were clerics on the island: Berenger Gregorii was abbot of the Benedictine monastery of the Holy Cross (Stavrovouni), and Petrus was dean at St Sophia<sup>1578</sup>. Berenger Albi and his children integrated well into Cypriot society. Berenger himself was *maître de l'hôtel* when he wrote his testament in 1411, and his children were both married to scions of important Cypriot noble families<sup>1579</sup>. On the social level, therefore, the family had adapted well. The religious sphere offers a different picture.

Berenger's testament begins with the usual formulae about the instability of life and the uncertainty of the hour of death. These phrases are followed by instructions about the funeral. Berenger desired to be buried in St Sophia, in the grave of his uncles Berenger and Petrus Gregorii. He bestowed 300 besants on St Sophia for the priests to take part in his funeral procession and to sing masses for his soul for nine days, as well as 100 besants to each of the Mendicant orders to do the same. The priests of St Sophia were also supposed to sing special masses for another nine days at the end of the year and to establish a daily mass for Berenger's and his wife's soul. This last point was to be executed «according to the customs of the homeland<sup>1580</sup>». This could just mean the customs of the country, i.e. Cyprus, but perhaps Berenger referred to his own homeland France here. In this case, Berenger would have explicitly related his instructions to the customs of his homeland France.

Berenger's attachment to explicitly Latin, perhaps »French« religious customs was mirrored by his circle of acquaintances. Apart from family members, the men concerned with his testament were mostly foreign clerics<sup>1581</sup>. On his deathbed, Berenger Albi therefore seems to have related mostly to men from the same Latin clerical milieu, and he seems to have perceived his religious identity as expressly »French« Latin. It is impossible to say whether this identification with French customs was a protective reaction to the hybrid religious atmosphere on the island or just nostalgia.

The other two testaments by foreigners modify this picture a bit. They are closely interrelated, since they belong to Antonio de Bergamo and his wife Pinadeben de Ferrara. We have seen in chapter two that Antonio, a *doctor artis et medicinae* who originated from Bergamo in Italy, pursued an important

1573 Bustron, Diëgësis (Kechagioglou), e.g. 18 (a certain brother Salpous is part of the party which pillages Thomas Urri's house). 40 (Antonio Soulouan plays check with James). 52 (Antonio Soulouan is sent as emissary to Queen Charlotte). 80 (the Augustinian friar Guillaume Goneme, who has just been made archbishop of Nicosia, is sent with a military party to secure Nicosia during the civil war). 102 (Guillaume Goneme goes on a military expedition to the Carpas peninsula). An exception is Queen Helena's confessor, to whom James turns after his murder of Thomas of Morea in order to beg him to use his influence on the queen in his favour. Bustron, Diëgësis (Kechagioglou) 12.  
1574 Bustron, Diëgësis (Kechagioglou) 6: και ἔδωκεν του την αρχιεπισκοπήν με ούλες τες ρέντες και δέκατα ('And he (the king) gave him the archbishopric with all its rents and tithes'.) When James murders Thomas of Morea, his father dispossesses him of the archbishopric, a process which again is described in the way of taking away his fief: Και ἔρισεν ο ρήγας και εσήκωσάν

του την αρχιεπισκοπήν. ('And the king ordered them to take away from him the archbishopric'.) Bustron, Diëgësis (Kechagioglou) 10.  
1575 Bustron, Diëgësis (Kechagioglou) 88. 154.  
1576 Cf. ch. .3.1, pp. 76-77 for Antonio and Pinadeben and ch. 2.3.5, pp. 83-84 for Berenger.  
1577 Kouroupakis, Hë Kypros kai to megalo schisma ap. β-5, pp. 348-350 (Boniface VIII).  
1578 Mas Latrie (ed.), Nouvelles preuves II 27-28.  
1579 Cf. ch. .3.5, p. 83-84.  
1580 Mas Latrie (ed.), Nouvelles preuves II 28: *secundum usus patriae*. For the daily masses, see 27-28.  
1581 Cf. ch. 3.2, p. 89.

career in Cyprus between the 1360s and 1390s. At the end of his life, he was chamberlain of the kingdom<sup>1582</sup>. His wife Pinadeben, also from Italy, still lived in Cyprus in 1406, when she made her last will<sup>1583</sup>. Antonio's daughter Bertolina was married to a certain Robert, who came from the well-known Cypriot Morphou family<sup>1584</sup>. Thus, Antonio and his family, too, had successfully integrated into Cypriot noble society.

Religiously, it is more difficult to garner information about Antonio than about Berenger, since we do not have his whole testament, but only a long list of receipts concerning the payments of his legacies<sup>1585</sup>. The lists reveal that Antonio left 25 besants to each of the four mendicant orders, a rather low sum compared to the money Berenger bequeathed to them. Furthermore, Antonio bequeathed 50 besants to a Franciscan nun called Bella Pelegrina and to the king's confessor, Simon de Aretio, both of whom seem to have been from Italy like himself. He also left money to be given to the poor, since two receipts concern sums spent for marriages of the needy. According to the receipts, the testament's executors were two Italians, Thomas de Zenariis from Padua, who also played an important role in the Cypriot Haute Court at the time, and Clemens de Aretio<sup>1586</sup>.

From other sources, we know that Antonio was canon of Paphos before getting married<sup>1587</sup>, though this is not mentioned on his tombstone, where he is called »famous magister [...] and doctor *dominus* Antonius of Bergamo, chamberlain of the kingdom of Cyprus<sup>1588</sup>«. His career as a statesman was certainly more important than his service in the church by the time he died. Antonio was buried in the Arab Ahmet Mosque, which can probably be identified with the Carmelite church<sup>1589</sup>. Almost all the tombstones of Venetian citizens from that period found in Cyprus stem from this church<sup>1590</sup>. This could point to a special relationship between the Venetians and the church. Perhaps Antonio was buried there because he was a Venetian citizen. These snippets tell us that Antonio must have been a regular member of the Latin church, and in his younger years even a member of the clergy. However, by the time of his death, his relationship with church circles does not seem to have been as intense as that of Berenger, although we do not know how much money he left to other churches that are not documented in the receipts. Antonio's personal relationships on the religious level seem to have been mostly to other foreigners from Italy, and his burial place also points to a special relationship with a church connected with his homeland Venice.

This special connection with Venice is more obvious in the documents concerning his wife Pinadeben's testament. Two surviving documents shed light on Pinadeben's last will. On 26 April 1406, she made her last testament<sup>1591</sup>, in which she mentions a commission to Thomas de Zenariis which she had had drawn up a year earlier on 27 September 1405. This latter document, unedited until now, lies in the Venetian State Archives among the documents of the notary Pietro de Yspania who recorded the legacy<sup>1592</sup>. The 1406 testament itself had been recorded in the book of the curia of Keryneia, which must have been a register similar to the *Livre des remembrances* which we know from the court in Nicosia. On 3 November 1406, the notary Marcus of Smyrna extracted the testament from the book and edited it as an official public document, because Thomas de Zenariis needed a proof of the testament's wording. This extracted document, including an extra introduction explaining the whole matter of the extraction, is now registered among the documents of the notary Antonio del Vida in the Venetian State Archives and has been edited by Mas Latrie<sup>1593</sup>. Both documents were entrusted to the *avogadori di comun* on 10 December 1407<sup>1594</sup>. Since the *avogadori di comun* were responsible for the execution of public and private affairs in Venice<sup>1595</sup>, this indicates that Thomas de Zenariis probably realized Pinadeben's wishes.

The 1406 testament was drawn up in French. As far as religious matters are concerned, it informs us that Pinadeben wanted to be buried in the Corpus Christi chapel in the burgh of Keryneia<sup>1596</sup>, where she lived. She left the chapel 50 besants for its expenses. Moreover, she bequeathed 5 besants each to two local clerics, one Marc of Beyruth, who was prior of Keryneia, and one Pierre, priest of the chapel of St George *du Donjon*<sup>1597</sup>. Finally, she ordered Thomas de Zenariis to act according to the commission she had assigned to him earlier concerning a chapel in Venice<sup>1598</sup>.

The commission from 1405 states that Pinadeben had originally made her testament in July 1404 and had left half of the money which she had invested in Venice to Thomas de Zenariis, while her second husband Nicolo de Assono should inherit the other half. Pinadeben had inherited this money from her first husband Antonio. However, in 1405 she decided that the whole sum should instead be used for the erection of an altar and a little chapel in a church either in Venice or in Padua, for the commemoration of her first husband Antonio and herself. She explicitly stated that her present husband Nicolo agreed to this idea and that she

1582 See ch. 2.3.1, pp 76-77.

1583 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 22-24.

1584 See ASVen, *Cancellaria inferiore*. Notai b. 56/3.

1585 I have analysed these lists during the discussion of Antonio's career and integration, see ch 2.3.1, from pp. 76-77.

1586 ASVen, *Cancellaria inferiore*. Notai b. 56/3. For Thomas de Zenariis, cf. ch. 2.3.1, p. 77.

1587 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* II 372.

1588 Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae* no. 147: *famosus magister [...] et m'dicus dns antonius d'Perguamo regno cipri camrarius*.

1589 See above, p. 148.

1590 See Imhaus, *Lacrimae Cypriae* nos 138. 141. 147.

1591 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 22-24.

1592 ASVen, *Cancellaria inferiore*. Notai b. 101/9.

1593 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 22-26.

1594 ASVen, *Cancellaria inferiore*. Notai b. 101/9; Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 26.

1595 See Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire* III 832.

1596 We do not know anything else about this church.

1597 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 25. According to Tassos Papacostas and Thomas Kaffenberger in personal communication, this is probably the originally Byzantine chapel within the North-Western walls of Kyreneia castle.

1598 Mas Latrie (ed.), *Nouvelles preuves* II 24-25.

trusted Thomas de Zenariis as an honest person («trusting in the loyalty and goodness of said *dominus* Thomas of Zenariis<sup>1599</sup>») to execute her will. She desired the altar to be dedicated to St Anthony of Vienne and a picture of her husband and herself to be painted on it<sup>1600</sup>. A priest should celebrate a mass for their souls every day. Half of the money left after the task was accomplished should belong to Thomas de Zenariis and the other to Nicolo de Assono. The document was drawn up in her house in Nicosia, which was next to the house of the sir of Tyre<sup>1601</sup>.

Thus, Pinadeben still seems to have entertained a strong relationship with her homeland. She was willing to spend a great sum of money and even disinherit related parties in order to build a chapel for her first husband and herself in Venice or Padua. The undertaking was supposed to be executed by a fellow countryman who must have been a friend of the family, since he had already been the executor for Antonio's testament. At the same time, Pinadeben seems to have had good relations with the local churches in Keryneia, where she lived permanently, though she had another house in Nicosia. Not only did she desire to be buried in Keryneia but she also left money to two specific priests. Antonio's and Pinadeben's testaments reveal that they were in contact with local Latin clerics, although they were certainly not as well integrated into the foreign Latin clerical milieu on Cyprus as Berenger Albi was. More importantly, they had strong emotional and relational ties to Italy.

A letter from pope Boniface VIII addressed to the archbishop of Genoa on 2 June 1391 provides a final case, though information on the individuals involved is scarce. The pope explains that the Genoese brothers Nicola and Francesco Mussi, who had lived in Cyprus for a long time, had wished for a chapel to be built in Nicosia for their remembrance. The schism had prevented their testamentary executors Eliano de Camilio and Antonio Canello from complying with the request, and they had petitioned to have the chapel erected in Genoa, instead. In his letter, the pope agreed with the petition<sup>1602</sup>. Though we do not know much about the Mussi brothers, they had clearly lived on Cyprus long enough to form an attachment to the place that expressed itself in a wish to endow a memorial chapel there. However, the relative importance of the endowment for the testators and their socio-religious ties in general remain of course unclear.

In conclusion, these individual cases indicate that the degree of integration into the Latin religious milieu in Cyprus amongst newcomers differed according to their origin, family ties and personalities. There are no indications for contact with Greek or other religious institutions, though this does not necessarily mean that there were no such contacts. Most

of the individuals discussed above both integrated to some degree into Cypriot religious life and at the same time had a tendency to cling to the customs, places and persons of their homeland, a fact that in the circumstances seems very plausible.

## 6.5 Conclusion

The kaleidoscope of sources presented allows a glimpse of the various ways in which Cypriot aristocrats from different backgrounds constructed and represented their religious identities. In the tension between the hierarchy of the churches where the Latin Church took pride of place, and close every-day contact between various religious traditions, aristocrats found different solutions for living their religious lives. These solutions depended on their goals and interests as much as on their cultural and social background. The royal family continued its promotion of a mixed local religious tradition. It protected Greek churches and monasteries and fostered local cults. At the same time, a stringent policy of appropriation of Latin Church positions and revenues by members of the royal family is discernible throughout the century, triggered by the Great Schism after 1378. The Lusignans appropriated various religious traditions and made them their own. In this way, they presented themselves successfully as the element uniting the whole society, although unfortunately nothing is known about any relations to the Oriental Churches.

At least some noble families seem to have followed the Lusignan policy of contacts with Greek Church institutions. They, too, probably often constructed their religious identities in the space between official adherence to the Latin Church – apparent at the moment of death, when they cared to represent themselves as good Latin Christians – and every-day contact with other Churches. Strangely enough, the nobles followed the royal family's lead only to a very small extent with respect to active involvement in the Latin Church. The reasons for this development are not clear. Perhaps there were not enough revenues involved to render these offices lucrative for the old nobility.

Church offices were, in contrast, monopolized by some ascending Syrian and Greek families who had converted to the Latin rite. These social climbers actively presented themselves as Latin Christians and used this religious identity as a means for their social aspirations. Syrians and Greeks' increasingly frequent service in the Latin Church from the 1440s onwards seems to have resulted from these possibilities of social ascension rather than from the Church union of Flor-

1599 ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai b. 101/9: *confidens de legalitate et bonitate dicti domini Thome de Zenariis*.

1600 ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai b. 101/9: *et ibi vult quod depingatur ymago dicti magistri Anthonij quondam maritj suj et sua* ('and she desires that an image of the said magister Antonius, her deceased husband, and of herself should be painted there').

1601 ASVen, Cancelleria inferiore. Notai b. 101/9.

1602 Kouroupakis, *Hē Kypros kai to megalo schisma* ap. β-5, pp. 348-350 (Boniface VIII).

ence. Nevertheless, these aristocrats lived their everyday lives in an extremely hybrid religious space, which they negotiated accordingly. The example of Hugo Podocataro reveals how an official affiliation with the Latin Church could be complemented by strong emotional ties to the Greek or Oriental churches. For some families, these traditional ties were so strong that they adhered only to their original religious values. If the correlation of social ascendance and conversion to the Latin rite is anything to go with, maintaining traditional religious identities probably meant a decision against ascension into the highest echelons of society. The tendency of upholding original religious traditions can also be seen in the few documents concerning nobles who had only recently migrated to Cyprus. Whether this was a reaction to the hybrid space they found themselves in, or just a re-enforcement of their own identity in a foreign land, is unclear.

The analyses from both chapters on identities, be they social, ethnic or religious, offer a fascinating picture of identity construction and its consequences among the aristocratic groups in Cyprus. Generally, the old nobility seems to have constructed their identities around the ideals of knighthood and lineage on a social level, within the feudal system which had been imported to Cyprus from Western Europe. On the ethnic and religious level, however, identities were more hybrid. Ethnically, nobles related both to Cyprus and to the West, and on the religious level, they related both to the Latin and the Orthodox Churches, though the affiliation with the Latin Church was connected to official representation, while the relationship with Orthodox institutions falls into the realm of everyday contacts. Nobles therefore by no means constructed their identities only in a Latin way, though the Latin heritage seems to have dominated on an official level. The religious history of the Lusignan family itself shows that they

consciously played an integrating role between the various parts of the population and perhaps the aristocratic groups in particular, since the Greeks and Syrians of the new aristocracy worked to a great extent in the direct orbit of the royal family and in the state administration.

Syrians and Greeks in turn constructed their identities in varying ways, which were probably connected to their strategies of social ascension. In the hybrid space of Cypriot society with its different possibilities of identity construction, some families chose to adapt in part to Latin fashions and styles. For example, they used Latin style tombstones, but wrote the inscriptions in their own language, thus hovering in a hybrid space between traditions. Many families seem to have adopted the practice of giving their children Latin names, which must have made integration into court society easier. Whether they had other, private, names in their own language remains unclear. However, it seems that an even more complete adaptation was conducive for ascension into the highest echelons of society, especially in the religious sector, which was an important marker between the communities. Those Syrian and Greek individuals (and families) who ascended into the highest echelons of Cypriot court society all converted to the Latin rite, and they also adapted the social system of knighthood, visible among others from the tombstones, where they took care to feature as knights and write the inscriptions in French. However, we have seen that official conversion did not necessarily entail a full emotional transgression to the other tradition.

Moreover, conversion and ascension were not necessarily connected with acceptance by the old nobility. However, after the civil war of the 1460s, at least parts of society, represented by the *Bustron* chronicle, opted for a stronger emphasis on the inclusive aspects of ethnic and religious identities.