2

SETTLEMENT

PHYSICALLY CYPRUS can have changed hardly at all since Guy of Lusignan acquired the island in the spring of 1192. At its centre, with foothills reaching down towards the southern and western coasts, rise the Troodos mountains, their highest point standing over 6,000 feet above sea-level. Along the north coast and extending into the Karpasia peninsula, that finger of land which points north-east towards the Gulf of Iskenderun, runs another line of mountains, the Kyrenia range. Between these two mountainous regions and occupying much of the rest of the island's 3,500 square miles, lies a plain, the eastern portion of which is known as the Mesaoria. Strategically the Kyrenia range has always been of greater importance than the Troodos. Admittedly it is lower – the highest peaks barely reach above 3,500 feet – but its escarpment is more pronounced, and it separates the capital, Nicosia, from the nearest point on the coast, the port and fortress of Kyrenia, sixteen miles to the north. By the time of the Latin conquest three of the summits of the Kyrenia mountains were capped by castles, from east to west: Kantara, Buffavento and St Hilarion. St Hilarion guarded the pass between Nicosia and Kyrenia, which, as the the location of Isaac Comnenus' treasury, was probably the best fortified place in the island at that time. For any ruler or conqueror, control of Nicosia, Kyrenia and St Hilarion was critical, as the civil wars of 1229–33 and 1458–64 and the Genoese invasion of 1373–4 were to demonstrate.

Cyprus lacks navigable rivers. Nicosia, which seems to have been regarded as the chief town in the island since at least as early as the end of the eleventh century,[1] cannot be reached by water and the river on which it stands, the Pedheios, does not flow continuously throughout the year. There was nevertheless a danger from flooding, as in 1330 when the Pedheios in full spate destroyed much property in Nicosia and was said to have claimed 3,000 lives.[2] More serious was the danger from earthquakes. Southern Cyprus lies along a line of major seismological activity, and from our period tremors are recorded in 1204,

[1] Mango, 'Chypre', p. 11.

[2] 'Chronique d'Amadi, in *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie (Paris, 1891–3), I, 404–5. For other references, Hill, II, 306.

1222, 1267 and 1303. There can be little doubt that the worst was that of 1222. Oliver of Paderborn, who also mentioned damage at Limassol and Nicosia, stated that at Paphos the city was completely destroyed together with the fortress and the harbour.[3] So great was the impression left by this calamity that Matthew Paris, writing about thirty years later at St Albans, could single out the destruction of Paphos and Limassol at that time as a divine warning presaging the loss of Jerusalem to the Khwarazmians in 1244.[4]

Contemporaries were agreed on the wealth and fertility of Cyprus at the time of the conquest. For Gislebert of Mons, the island was 'a land rich in all things'; for his near-contemporary, Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who visited the island in 1212, Cyprus was 'a most fertile island, having the very best wines'. Locusts, a persistent scourge in later centuries, are not recorded before 1351.[5] The overwhelming majority of the island's population was engaged in agriculture or viticulture – most of the vineyards being situated, then as now, on the southern slopes of the Troodos. Evidence is lacking for the exploitation of the deposits of metallic ores during the first two centuries of Lusignan rule, but the salt pans near Larnaca and at Limassol were a royal monopoly and certainly attained considerable importance.[6]

There can be no question that when Guy purchased the island, the bulk of the population lived in the countryside. The impression of Cyprus in the twelfth century is of a rural society with few urban centres, none of which was walled. Towns developed under the Latins, but even in the sixteenth century, when statistical data first becomes available, it would seem that less than a fifth of the total population dwelt in them.[7] We have no adequate means of calculating the size of the population on the eve of the conquest. A figure of 60–75,000 has been suggested for the eighth and ninth centuries, and the sixteenth-century evidence points to a rapid growth between 1500 and 1570 from around 120,000 to rather

[3] Oliver of Paderborn, 'Historia Damiatina' in *Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters, späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinal Bischofs von S. Sabina, Oliverus*, ed. H. Hoogeweg (Tübingen, 1894), p. 279; al-Maqrīzī, *A History of the Ayyūbid Sultans of Egypt*, trans. R. J. C. Broadhurst (Boston, 1980), p. 146; Hill, II, 87, 159, 216, cf I, 244–6, 311, III, 819–20. For striking evidence confirming the destruction of the fortress at Paphos at the time of the 1222 earthquake, A. H. S. Megaw, 'Saranda Kolones: A Medieval Castle Excavated at Paphos' in *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνοῦς Κυπρολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου*, II (Nicosia, 1972).

[4] Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (RS 57, 1872–83), IV, 346.

[5] Gislebert of Mons, 'Ex Gisleberti Montensis Praepositi Hannoniae Chronico', *RHF*, XVIII, 403; Wilbrand of Oldenburg, 'Itinerarium Terrae Sanctae', ed. S. de Sandoli, *Itinera Hierosolymitana Crucesignatorum* (Jerusalem, 1978–84), III, 226–33. For locusts, R. C. Jennings,'The Origins of the Locust Problem in Cyprus', *Byzantion*, LXVII (1987), 315–17; B. Arbel, 'Sauterelles et mentalités: le cas de la Chypre vénitienne', *Annales ESC*, (1989), 1060, 1072–3.

[6] J. Richard, 'La révolution de 1369 dans le royaume de Chypre', *BEC*, CX (1952), 113.

[7] Mango, 'Chypre', pp. 11–12; B. Arbel, 'Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule (1473–1571): A Demographic Study', *Μελέται καὶ Ὑπομνήματα*, I (1984), 203.

less than 200,000.[8] In common with the rest of Europe and the Near East, the upward trend in population between the ninth and sixteenth centuries was put into reverse by the Black Death of 1348 and subsequent epidemics in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and it is likely that the pre-plague total was not matched again until the eve of the Ottoman conquest and quite likely not even then.[9] For 1191 an estimated population something in excess of 100,000 may therefore not be too far wide of the mark.

Communication with the outside world was liable to be slow and irregular. As a tenth-century Arab geographer, Muqaddasi, noted, it would take twenty-four hours to cross from Syria to Cyprus. However, at the beginning of the twelfth century bad weather meant that the pilgrim, Saewulf, took seven days to cross to Palestine, and in the thirteenth Louis IX of France took four days to sail from Limassol to the Egyptian port of Damietta, having already delayed embarkation for two days because of contrary winds.[10] The time taken to travel to or from the West could vary far more. In summer the journey might take as little as three to four weeks: thus in 1191 King Richard took twenty-seven days, including a delay of thirteen days at Rhodes, to come from Messina to Limassol; Frederick II in 1228 took twenty-four days to sail from Brindisi to Limassol, and in 1248 Louis IX took the same number of days to come from Aigues Mortes.[11] Winter conditions might make the journey far longer: on 16 October 1309 the papal nuncio, Raymond of Piis, set out for Cyprus from Marseilles; after seventy-eight days of buffeting by the weather he arrived at Rhodes on 3 January 1310; there he fell ill and was unable to continue his journey for about two months, eventually arriving in Famagusta on 7 March.[12] But at least he did arrive: in December 1308 a ship taking an embassy from Cyprus to the papal curia had been wrecked on Cos.[13]

Although communications might be impeded, the fact that Cyprus was an island proved a major advantage to its inhabitants. The sea formed a natural defence and preserved the islanders from the ravages of war. The only recorded attacks by Muslim shipping before the fifteenth century occurred in 1271 when a

[8] Mango, 'Chypre', pp. 5–6; Arbel, 'Cypriot Population', pp. 188–90, 211–14 *et passim*.

[9] For the Black Death, Leontios Makhairas, *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle'*, ed. R. M. Dawkins (Oxford, 1932), I, §66; 'Amadi', p. 407. Cf. *Lacrimae Nicossienses*, ed. T. J. Chamberlayne (Paris, 1894), pp. 52–4, 79, 149; J. Darrouzès, 'Un obituaire chypriote: le Parisinus graecus 1588', *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαί*, XI (1951), 55 *et passim*. For subsequent plagues, Hill, II, 323, 411, 464–5.

[10] Muqaddasi, *Description of Syria including Palestine*, trans. G. Le Strange (PPTS 3, 1886), p. 82; Saewulf, 'Relatio de peregrinatione ad Hierosolymam et Terram Sanctam', ed. S. de Sandoli, *Itinera Hierosolymitana Crucesignatorum*, II, 8, 10; John of Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1868), pp. 52–3.

[11] Landon, *Itinerary*, p. 48; Hill, II, 94, 140.

[12] C. Perrat, 'Un diplomate gascon au XIVe siècle: Raymond de Piis, nonce de Clèment V en Orient', *MAHEFR*, XLIV (1927), 65–6.

[13] 'Amadi', p. 267.

Mamlūk fleet was wrecked on the coast near Limassol before it could do any damage, and in 1363 when Turkish raids prompted the Cypriots to take firm retaliatory action.[14] On the other hand, the coasts were exposed to corsairs such as the Greek, who in the 1190s carried off Aimery of Lusignan's wife and children, or those, said to be from Rhodes and Monemvasia, who in 1302 captured the count of Jaffa and members of his family while they were staying on his estate at Episkopi.[15] But apart from incidents such as these and rather more serious Genoese depredations in the 1310s,[16] Cyprus enjoyed a remarkable record of immunity from attack. After the initial conquest and pacification of 1191–2, the only serious fighting in the island before the Genoese invasion in 1373 took place during the civil war of 1229–33.

For our knowledge of the Latin settlement of Cyprus as begun during the rule of Guy of Lusignan, we have largely to rely on various thirteenth-century traditions. None of these accounts is entirely trustworthy, but they do tell us what people were prepared to believe a generation or so after the settlement, or at least what the writers themselves wanted people to believe. The fullest and probably the best informed is worth quoting at length:

> After King Guy had paid the 60,000 bezants to the king of England, he went to Cyprus and took some of the knights who had been disinherited in the kingdom (of Jerusalem). As soon as he had taken seisin of the island, he sent messengers to Saladin asking his advice as to how he could continue to rule the island of Cyprus. Saladin replied that he had no great love for King Guy, but since he had asked his advice, he would give it as best he knew how . . . and so he said to the messengers, 'I counsel King Guy that if he wants the island to be secure he should give it all away'. At this the messengers departed and came to Cyprus and gave this reply to the king who followed Saladin's advice closely.
>
> Now I shall tell you what King Guy did when he had taken seisin of the island of Cyprus. He sent messengers to Armenia, to Antioch, to Acre and through all the land saying that he would give generously to all those who wished to come and dwell in Cyprus so that they might live. The knights, sergeants and burgesses whom the Muslims had dispossessed heard the word of King Guy. They set off and came to him, and also young women and orphans in great numbers whose husbands and fathers were dead and lost in Syria. He gave rich fiefs, both to the Greeks and the knights he had brought with him and to shoemakers, masons and Arabic scribes so that (may God be merciful!) they have become knights and great lords in the island of Cyprus. And he had them marry the women on their arrival as appropriate to their station . . . and he granted enough land away to those who would take it that he enfeoffed 300 knights and 200 mounted sergeants, not to mention the burgesses who lived in the cities to whom he gave substantial lands

[14] For 1271, Hill, II, 167. For 1363, Leontios Makhairas, §137–44, 150–2. For Muslim destruction of Christian shipping in Limassol in 1220, Hill, II, 87.

[15] *Cont. Guillaume de Tyr*, pp. 162–5; 'Amadi', p. 238.

[16] 'Amadi', pp. 393–5, 398.

> and allowances. And when he had finished this distribution, he had not kept enough for himself to support twenty knights.[17]

It is probable that the author of this passage was a squire of Balian of Ibelin, one of Guy of Lusignan's leading opponents among the baronage in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Elsewhere in his history he had shown himself consistently hostile to Guy, and this hostility is also apparent here. The writer was an early exponent of the tradition in Christian circles that depicted Saladin as a man of high personal integrity, and in this passage, by giving Saladin the credit for suggesting Guy's policy, he was praising him at Guy's expense. The assertion that Guy surrounded himself with artisans whom he had ennobled was a more explicit example of his denigration of Guy, and he registered his horror at this affront to aristocratic exclusiveness by his pious ejaculation.[18] But neither the turning of Greeks and base-born men into great lords nor Saladin's advice can be substantiated from independent evidence, and these elements in the story may perhaps be discarded as no more than further instances of the author's partisanship.[19]

Left by itself, however, the passage does provide a grudging recognition that the settlement of Cyprus had been a success and that Guy had acted wisely in recruiting as many settlers as possible. The experience of the Templars during their brief period of rule had shown that a small garrison was not sufficient to control the population: what was needed, if Cyprus was to be held permanently, was a large number of men with a vested interest in preserving the new regime. But the numbers quoted – 300 knights and 200 mounted sergeants – may well be exaggerated. Before 1187 the entire feudal host at the disposal of the kings of Jerusalem apparently amounted to no more than 675 knights,[20] and so, despite the permanent loss of large areas of land in Syria and Palestine, it seems unlikely that Guy would be able to find dispossessed men in such numbers to go with him to Cyprus. The implausibility of these figures is underlined when considered in the light of another tradition concerning the settlement. This recorded that the knights received fiefs worth 400 white bezants annually and turcopoles (a term evidently used here as an alternative for 'mounted sergeants'), 300.[21] Assuming that these statistics were well-founded, it would seem that the Cypriot fiefs were

[17] *Cont. Guillaume de Tyr*, p. 139.

[18] Morgan, *Chronicle of Ernoul*, pp. 41–4 (for Ernoul, the putative author, although the attempt to identify him with Arneis of Jubail is unconvincing), pp. 102–6 (for Saladin), pp. 163–5 (for this passage, but with a differing interpretation).

[19] A contemporary Arabic source confirms that Guy was in friendly contact with Saladin immediately after his acquisition of Cyprus. M. C. Lyons and D. E. P. Jackson, *Saladin. The Politics of the Holy War* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 349.

[20] R. C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare (1097–1193)* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 89–90.

[21] 'Eracles', p. 192.

worth appreciably less than their Syrian counterparts. If so, then Cyprus would have had little attraction for men who reckoned that they had some chance of a livelihood in Syria.[22] But however unsatisfactory particular statements in these accounts may seem, the outline is clear enough: there was no attempt to colonize Cyprus before Guy took charge early in 1192, and the early settlers, like Guy himself, came from Syria and were drawn from the ranks of those men and women who had been dispossessed by the Muslims.

Few of those who accompanied Guy to Cyprus after his purchase of the island can be positively identified, but the names of some of the more prominent knights in the first decade of Lusignan rule are known from the witness lists in the handful of charters that survive.[23] Several had been Guy's associates before his acquisition of the island. His brother, Aimery, Humphrey of Toron, Hugh Martin, Renier of Jubail and the brothers Walter and Alelm Le Bel, had supported him during and immediately after the siege of Acre (1189–91), but it should be pointed out that some of his other supporters from those years chose to remain in Syria.[24] Other early settlers had been members of Guy or Aimery's households and in a number of instances would, like the Lusignans themselves, have originated from Poitou. But again the list of identifiable individuals is short: Hugh Martin, Fulk of Yver, Lawrence of Plessy, Massé of Gaurelle, Adam of Antioch, Guy Le Petit and Reynald Barlais.[25] Some settlers belonged to families established in the East before Saladin's conquests, although, apart from the Lusignan brothers, only Humphrey of Toron had been a major figure in the

[22] At this period fiefs in Syria were generally worth at least 300 saracen bezants. Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, p. 10. The saracen bezant, although somewhat lighter than the white bezant, had a far greater gold-content. Four hundred white bezants were therefore worth considerably less than 300 saracen bezants. D. M. Metcalf, *Coinage of the Crusades and the Latin East in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford* (London, 1983), pp. 10, 51. According to the less authoritative accounts of the settlement, the fiefs in Cyprus turned out to be worth twice as much as anticipated. 'Eracles', p. 189 variant mss; *Ernoul*, p. 287.

[23] Five charters survive from before 1205. (1) August 1194: J. Richard, 'L'abbaye cistercienne de Jubin et le prieuré Saint-Blaise de Nicosie', *EKEE*, III (1969–70), 69–70. (2) September 1195: Mas Latrie, *Histoire*, III, 598–9. (3) May 1196: Mas Latrie, *Histoire*, II, 30; cf. *RRH*, no. 729. (4) November 1197: Mas Latrie, *Histoire*, III, 606–7. (5) March 1201: *Le cartulaire du chaptire du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, ed. G. Bresc-Bautier (Paris, 1984), pp. 331–2.

[24] A list of Guy's supporters at Acre can be compiled from his charters. *RRH*, nos. 683–4, 690, 693, 696–8, 701–2. Hugh and William of Tiberias, Antelinus of Lucca, Thomas Chamberlain, Philip Morosini, Baldwin of Cyprus and Renouard of Nephin stayed in Syria. *RRH*, nos. 707, 716–17, 736.

[25] 'Les Lignages d'Outremer', *RHC Lois*, II, 472, 473, 474. Lawrence of Plessy was the ancestor of the Morphou family. For Reynald Barlais, 'Eracles', p. 219; *Cont. Guillaume de Tyr*, p. 191 (wrongly named William). Reynald is believed to have been related to the Berlay lords of Montreuil-Bellay on the Poitou/Anjou border. J. Richard, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Amsterdam, 1979), p. 199. For the Berlay see for example, 'Cartae et chronica de obedentia Mairomno' in *Chroniques des églises d'Anjou*, ed. P. Marchegay and E. Mabille (Paris, 1869), pp. 66, 72, 80–3; *Cartulaires et chartes de l'abbaye de l'Absie*, ed. B. Ledain (Poitiers, 1895), pp. 22, 27, 88. The Rivet and Cheneché families should probably be added to this list.

kingdom of Jerusalem. Philip and probably Baldwin of Bethsan were younger sons of Gremont, lord of Bethsan; Walter Le Bel had held a fief in or near Acre, and Reynald of Soissons had had one at Nablus; Elias of Robore appears to have been a vassal of the lord of Tiberias, Renier of Jubail is likely to have been descended from or identical with a man of that name who appears in 1160 and 1161 as a vassal of the lord of Caesarea; Odo of Mayre may have come from Antioch; Baldwin Hostiarius and Baldwin of Neuvillé may have been related to men with the same surnames living in the Latin kingdom at other periods in the twelfth century, while William of La Baume and his brother Roland could have been descended from a Tripolitan knight who was witnessing documents as far back as 1139.[26]

This analysis goes some way towards confirming the narrative traditions of the settlement. True, many of the early settlers known to us by name had already been associated with the Lusignans before 1192, and there is no way of distinguishing the knights who accompanied Guy to Cyprus as members of his entourage from those who came to the island in the hope of being given fiefs following an appeal for more men. But the general indications as to the origins of the settlers do find support. Knights who seem to have had connections with Antioch and Tripoli are represented as well as those from Jerusalem, and, since Toron, Nablus, Bethsan and Tiberias were among those places that remained in Muslim hands after the Third Crusade, in some cases at least they must have been disinherited by Saladin. This pattern was paralleled in the ecclesiastical sphere: the first Latin archbishop of Nicosia and the first bishop of Paphos, sees erected in 1196, had previously been archdeacon of Lydda and archdeacon of Lattakia.[27]

In the thirteenth century and later people emigrated to Cyprus directly from western Europe. Doubtless this process began almost immediately after 1192, but in its initial stages the European colonization of the island was achieved by settlers from the kingdom of Jerusalem and the other Latin states in Syria. It was these people who set the tone of the Lusignan regime. In many instances the ideas and institutions they brought with them were western in origin, even if they had already been modified by their introduction into an eastern environment. So for example, the feudal customs of Jerusalem, which were essentially western in

[26] For the Bethsan family, J. L. La Monte and N. Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, VI (1950), 63–6. For Reynald of Soissons and Walter Le Bel, John of Ibelin, 'Livre de Jean d'Ibelin', *RHC Lois*, I, 424, 425. For Elias of Robore *RRH*, no. 583. For Renier of Jubail, *RRH*, nos. 361, 373; E. G. Rey, 'Les seigneurs de Giblet', *ROL*, III (1895), 417–18. For Odo of Mayre, *RRH*, no. 550. For a Renier Hostiarius, *RRH*, no. 1122. For a *Guago* of Neuville, *RRH*, no. 452. For a Raymond of La Baume in 1139, *RRH*, nos. 191, 192.

[27] R. Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande* (Göttingen, 1985), no. 181; *Cont. Guillaume de Tyr*, p. 121.

concept but conditioned by the hard struggles in the early twelfth century against the Christians' Muslim neighbours, were transplanted into Cyprus with only minor changes.[28] But although the settlers would have had their own ideas about legal, religious, administrative and economic organization, they encountered an existing system of social and political structures, the legacy of Byzantium. The result was a compromise. In certain sectors, they simply took over or adapted what they found; in others, particularly in those that had been affected most by the conquest, they introduced their own institutional ideas. Thus the exploitation of the land and the peasantry and the organization of commercial taxation seem to have gone on much as before. As for the currency, the Byzantine scyphate trachea – the debased gold coin known in Cyprus as the 'white bezant' – would have been the principal unit at the time of the conquest, and, from the time of Guy of Lusignan until the closing years of the thirteenth century, the Lusignans issued their own imitative versions of this coin.[29] But in the matter of landownership, in military and ecclesiastical organization, and in the social structure of the ruling class, the Latin conquest and settlement brought far-reaching changes.

Richard's conquest of Cyprus had been thorough, and between them he and the Templars seem to have broken the will of the population to resist. So far as is known, Guy's settlement of the island did not run into internal opposition. The fate of the former Byzantine landowners is not at all clear. According to the Greek recluse, Neophytus, many fled to Constantinople.[30] Perhaps others continued in Cyprus in straitened circumstances. Whether the Lusignans pursued a systematic policy of expropriation is uncertain, although, for what little he is worth, the sixteenth-century writer, Etienne de Lusignan, asserted that they did.[31] But there is no evidence for members of the Greek landowning class, the *archontes*, surviving under the new regime. How far their disappearance resulted from flight, death or dispossession remains open to question, but their demise has to be attributed in the first instance to the speed and effectiveness of the conquest. In Crete and the Morea, conquered after the sack of Constantinople in 1204, resistance was protracted, and the new western rulers were obliged to admit existing Greek landowners into the feudal hierarchy, although admittedly with inferior status.[32] Nothing comparable seems to have occurred in Cyprus.

[28] P. W. Edbury, 'Feudal Obligations in the Latin East', *Byzantion*, XLVII (1977), 329.

[29] Metcalf, *Coinage of the Crusades*, pp. 51–3.

[30] Neophytus, pp. clxxxv, clxxxvii.

[31] Estienne de Lusignan, *Description de toute l'isle de Cypre* (Paris, 1580), f. 77v. Writing in the mid-thirteenth century, Philip of Novara ('Livre de Philippe de Navarre', *RHC Lois*, I, 536) referred to the former properties of churches, abbeys and 'artondes' (*lege* 'arcondes', i.e. *archontes*) being given as fiefs.

[32] F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge* (Paris, 1959), pp. 128–33; A. Bon, *La Morée franque* (Paris, 1969), p. 88; D. Jacoby, 'The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade', *American Historical Review*,

The thoroughness of the conquest, combined with the security afforded by the sea, also affected the way in which the Lusignans organized their own feudal dependants. Favoured vassals did not receive fortified towns or castles to be held in fief, presumably because there was no need: there were no frontiers to defend and no insurgent population to hold in check. Here again the contrast with the Morea is instructive. The princes of Achaea, who took forty years to conquer the territories to which they laid claim, were obliged to enfeoff their followers with castles and grant them extensive privileges, including the right to build new fortifications and exercise high justice within their lordships.[33] Such privileges were unknown in Cyprus. There the Lusignans retained exclusive control of defence and gave their vassals fiefs which had no strategic significance but were simply intended to provide them with their livelihood and enable them to perform their military obligations.

The conquest had destroyed the Greek landowning aristocracy, but not the Greek church. With the advent of the Lusignans, eastern orthodoxy, while retaining the support of the indigenous, Greek-speaking population, ceased to enjoy the patronage and protection of the ruling class. This divergence between rulers and ruled in their religious loyalties seems to have presented greater problems than the mere fact that Greeks had been replaced by non-Greeks in position of power and landed wealth. The introduction of a Latin hierarchy and Latin clergy to cater for the faith of the new rulers evoked resentment, and the efforts of the Latin clergy from the 1220s onwards to subordinate the Greek church to themselves provided a continuing source of friction. The Greek church was at a disadvantage, both politically and economically, for, although it had survived, the rank of society comprising the wealthiest of its benefactors had not, and the difficulties resulting from the termination of their patronage and munificence were aggravated by the loss of some at least of its existing property and endowments.[34]

Guy of Lusignan and the early Latin settlers were fortunate in that the invasion had been clear cut and so had not harmed the economy. Massacre and wanton destruction had not been a feature of Richard's success; indeed, the principal Frankish-Syrian account particularly noted the measures taken by the English king to safeguard the lives and property of the inhabitants of Limassol.[35]

LXXVIII (1973), 905 *et passim*; *idem*, 'From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change' in B. Arbel, *et al.* (eds), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London, 1989), pp. 3–10, 26–30. The statement in the passage quoted above (p. 16) that Guy of Lusignan gave fiefs to Greeks is unsupported and in any case would appear to refer to Greeks from Syria. The reference from Philip of Novara cited in the previous note appears to be the sole thirteenth-century allusion to Greek *archontes* in Cyprus. For a Latin-Syrian author using term *archontes* in the context of the Byzantine world, 'Eracles', p. 292.

[33] Bon, *Morée franque*, p. 87.

[34] J. Gill, 'The Tribulations of the Greek Church in Cyprus, 1196–c.1280', *BF*, V (1977).

[35] 'Eracles', p. 164.

The establishment of the new class of landowners, with its own culture and ecclesiastical organization, was the most obvious result of the conquest and Guy's subsequent acquisition of the island. The events of the early 1190s had less dramatic but nevertheless significant consequences for administration, commerce and urban society and led to important changes in the role of Cyprus in the politics of the eastern Mediterranean world. Guy of Lusignan brought knights, burgesses and clergy as settlers from Syria and Palestine, but his period of rule was only the beginning. Throughout the thirteenth century, a steady stream of men and women with previous connections with the Latin states of the mainland came to Cyprus, and as they succumbed to the superior military might of their Muslim neighbours so the island provided a refuge for the survivors. Other newcomers, including knightly adventurers, clergy and merchants, arrived from the West, and they were eventually to transform the original predominantly French-speaking ruling class into a more heterogeneous, cosmopolitan group. By the fifteenth century there was scarcely a region of western Europe that was not represented among the Latin settlers.