

**The Greek Church of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople
during the Frankish Era
(1196-1303)**

ELENA KAFFA

A thesis submitted to the University of Wales
In candidature for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of History and Archaeology
University of Wales, Cardiff

2008

**The Greek Church of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople
during the Frankish Era
(1196-1303)**

ELENA KAFFA

A thesis submitted to the University of Wales
In candidature for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of History and Archaeology
University of Wales, Cardiff

2008

UMI Number: U585150

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U585150

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

This thesis provides an analytical presentation of the situation of the Greek Church of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople during the earlier part of the Frankish Era (1196 – 1303). It examines the establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople, Cyprus and Achaëa and it attempts to answer questions relating to the reactions of the Greek Church to the Latin conquests. It considers the similarities and differences in the establishment in Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus, the diocesan structure, agreements regarding the fate of the Greek ecclesiastical properties, the payment of tithes and the agreements of 1220 – 1222.

Moreover it analyses the relations of the Greek Church of Cyprus, the Greek Church of Constantinople and the Morea with the Latin Church. For instance it details the popes' involvement in the affairs of the Church in these three significant areas, the ecclesiastical differences between the Greek and the Latin Church, the behaviour of the Greek patriarchs, archbishops and bishops within the Greek Church, the reaction of the Greeks towards the establishment of the Latin Church, and significant events such as the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara and the promulgation of the *Bulla Cypria*.

The third topic area pertains to the relationship of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus with the secular authority. It discusses the attitude of the king of Cyprus, the rulers of the Morea and the emperor of Constantinople towards the problems between the Latin and Greeks, the relationship of the Latin nobility with the Greeks, and the involvement of the crown regarding the ecclesiastical property and possible explanations for the attitude of the Latin crown towards the Greeks.

Elena Kaffa
August 2008

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed (candidate) Date

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is being submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **PhD**

Signed (candidate) Date

STATEMENT 2

This thesis is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Other sources are acknowledged by explicit references.

Signed (candidate) Date

STATEMENT 3

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (candidate) Date

STATEMENT 4: PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BAR ON ACCESS

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loans **after expiry of a bar on access previously approved by the Graduate Development Committee.**

Signed (candidate) Date

Contents

Acknowledgments	i
List of Abbreviations	ii
Introduction	1
1. Sources for the Ecclesiastical History of Frankish Greece and Cyprus	2
2. Latin Documents	2
3. Sources in other medieval European Languages (medieval Italian and medieval French)	13
4. Greek Primary Sources (Byzantine Greek and medieval Cypriot Greek)	14
5. Recent historiography relating to the ecclesiastical history	22
Chapter One	41
The Establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople, Cyprus and Achaea	41
6. Was there or was there not a papal plan?	45
7. Similarities and differences in the establishment of the Church of Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus	52
8. The structure of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus after the establishment of the Latin Church	56
9. The status of the Greek clergy under the Latin rule	69
10. The Greek Ecclesiastical Properties and the payment of tithes in Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea	75
11. The importance of the agreement of 1220-1222	87
Chapter 2	92
Relations between the Greek Church of Cyprus, Constantinople and the Morea, and the Latin Church	92
12. Introduction	92
13. The ecclesiastical differences between the Greeks and the Latins	93
14. Papal policy towards the Greek Church	109
15. The reaction of the Greeks to the Latin Churches in Constantinople and the Morea, and Cyprus	117
16. The involvement of the pope in the affairs of the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople and the Church of the Morea, and the role of the papal legates	131
17. The relationship between the Greek patriarch of Constantinople and the Greek archbishops, and the pope, and the Latin patriarch and archbishops	136
18. Relations between the Church of Cyprus and the Latin Church	140
19. Relations until the Bulla in 1260	140
20. The involvement of the pope and his legates	140
21. The relationship between the Greek and Latin archbishops	144

22. Relations after the Bulla	149
23. The involvement of the pope and his legates	149
24. The election of the Greek bishops	152
25. Later sources	156
26. Conclusions	158
27. The oath of obedience	159
28. Legal cases	161
29. The relationship between the Greek and Latin archbishops	162
30. The sentence of Excommunication	168
31. Conclusions	175
Chapter 3	178
The relationship of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus with the Latin secular authority	178
Conclusions	203
Bibliography	210

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to many people who have provided encouragement and assistance in various ways towards the completion of this thesis. I would first like to express my gratitude and thanks to my supervisor Professor Peter W Edbury for his constant support, helpful comments, and constructive criticism, which have saved this research from various pitfalls.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr Chris Schabel for all his help and advice, his useful suggestions and constructive comments, Dr Angel Nicolaou-Konnari for her assistance and her books and Dr Nicholas Coureas for allowing me to use some collections from the Cyprus Research Centre. I would also like to thank Kam Stylianou for her patience and help in correcting the English language, as English is not my first language.

In addition, I would like to express my thanks to the A. G. Leventis Foundation for their provision of a generous grant for the academic years 2003-2006.

Last but by no means least, I wish to thank my mother for providing moral and financial support throughout my many years of study and research, as well as my late father who inspired me to succeed in my aim and make the dream of my life a reality.

List of Abbreviations

<i>BEFAR</i>	<i>Bibliothèque des École françaises d'Athènes et de Rome</i>
<i>Cartulary</i>	<i>The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia</i> , eds. N. Coureas - C. Schabel, Nicosia 1997
<i>EKEE</i>	<i>Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών</i>
<i>EK</i>	<i>Εκκλησιαστικός Κήρυξ</i> , Larnaca 1911-1918
<i>KS</i>	<i>Κυπριακες Σπουδές. Δελτίον της Εταιρείας Κυπριακών Σπουδών</i>
<i>Makhairas</i>	<i>Leontios Makhairas Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, entitled 'Chronicle'</i> , ed. R. M. Dawkins, Oxford 1932
<i>PCRCICO</i>	<i>Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis: Fontes. Series III</i> , 15 vols., Rome, 1943-1990
<i>PG</i>	<i>Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeco-latina.</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina.</i>
<i>Σάθας, M. B.</i>	<i>Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, Bibliotheca Graecae Medii Aevi</i> , ed. C. Sathas, Venice-Paris 1872-1894
<i>Synodicum</i>	<i>The Synodicum Nicosiense and Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373</i> , ed. C. Schabel, Nicosia 2001

Introduction

This dissertation is an examination of the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople; the relationship between the Greek Church and the Latin Church in these places, and the relationship between the Greek Church and the Latin secular authority until 1303, the end of Boniface VIII's papacy.

The subject is important as it aims to shed light on the ecclesiastical history of three significant places; Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople during the Frankish period. It examines the development of the relationship between the Greek Church and the Latin Church from the first years of its establishment, firstly in Cyprus after the Third Crusade, and after the Fourth Crusade in Constantinople and the Morea, until 1303. In addition, it examines the complex relations of the Greek Church and the papacy and other Greek Churches of the Latin East as they evolved, including Jerusalem and Antioch and in the west, with Sicily and South Italy, its troubled relations with the Latin Church and it makes a comparison of the relations between the Latins and Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople. It compares the experience of the Church in these three areas, for example how the experience of the Greek Church in Cyprus differed from that of the Greek Church in the Morea, in the hope that what happened in one area can shed light on what happened elsewhere. It raises the question as to whether the differences require any new lines of enquiry or prompt new interpretations.

Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople were selected despite the chronological difference in the establishment of Frankish rule, as they have similarities and many common aspects. In addition, the Greek Church in these three locations has not been

studied before in parallel, and, unlike the Latin Church, there has been no analytical research or bibliographical surveys.

It is important to note that there is not much evidence pertaining to Greece and Constantinople, unlike the material for Cyprus. For instance, there is no cartulary surviving from any Latin church in Greece or Constantinople. When I started my research, I was of the belief that there would be more applicable information. As a result, I have attempted to make do with what little evidence there is.

Sources for the Ecclesiastical History of Frankish Greece and Cyprus

The primary sources for the study of Cyprus and Frankish Greece, and more specifically the Morea and the centre of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople, are varied. Evidence pertaining to Latin and Greek evidence in the Morea is limited. The language of the materials is Latin, medieval French, Italian, Byzantine Greek and medieval Cypriot Greek. Most of the materials are chronicles, narrative accounts, decrees, synodal acts and papal letters which are numerous and of great significance. In addition, there is also archaeological evidence such as church buildings, frescoes and icons which provide pointers to the relationship between Latins and Greeks.

Latin Documents

The first and the largest collection of documents which are presented and discussed are the papal letters. A selection of documents from the papal registers has been published in the series of edited papal correspondence in the *Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis (PCRCICO)*. This series has edited the most important papal letters which were sent by popes to their subjects including the

Greeks, regarding ecclesiastical affairs like ecclesiastical legislation, agreements, administrative issues, doctrines, and they provide useful information about the relations between the Latin Church and the Greek Church of Constantinople, and the other local churches of Greece, including the Greek Church of Cyprus and the Morea. The most significant papal letters related to the topic of this dissertation are in the *PCRCICO*. In addition to the *PCRCICO*, there is another older and lengthier series, the *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome (BEFAR)*, which includes almost all of the papal letters, many of them summarized and others printed in full. The *BEFAR* series does not include Innocent III or Honorius III (or Clement V). There are also various other collections of papal letters prior to the *BEFAR* but they do not often have letters not found in these more modern collections. Furthermore there is a small number of letters that are not in the registers but which survive elsewhere, perhaps because they were preserved by the recipients. There is information about the pope with regard to Greece and Cyprus in Carmelite, Dominican, Augustinian and Franciscan collections of documents.

Pope Celestine III (1191-1198) is the first pope who issued letters that are relevant here. His register has not survived but there are his bulls concerning Cyprus in *The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia*. The *Cartulary* has some of the most important Latin documents concerning the Church of Cyprus during the Frankish Era. Celestine's letters contain reference to significant events which took place in Cyprus, such as the establishment of the Latin Church on the island, which consisted of an archbishopric and three suffragan bishoprics, and the election of the first Latin archbishop, Alan of Nicosia. The Foundation Charters of Celestine III have also been translated by Christopher Schabel in *The Synodicum Nicosiense and*

Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373 published in 2001. In the first section of this book, Schabel edited and translated the text of the Nicosia Synodicum which comprises a mid-fourteenth-century assembly of texts from 1252-1354, concerning the ecclesiastical legislation and acts of councils involving the relations between the Greek and the Latin Church. In the second part there are translations of documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus from 1196-1373, mostly from the *PCRCICO*.

After the capture of Constantinople by the Latins, the most prominent sources are the letters of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) which were published in the *Patrologia Latina*. The *Patrologia Latina* edition of Innocent III is itself a reprint of a seventeenth-century edition of Innocent's registers. It should be noted that the registers for certain years do not survive. It is worth emphasizing that not all of Innocent's letters were copied into the registers and occasionally, letters not copied into the registers were preserved by the recipients, as happened in the case of the *Cartulary* of St Sophia in Nicosia. Innocent III's letters in the *Patrologia Latina* appear in three volumes (214, 215, and 216). New, improved editions of Innocent III's letters are *Acta Innocentii III* edited by T Haluskynskij (*PCRCICO*), which include only the most pertinent letters about Greece. The most recent and reliable edition is *Die Register Innocenz' III*, which aims to publish all the letters of Pope Innocent that survive. Eight volumes have appeared so far covering the period to 1206.

Innocent III's letters are extremely important, especially for Constantinople, as they have information about the fall of the city in 1204, the establishment of the Latin Church, the election of a new Latin patriarch in Constantinople, the new situation of ecclesiastical affairs and the reaction of the Greeks to the new status quo. Innocent

III's letters provide the only significant information available on the founding of the Latin Church in the Morea. His letters expose the new reality which Greeks had to deal with. From his correspondence with the Greek patriarch, John Camateros, the Greek emperor Alexius IV, the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, the clergy, his legate in the East and the Latin nobles of Constantinople and others, useful information can be obtained which assists us in forming an accurate picture of the situation in Constantinople. From Innocent's letters, the pope's efforts to unite the Latin and the Greek Church, to bring back the schismatic Greeks to the right faith, and his belief about the supremacy of the Latin Church are revealed. There are also references to the reactions of the Greeks after the conquest, for instance the Greek clergy and priests in Constantinople and Achaea were terrified and left the country, abandoning their churches. Those who remained were forced to show obedience to the Latin Church, as they were scared by the idea of being excommunicated or hanged by the Latins. Furthermore in the letters, there is evidence for Greek efforts to unite with the Latin Church, for the domestic affairs of the local Latin Churches, for the commands that the pope sent to his clergy and for the missions of the papal legates in the East. The later years of Innocent's registers also contain much about the papacy and the Latin Church in Greece. In the *Patrologia Latina*, there is interesting information such as evidence for the Latins disturbing the graves of the Greek bishops of Patras when building a fortress, and the disputes between the Latin Church and the new Frankish rulers over the ownership of former Greek ecclesiastical property. The registers also include references of how the Latins modified the old Greek diocesan structure. From this evidence, the differences between the situation in Cyprus and that in Greece can be discerned.

The successor of Innocent III was Honorius III. Most of Honorius' letters are calendared in *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, compiled by A Pressutti in two volumes. Pressutti gives the text or extracts from the text of some of Honorius III's letters, but all too often he simply supplies a summary. The drawback of this calendar is the fact that his summaries often omit significant details. Some of these letters are also published in *PCRCICO, Acta Honorii III*, edited by A L Tautu, and others are to be found in older editions such as Baronius' *Annales ecclesiastici* or in recent editions such as Coureas/Schabel edition of the Nicosia *Cartulary*.

Several of Honorius's letters in the Nicosia *Cartulary* refer to the agreements of 1220 and 1222, but most relate to the domestic affairs of the Latin Church, and there are not as many references to the Greek Church as there are to be found in Innocent III's letters. Honorius wrote to the patriarch of Constantinople, the empress Margarita, and others, and his letters shed light on various topics such as, the excommunication of Geoffrey II of Villardouin, prince of Achaea and Otho of La Roche prince of Athens, the efforts towards the union of the two Churches and the protection of some monasteries by the pope.

The next pope was Gregory IX (1227-1241). His letters which relate to the Greeks and their church are published by Tautu in the same volume as Honorius III's letters, *Acta Honorii III and Gregorii IX* and in *Les Registres de Gregoire IX, (BEFAR)* in four volumes, edited by L Auvray, and they deal with issues like the schism and the union of the Latin and Greek Church. Two of his letters, his Bulls concerning Cyprus (1231-1240), are published and translated in *Synodicum*, and ten of his letters have been published in the *Cartulary* and refer to some very important events of the ecclesiastical

history of Cyprus during the Frankish rule. During Gregory IX's pontificate the "martyrdom" of the thirteen monks of Kantara took place, an isolated event, the only violent event in the historical progress of the development in the relation between the Latin and Greek Church in Cyprus. During this period the Greek archbishop and the Greek high clergy of the island went into voluntary exile in Cilician Armenia because they refused to obey the pope's orders, and were replaced by Latins.

The next pope to follow was Innocent IV and some of his letters are connected with Greek Church. His letters that pertain to the Greek Church are in *PCRCICO, Acta Innocentii IV*, edited by T Haluscynskyj and M Wojnar. Most of his letters are published in *Les Registres de Innocent IV, (BEFAR)* in four volumes, edited by E Berger. They consider theological matters with references to the union of the two Churches and the efforts of the Greeks who sent legates to the pope regarding this issue, the Greeks, the confirmation of previous agreements by Innocent IV and other topics. Some of his Bulls (1243-1254) and his Decrees on Greek Rites (1254) are translated in *Synodicum* and twenty five of his letters concerning Cyprus are in the *Cartulary*. It is apparent from his correspondence, for example his important letter to his legate Eudes of Châteauroux, the cardinal bishop of Tusculum, that he was trying to improve his relations with the Greeks in Cyprus.

Innocent's successor was Alexander IV, who is most famous for his *Bulla Cypria* or *Constitutio Cypria* of 1260. The *Bulla Cypria* or *Summa Alexandrina* was an arrangement by Alexander concerning the Greek and the Latin Church of Cyprus. One of the versions of *Bulla* is preserved in the *Cartulary* and it has been translated by Schabel in *Synodicum*. A virtually identical version of the Latin text of the *Bulla*

is also preserved in the papal registers. Moreover there are three groups of Greek translations of the text of *Bulla*: one is in *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη* edited by Sathas, another in *Patrologiae Graecae*, volume 140, and the third one was used by J Darrouzès in the article “Textes synodaux Chypriotes” in *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 37, 1979, pp 5-122. In addition to the *Bulla*, there are nine more letters of Alexander in the *Cartulary*, some others in *Acta Alexandri IV*, edited by Haluscynskij (*PCRCICO*) and in *Les Registres D’Alexandre IV*, edited by M M de la Roncière *et al*, for the series of *BEFAR* which, in the case of Alexander’s letters concerning the Greeks, have been printed in full. Alexander’s letters had been sent to the clergy of Achaea and the Morea, appealing to them to help the emperor of Constantinople, to the Greek and Latin bishops of Cyprus, asking them to obey the Latin archbishop and his rule, to the queen of Cyprus regarding the payment of ecclesiastical tithes, to the nobles concerning domestic affairs, to the Greek emperor Theodoros, to the patriarch and the high clergy of Constantinople and others. Some other letters like letter number 621 (Reg.24, c.514, f.74) in *Les Registres*, refer to the ecclesiastical situation in Achaea. In addition, the main topic of most of his letters is the union of the two Churches. The pope believed that it was time the Greeks returned to the mother church, the Latin Church, and he made efforts to convince them to listen to him. Many references in his letters delineate papal primacy and other ecclesiastical matters.

Urban IV (1261-1265) is another pope who made various efforts to unite the Greeks and the Latins, and from his letters we can draw useful information about the situation in Greece and Cyprus during the critical years of his pontificate. His letters are published in *BEFAR*, *Les Registres d’ Urban IV*, edited by J Giraud, in *PCRCICO*, *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X*, edited by Tautu, his Bull to archbishop

Hugh of Fagiano, was translated in *Synodicum*. In the *Cartulary* there are six of his letters which deal with issues relating to the Church of Cyprus. The main topic of his letters is the union of the two Churches, an issue which concerned every pope, and they consistently tried to bring the daughter (the Greek Church) back to the mother (the Latin Church). It must be maintained that almost all the papal letters refer to, emphasise and repeat, the attempts of the Greeks (their letters, their envoys) and of their emperor, Michael Paleologus, in particular to unite with the western Church. In addition, in his letters he mentions the penalty of excommunication, which was implemented for everyone who was against the right faith and the will of the Latin Church, the papal primacy and the pope's importance as the successor of the Apostle Peter, and the capture of Constantinople. He referred to the problems which the Greeks caused the Latins, dogmatic matters and Latin and Greek Fathers of the Church, like Gregory Dialogu, Ambrose of Milan, John Damaskinos and Pope Sylvester in order to emphasize the common faith of the Greeks and the Latins. Moreover it focuses on the years when the Greeks and Latins lived in peace and the Church was one and united. The letters which relate to Cyprus are very interesting as they describe the situation after the *Bulla Cypria*. From Urban's correspondence it is apparent that a significant number of the Greeks, clergy and laity, rejected the terms of the *Bulla* and victimized the Greeks who obeyed the pope. Urban attempted to support the Latin archbishop of Cyprus to enforce the *Bulla's* provisions and to convince the Greeks to obey the Latins, an example of this is his letter to Hugh of Fagiano in *Synodicum*. In addition to the letters regarding Greece which are printed in full in *BEFAR*, there are also some very brief summaries of twelve letters, which have not been published and pertain to Greece. An effort to transcribe and read these letters was made. The letters are from Registers 26 (#326 f.107v) and 29 (#1234

f.98r, #1380 f.123v, #1381 f.123v, #1382 f.123v, #1471 f.137v, #2433 f.284v-285r, #1640 f.162v, #1641 f.163r, #1647 f.163v, #1776 f.180v) and were sent by Urban to the prince of Achaea, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, and to his barons; the bishop of Olena, and canon of Euboea, and the archbishops of Patras and Thebes. Hardly any of these letters refer to the Greeks but they are still of great interest as information about the situation of the Latin Church in the Morea can be obtained. These letters deal with domestic affairs of the Latin Church, their problems and their relations with the pope, and Prince Geoffrey of Villehardouin and his nobles. The purpose of the reading of the letters is to attempt to extract more useful information about the Greek Church in the Morea and enhance our understanding of the period, enabling us to form a more accurate assessment of the situation in Greece during the Frankish Era.

Clement IV's letters regarding the Greeks have been published in one volume of *PCRCICO*, together with the letters of Urban IV and Gregorii X in *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X*, edited by Tautu. They have also been published in *Les Registres de Clement IV, (BEFAR)* in one volume edited by E Jordan and they are mainly summaries of letters which were sent to the king of Cyprus, to the Latin emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin, to the abbot of Saint Theodosios of Thebes and others, concerning issues of the Latin Church. An effort has also been made in *BEFAR* to transcribe and read the unpublished letters relating to the Greeks in summary form. Those letters are numbers; 1025, 1075, 1164, 1335, 1336 and 1361. Furthermore there are also thirteen of Clement IV's letters concerning Cyprus in the *Cartulary*. They deal chiefly with doctrine and ecclesiastical matters, like the *Filioque*, purgatory, papal primacy, the seven sacraments of the Greek Church, the formula of the Greek faith, the schism and the union. It is significant to note that in an *Apostolica Sede Vacante* letter,

sent by the curia from the papal chancery, to Ralph, legate of the pope, (30 Nov. 1268, 1 Sept. 1271, 23 Mar. 1272), letter 29 in *PCRCICO* there is the oath of the Greek emperor concerning the union of Latin and Greek Church. Clement's letters were sent to various recipients like the prince of Achaea, to the emperor of Constantinople, to the patriarch of Constantinople, to the Greek emperor, Michael Paleologus, and to the Church of Patras regarding matters of the local Latin Church of Cyprus and others.

Gregory X's letters have been published in one volume of *PCRCICO* with the letters of Urban IV and Clement IV. Most of the letters were sent to the Greek emperor, Michael and Andronicus Paleologus, and to the Greek patriarch of Constantinople. Innocent V's letters concerning the Greeks have been published in *PCRCICO, Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, edited by F M Delorme and Tautu. As with the letters of previous popes, the union of the two Churches is their main topic. They delineate the attempts of the pope to bring about the return of the Greeks, the oaths which had been taken by the Greeks and the agreements between the Latin Church and the Greeks. They also refer to the formula of the right faith in accordance the Greeks, the *Filioque*, the confession of papal primacy by the Greeks and the consequences for the Greeks who refused to obey.

The next pope whose letters contain references to the Greeks was John XXI. Some of his letters are in *PCRCICO* in *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, edited by Delorme and Tautu. His letters can be viewed as a repetition of the same objectives, the wish of the Greeks for union, the confession of the Latin faith and the primacy of the pope, the superiority of the Latin Church as 'magistra', and the pope as the guide, successor of Peter and 'doctor' of the right

faith. There are also references to the *Filioque*, purgatory, the seven sacraments of the Church, the unleavened bread and the oath, which Michael and Andronicus Paleologus and the Great Logothetis, George Acropolitis gave to the Latins. In addition there is a fascinating letter from the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, John Beccius to the pope regarding ecclesiastical matters. Apart from *PCRCICO*, John XXI's letters are published in one volume of *BEFAR, Les Registres de Gregoire X et Jean XXI*, edited by Giraud.

The other four popes whose letters relate to the Greeks until the period which this dissertation examines are: Nicholas III, Martin IV, Nicholas IV and Boniface VIII. Their letters regarding the Greeks are in *PCRCICO*, in *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, edited by Delorme and Tautu. Their letters concerning the Greeks are few and they repeat the same issues as their predecessors. In one letter, Michael Paleologus and the Greek patriarch congratulate Nicholas III on his election as the new pope and renew their oath. In another, Paleologus expresses his desire for the union once more to Martin IV. In the letters of Nicholas IV and Bonifacius VIII, issues such as the sacrament of marriage and the use of unleavened bread were addressed. Letters of these popes are in *BEFAR*, in *Les Registres de Nicholas III*, edited by J Gay and S Vitte, in *Les Registres de Martin IV (1285-1287)*, edited by F Olivier-Martin and *Membres de l'école Française de Rome*, in *Les Registres de Nicholas IV*, edited by E Langlois and in *Les Registres de Boniface VIII*, edited by G Digard *et al*, where there are many letters concerning Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea. A letter of Nicholas IV is also in the *Cartulary*.

The series which have been mentioned are not the only sources as there are more sources written in Latin. For instance, *Actes Relatives à la Principauté de Morée 1289-1300*, edited by C Perat and J Longnon, which contain letters concerning the Morea. A letter of great significance is one sent by Bonifacius VIII to the patriarch of Constantinople and the archbishops of Achaea and Patras, regarding the domestic affairs of the Latin Church. Another useful text written in Latin in connection with the ecclesiastical differences between the Greeks and Latins, is *De Ecclesiae Occidentalis atque Orientalis perpetua Consensione libri*, by Allatius. The quotation about the 'martyrdom' of the thirteen monks of Kantara is of paramount importance. The *Oriens Christianus*, edited by M Le Quien, also contains useful information about the Latin Church in Greece. Le Quien, in *Oriens Christianus*, 1-3, Paris 1740, reprint, Graz 1958, is more specific and provides a detailed analysis of the situation of the Church throughout Greece, devoting a separate chapter to the Church of Patras. Moreover there is the work of Giorgio Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, and the text of the agreement of Ravennika in 1210. The text of the latter being very important to the ecclesiastical history of Greece and it has been translated it into English by Dr Schabel. For his translation, he used the text of Honorius III, number 48 in *PCRCICO* that he himself had corrected from the original manuscript.

Sources in other medieval European Languages (medieval Italian and medieval French)

There are primary sources in other medieval European languages such as medieval Italian and medieval French. The information on church history in these sources is, however, not abundant. There are three narrative sources relative to the topic of this dissertation in medieval Italian and they all refer mainly to events after 1303. They are the *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, edited by René de Mas Latrie and the

Chronique de l'île de Chypre, by Florio Bustron, also edited by R de Mas Latrie. These chronicles refer to the ecclesiastical history of Cyprus, which can be inferred from the narration of events, concerning the Greeks and their reactions towards the Latin Church and its actions.

There are also old French narrative sources from the east, those by *The Templar of Tyre* and Philip of Novara, and the *Annales de Terre Saint, Eracles* and the French and Catalan version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*.

Greek Primary Sources (Byzantine Greek and medieval Cypriot Greek)

The primary sources written in Byzantine Greek and medieval Cypriot used in this dissertation are divided into four groups. The first group consists of the sources which were published in classic series such as the *Biblioteca Medii Aevi*, the second group is modern editions, the third group is articles containing unpublished sources and the last group is contemporary narrative accounts.

Of the classical series, one of the most important is the edition of C. Sathas, the editor of the series *Biblioteca Medii Aevi*, which includes, *Μαρτύριον Κυπρίων* a narration of the events leading to the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara. In addition to Sathas, there is an edition of an earlier version of the *Μαρτύριον* by Theodoros Papadopoulos. Papadopoulos is also the editor of *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα*, 1984, which contains a corpus of legal texts containing laws regarding the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, such as laws concerning the priests who were excommunicated by their bishops and everyday matters. *Ανώνομον Σύνοψις Χρονική*, describes the capture of Constantinople. The *Ασσίξεις της Ρωμανίας* belongs to the same series (Volume 6). In

Ἀσπίδες there are ecclesiastical laws concerning the Church of Cyprus, for instance the way that the secular authority influenced the Church.

The *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς* is another very useful collection of primary Greek sources, works of Byzantine patriarchs, written in Greek and edited in 1872 by A Demetracopoulos. The collection commences with the books of patriarch Photios and it is divided into centuries. The *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς* contains the works of the Greek patriarchs against the Latins and quotations from their books. Moreover there are also the editions of the “Short Greek Chronicles” by Peter Schreiner. His *Die Bysantinischen Kleinchroniken* is a presentation of Greek chronicles, edited in Vienna, 1975.

The *Patrologia Graeca* by Migne is another significant series for the topic of this dissertation. The *Patrologia Graeca*, Volume 143 includes the work of Michael Paleologus and George Pachimere. There are published letters and texts regarding ecclesiastical matters by the patriarch of Constantinople, George the Cypriot, Barlaam, Michael Cerularius and Nilos which discuss issues like the *Filioque*, papal primacy, leavened and unleavened bread. In the *Patrologiae Graeca*, there are letters sent by the Greeks to Pope Innocent III, letters of Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople, to the Cypriots and George Acropolitis’ *Χρονική Συγγραφή*.

The *Corpus Fontium Historia Byzantinae* is another major series, of particular value for its coverage of the topic in Volume XIII, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, Volume III, *Nicetae Choniatae Orationes et epistulae* and Volume II *George Acropolitae Opera*. There is also the earlier *Nicetas Choniates Historia*, edited by Ioannes A Von Dieten,

1975. Moreover in the series *Βιβλιοθήκη Ιστορικών Μελετών*, there is *George Logothetae Acropolitae Chronicon Constantinopolitanum*. Another series is *Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ιεροσολύμων Ιστορία Περί των έν Ιερουσόμοι Πατριαρχευσάντων* or *Δωδεκάβιβλος* which, among other things, has letters against the Latins, Joseph Briennios's letters which talk about the oath which the Greeks gave to the Latins, Germanos's letters and other topics.

Acta et Diplomata Monasterorum et Ecclesiarum Orientis, edited by Fr. Miklosich- Ios. Müller and *Παλλαιολόγεια και Πελλοπονησιακά*, edited by S Lampros are another two series with information about the ecclesiastical situation of Greece. There is also the series *Le Patriarchat Byzantin serie I, Le Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, Volume 1 Les Actes des Patriarches*, edited by V Grumel with short summaries of letters of Greek patriarchs, including the patriarch John X Camateros. Furthermore, the edition of A Heisenberg *Neuwe Quellen zur Geschichte de lateinische Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion*, 1923, contains the important text of Nicholas Mesarites, *Der Epitaphios des Nikolaos Mesarites auf seinen Bruder Johannes*, which talks about the efforts being made towards the union of the two Churches.

There are also Greek primary sources edited in more recent editions like *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών 4^{ος}-15^{ος} αιώνας*. *Σύνταγμα* edited by B Neratzi-Varmazi belongs to the series of Cyprus Research Centre *Πηγές και Μελέτες της Ιστορίας της Κύπρου XXIII*, and is a collection of texts about medieval Cyprus, from the 4th to the 15th century. The letters of Neophytos Englistos, 'Περί των κατα χώραν Κύπρον σκαιών', are of great value to the period under discussion and the letters of patriarch Germanos to the people of Cyprus, and Gregory of Cyprus's letters to the king of Cyprus.

Moreover *Σύνταγμα* has many later texts concerning the ecclesiastical history of Cyprus, such as the 14th-century letter of Nicephoros Gregoras to the king of Cyprus, John Kantakuzinos's letter to the bishop of Karpasia, and the most important letters of Joseph Briennios and his study concerning the union of the Church of Cyprus with the Church of Constantinople during the 15th century.

In the same series as *Πηγές και Μελέτες της Κυπριακής Ιστορίας*, is *Κυπριακά Τυπικά*, edited by I P Tsiknopoulos. It includes the foundational rules of medieval monasteries of Makhairas and St Neophytos, written by Nilos and Neophytos. The rules written by Nilos contain references to the establishment of the Latin Church, important details about the structure of the Greek monasteries during the 12th-13th centuries, everyday life in an Orthodox monastery and other historical information. They also mention the financial support of the Byzantine emperor and the attitude of the local and secular authority towards the monasteries. The texts of these two Greek monasteries have been translated into English by Nicholas Coureas in his book, *The Foundation Rules of Medieval Cypriot Monasteries: Makhairas and St. Neophytos*, Nicosia, 2003, for the same series of the Cyprus Research Centre.

Another book is *Dated Greek Manuscripts from Cyprus to the year 1570*, edited by Costas N Constantinides and Robert Browning which is of great assistance in the dating of the Cypriot manuscripts and the study of medieval Cyprus.

Another type of text is the synodicon which is a collection that preserves acts, such as the *Synodicon of Orthodoxy* and the *Synodicon* written by the bishop of Amathunta, Germanos. *The Synodicon of Orthodoxy* or, *Le Synodicon de l'Orthodoxy*, was

published in the journal *Travaux et Mémoire* 2, 1967 edited by Jean Gouillard and discusses subjects concerning the ecclesiastical situation, the Church of Cyprus, its bishops, the saints and the Churches of Monemasia and Patras. The *Synodicon* of the bishop of Amathunta is edited by the Greek historian, P J Kirmitsis, as part of his article ‘Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας’ in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές* 47, 1983, and describes the Holy Sacraments of the Orthodox Church in detail, like marriage, baptism and the Holy Communion. The topic of ‘Τακτικόν, ήτοι αρχιερατικόν ευχολόγιον της επισκοπής Καρπασέων και Αμμοχώστου’ in *Εκκλησιαστικός Κήρυξ*, 2, 1912-1913, edited by H I Papaioannou is similar. The *Τακτικόν* was written during the period of the Palaeologoi (1259-1453) and supplies information about the functioning of the Church of Cyprus, the ordination of the bishops, excommunications and the heretics.

In addition to the above-mentioned books, there are articles which include primary sources. The most significant articles are the following: N Oikonomies, ‘Cinq actes inédits du Patriarche Michel Autôreanos’ in *Revue des Etudes Byzantine*, 1967, which has five acts from the thirteenth century Parisinus graecus 1234, A Papadopoulos-Keramevs, “Θεόδωρος Ειρηνικός, Πατριάρχης Οικουμενικός έν Νίκαια” in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1901 which illustrates the Greek patriarch’s standpoint against the Latins and papal primacy, J Gill ‘An Unpublished letter of Germanos, Patriarch of Constantinople (1222-1240)’ in *Βυζάντιον*, 154, 1974, which talks about the *Filioque* and the Latins, Papadopoulos-Keramevs, ‘Documents Grecs pour servir a l’histoire de la 4me Croisade’ in *Revue de L’ Orient Latin*, 1893, which contains the mass of St Gregory Dialogou and evidence of the use of leavened and unleavened bread, A Papadakis and A M Talbot, “John X Camateros Comfronts

Innocent III: An unpublished Correspondence”, *Byzantinoslavica*, 33, 1972, where the correspondence between the Greek patriarch and the pope is presented, ‘Αυτοκρατόρων του Βυζαντίου Χρυσόβουλλα και Χρυσά Γράμματα αναφερόμενα εις την ένωσιν των Εκκλησιών’ in *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 2, 1914, which has documents written by Byzantine emperors, regarding the union of the two Churches. There are also ‘Κυπριακά και Άλλα Έγγραφα εκ του Παλατινού Κώδικος 367 της Βιβλιοθήκης του Βατικανού’ which contains some of the documents about the Church of Cyprus in *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 14, 1917, 15, 1921, K Spiridakis, ‘Περιγραφή της Μονής Κύκκου επί τη Βάσει Ανέκδοτου Χειρογράφου’ in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 93, 1943, with historical information about the decrease of the number of the Greek bishops from 14 to 4, and the transportation of the bishops from their cities to villages, and Gregorios A Ioannides, ‘La Constitutio o Bulla Cypria Alexandri Papae IV del Barberinianus graecus 390’ in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 66.2, 2000, a very significant article which contains a version of the text of the *Bulla Cypria*.

Jean Darrouzès, a French historian, wrote many articles and edited many primary sources about the Church of Cyprus and Greece. For instance, ‘Le Mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins’ in *Revue des Etudes Byzantine* 11, 1963, which discusses dogmatic matters and his series of articles ‘Notes pour servir à l’histoire de Chypre’ which appeared in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 17, 1953, 20, 1956, 22, 1958, 23, 1959, and quotes primary sources and describes events of the daily life of the monks. In addition, there are more articles focusing on the topic such as ‘Un obituaire Chypriote, Le Parisinus Graecus 1588’ in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 15, 1951, which contains the legendary of the Church of Constantinople as it is edited in *Acta Sanctorum*, and it talks about the Greek Church under the Lusignan, the Latin

donations to the Church of Cyprus and contains other historical information. Darrouzès's article in *Byzantine Zeitschrift*, 44, 1951, 'Évêque inconnu ou peu connu de Chypre' is similar. Perhaps the most important of his articles concerning the Greek Church, is the article 'Textes Synodaux Chypriotes' in *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 57, 1979, which contains the text of the *Bulla Cypria* from the Parisinus Graecus 1391, Barberinus 390, and Athos Dionysiou 489 manuscripts. Moreover, 'Manuscrits Originaires de Chypre' and 'Autre Manuscrits Originaires de Chypre' in *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 8, 1951, 15, 1957, deal with Cypriot manuscripts and ecclesiastical matters too.

K Hadjipsaltis is a Greek historian who wrote many articles about the Church of Cyprus during the Frankish Era which include primary sources. His articles 'Μητροπόλεις και επισκοπές της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου και το Σχετικό Κείμενο των Τριών Κωδίκων' in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 14, 1949, discuss the problem of the number of dioceses in Cyprus according to three manuscripts, Ω 38 of the monastery of Lauras, Παλαιοί Νομοκάνων and the Paphos code. In another article, 'Σχέσεις της Κύπρου προς το έν Νίκαια Βυζαντινόν Κράτος', in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 15, 1952, there is a letter from the king of Cyprus, Henry I Lusignan (1232-1253), to the Byzantine emperor of Nicaea, John Ducas Vatatzis and one other letter from Greek Archbishop Neophytos to Emperor Vatatzis, concerning the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara. Neophytos' letter refers to trust, devotion and love on the part of the Greek clergy of Cyprus towards the patriarch, Germanos. In the third article, 'Νεόφυτου Μοναχού και Έγκλειστου Βιογραφικόν σημείωμα, ειδήσεις τινές περί της έν Κύπρω Μονής Ιωάννου του Χρυσσοστόμου' in *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 6, 1972-1973, interesting aspects of the Church of

Constantinople and Cyprus are presented. In addition, in his article 'Το ανέκδοτο κείμενο του Αλεξανδρινού Κώδικος 176 (366) Παραδόσεις Ιστορία της Μονής Κύκκου' in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 94, 1950, there is evidence concerning the domestic affairs of the Greek Church of Cyprus with references to the fourteen dioceses, and the relationship between the Church and the secular authority. 'Εκκλησιαστικά δικαστήρια Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας' in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 98, 1955, is also relative to the ecclesiastical situation. It discusses the Greek legal system during the Frankish Era and the functioning of the ecclesiastical courts of Cyprus which were subject to the jurisdiction of the papacy [*or* the Latins]. There are two more significant articles of Hadjipsaltis, 'Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου και το έν Νίκαια Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο αρχόμενου του ΙΓ μΧ αιώνας', in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 17, 1964, and 'Εκ της Ιστορίας της Κύπρου κατά την Φραγκοκρατία' in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 22, 1958. Both refer to the Church of Cyprus, the first one to the relationship between the Church of Cyprus and the patriarchate of Nicaea and the second has two documents which examine the election of the Greek bishops. In addition the new edition by Alexander Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern Der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, is of importance as it contains new editions of texts concerning Cyprus. The texts about the election of the Greek bishops during the Frankish era from Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 367, published in Nicosia 2007 are of great significance.

From the narratives sources written in Greek, only two are relative to the topic of this dissertation. The first one is Leontios Makhairas *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle'*, Oxford, 1932, in two volumes. In his first book Makhairas talks about the establishment of the Latin clergy of Cyprus and provides a

list of the Greek bishops of the island. The second narrative source is the Greek version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, edited by Peter P Kalonaros. The *Chronicle of the Morea* contains information and details about the ecclesiastical situation of the Morea such as the excommunication of Geoffrey II of Villehardouin by the bishops.

Recent historiography relating to the ecclesiastical history

In this part of the thesis I will present the recent historiography regarding Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople. Firstly I will consider Cyprus and then Greece, the Morea and Constantinople. As S G Michaelides's book *Ιστορία της κατά Κίτιον Εκκλησίας* (Larnaca 1992) states, the religious history of Frankish Cyprus has largely been viewed ahistorically from a Greek perspective, with chapter headings such as in 'The Church in the Dark Ages: Latin Rule'.¹ Chris Schabel's comments on this topic are very accurate. I strongly agree with his opinion expressed in his article about the status of the Greek clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus. According to Schabel, the Greek historians' view purports that,

religion has been seen as a divisive factor and we have a depressing picture of a Latin clergy that stripped the Greek clergy of its property, forced it into submission, abolished its independence and rights, refused to tolerate its beliefs and practices, attempted to Latinize it (and population), and persecuted those who would not yield. The strength of the Cypriots' Orthodoxy and Hellenism helped them to survive intact and preserve their identity. Aside from factual errors, this is a logical interpretation based on the modern ideals of democracy, freedom of religion, and self-determination of peoples, perhaps sometimes with a slight dose of Greek Orthodox chauvinism. From a medieval perspective – with very different ideals – the actions of the Latin and Greek clergies become more understandable, and taking Christianity as a unifying element, we see general peace and prosperity, punctuated by relatively few episodes of conflict.²

¹ S. G. Michaelides, *Ιστορία της κατά Κίτιον Εκκλησίας*, Larnaca 1992, pp.18-19

² C. Schabel, "The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus", in *Sweet Land..., Cyprus through the Ages: Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus*, ed. J. Chrysostomides - Ch. Dendrinos, Camberley, Surrey 2006, vol. 64-65, pp 169 – 70.

I will divide the historiographical tradition into three categories. The first is the traditional Greek historiography, the second is the non-Greek traditional historiography and the third consists of modern historians. The first group include C N Sathas, *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevii*, 2 vols, Venice 1873, G Philippou, *Ειδήσεις ιστορικάί περί της Εκκλησίας Κύπρου*, Athens 1875, reprint Nicosia 1975, H T F Duckworth, *The Church of Cyprus*, London 1900, J. Hackett, *History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus*, London 1901, C I Parioannou, *Ιστορία της Ορθόδοξου Εκκλησίας Κύπρου*, Athens 1923, P I Kouritis, *The Orthodox Church in Cyprus in the Frankish Period*, Nicosia 1907, P Zannetos, *Ιστορία της νήσου Κύπρου*, Larnaca 1910, reprint, Nicosia 1997, G Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, Cambridge 1948, pp 1041-1104, P Kirmitsis, “Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας”, *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί*, 47 (1983), 3-108, K Kyrtis, “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξου Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας”, *Επετηρίδα Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* 2, 1993, pp 149-86, Th Papadopoulos, “Η Εκκλησία Κύπρου κατά την περίοδο της Φραγκοκρατίας” in *Ιστορία της Κύπρου, Δ΄ Μεσαιωνικόν βασίλειον – Ενετοκρατία, Μέρος 1*, ed. Th Papadopoulos, Nicosia 1995, pp 543-665 and B Englezelis, “Cyprus as a Stepping-stone between West and East in the Age of the Crusades, the two Churches” in *XVe Congrès international des Sciences historiques, Rapports* vol 2, Bucharest (Romanian Academy of Science), 1980, pp 216-21.

The second group includes historians such as J. Richard, “A propos la Bulla Cypria de 1260” in *Byzantinische Forschungen* 22, 1996, pp 14-31, M Efthimiou, *Greeks and Latins on Cyprus in the Thirteenth Century*, Brookline, MA 1987, C Galatariotou, *The Making of a Saint, The Life, Times and Sanctification of Neophytos the Recluse*, C Schabel, “The Latin

Bishops of Cyprus, 1255-1313 with a note on bishop Neophytos of Solea”, *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, Vol. 30, 2004, “The Greek bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340 and the Synodikon Kyprion”, *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί*, Vols. 64-65, 2003, “Antelm the Nasty, First Latin Archbishop of Patras (1205- CA 1241)” in *Diplomatics in the Eastern Mediterranean 1000-1500*, ed. A D Beihammer, M G Parani and C D Schabel, Boston 2008, “Etienne de Lusignan’s Chronograffia and the Ecclesiastical History of Frankish Cyprus: Notes on a recent reprint and English translation” *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, Minnesota 2002-2003, *The Synodicum Nicosiense and other documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373*, introduction pp 17-86, Nicosia 2001, *Bullarium Cyprium* (forthcoming) *Religion in Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374*, ed. A Konnari – C Schabel, “The Myth of Queen Alice and the Subjugation of the Greek Clergy on Cyprus”, in *Identitiés Croisées en un milieu méditerranéen: le cas de Chypre* ed S Fourier – G Grivaud, 2006, “The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus”, in *Sweet Land...* ed J Chrysostomides – Ch Dendrinis, Surrey 2006 (the former are most important and closest to my topic as are the articles and books of C Schabel). The PhD thesis of A Konnari is also very significant, *The Encounter of Greeks and Franks in Cyprus in the Late Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Phenomena of Acculturation and Ethnic Awareness* and her chapter about “Greeks” in *Cyprus Society and culture*. There is also the book by N Coureas, *Latin Church in Cyprus 1195-1312*, Aldershot 1997, in which his chapter about relations between the Latin and Orthodox churches pp 251-319 is of great assistance.

This thesis will make an effort to present a critical assessment of the state of research, the strengths and weaknesses of the literature currently available and the areas where further research may be able to shed further light. To begin with, the first group of historians will be examined, presenting Greek historians such as G Philippou *Ειδήσεις*

ιστορικάί περί της Εκκλησίας Κύπρου who wrote in 1875. His book contains a chapter about the Frankish period and from page 42 to 66, the events which took place during the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus are detailed. He talks about the monastic communities in Cyprus very briefly and then refers to the letter of Celestine III pertaining to the establishment of the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy in Cyprus. It is apparent that he makes some “errors” or misunderstands some of the events. This could have arisen due to a misinterpretation of the primary sources, for instance he said that Queen Alice wrote to Pope Innocent III requesting a reduction in the bishoprics from 14 to 4, which is not what actually occurred. The reduction of the sees was a result of the agreements of 1222. I choose to start with Philippou’s book as it is a good example of how a historian, especially in this case, a Greek one, can be influenced by his country’s identity or simply follow previous historians who make the same “errors” like Giofrancesco Loredano and Etienne de Lusignan.

Returning to Queen Alice, an article written by Schabel explains in detail the myth of Queen Alice. It is an extremely important article as it shows how a myth can be created and that Alice herself was a separate entity to the myth that evolved. Further information in Philippou’s book is the reference to Pelagius during the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara. However, according to the primary sources, Pelagius was not present and can therefore not be associated with the martyrdom. Here it is possible to observe the influence of another historian, Sathas, who dated the martyrdom in 1221. This date was then disputed by later historians like Papadopoulos, who proved in the introduction to his edition about the martyrdom that Sathas was incorrect and that the martyrdom indeed took place a decade later in 1231. Sathas appears to be the first Greek historian who influenced the next generation of the Greek historians. His book, *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevii*, which was published in 1873, contains an introduction to

the second volume where he makes serious historical mistakes and his viewpoint is probably one of the most biased of all the Greek historians.

In addition another significant historical event which is confused refers to the reaction of Celestine III to the *Bulla Cyprica* which took place in 1260, 65 years after the establishment of the Latin Church. Philippou makes mistakes for instance he used the *Bulla* as the basis for his understanding of what had happened in the 1190s. Apart from a misunderstanding of the sources, Philippou's book is also problematic due to his prejudiced perspective, highlighted by his use of expressions. He refers extensively to the violence used by the Latins in order to submit the Greeks, and the great degree of suffering endured by Neophytos because of the Latins, in order to get him to give the oath of obedience.³ In addition, his presentation of the events is very brief and the sources he used are very few in number, as we can see from the footnotes and not contemporary to the events like Makhairas.

Another Greek book which belongs to the same category is *The Orthodox Church in Cyprus in the Frankish Period*, published in 1907 by Kouritis. Kouritis was influenced by earlier writers which led to his chronology being confused. This confusion was the basis of his negative views on the Latins' actions. I would like to add that Kouritis is biased in and very hostile towards the Latins. I believe he uses very negative diction about the Latins and he also appears very angry with the Latins as shown by his discussion of Pelagius, Hugh of Fagiano and Allatius in particular who was a contemporary writer with the martyrdom of the thirteen monks, accusing him of being a friend of the pope.⁴ Another problem I encountered in his book is the reference to the word 'nation'. Greece started to sense

³ G. Philippou, *Ειδήσεις Ιστορικοί περί της Εκκλησίας Κύπρου*, Athens 1875, repr. Nicosia 1975, pp. 50-51.

⁴ P.I. Kouritis, *The Orthodox Church in Cyprus in the Frankish Period*, Nicosia 1907, p. 20.

nationhood only after the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, however Kouritis talks about a national conscience⁵ during the Frankish period. This is important as it shows him anachronistically projecting his own 19th century national consciousness back to the 13th century. Moreover, his sources are not extensive or very reliable as they are mostly later Greek sources, secondary works and no reference to papal letters is made. Overall he interprets the facts and comments on them without having the relevant evidence to prove his observations.

In his book *Ιστορία της νήσου Κύπρου* published in 1910 and his article “Ορθόδοξα Επισκοπικά Δικαστήρια Εν Κύπρω επί Φραγκοκρατίας”, P. Zannetos adheres to the same anti-Latin approach. I believe him to be an unreliable source due to his biased viewpoint and not use of expressions such as the ‘tyranny’ of the Latins. He describes the Latins in a very negative tone when he refers to the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara, placing great emphasis on how hostile the Latins were towards the Greeks. Almost all of his sources are Greek and not Latin and he used no footnotes at all, thus his opinions remained unsubstantiated. Zannetos’s lack of footnotes raises a significant question for a historian; out of these authors, whose aim was to conduct original research and who simply attempted to popularise the works of others? Zannetos does more than rewrite the works of Philippou and Kouritis for a popular audience. In other words he tried to use the original sources that were available to him from Sathas and Mas Latrie for example.

P Kirmitsis’s article “Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας” in *Κυπριακαί Σπουδές* 1983 was very useful. Kirmitsis’s presentation of the events is in

⁵ P.I. Kouritis, *The Orthodox Church in Cyprus in the Frankish Period*, Nicosia 1907, p. 59.

more detail and he disagrees openly with other Greek historians like Philippou.⁶ There is a significant leap in the time to Kirmitsis. Presumably he also used Hackett or rather the Greek version of Hackett which was translated by Papaioannou. He does however follow the “model” of other Greek historians, his “mindset” remains the same, he is anti-Latin and very hostile towards Hugh of Fagiano, he uses mostly secondary sources. He gives opinions without having evidence to prove them⁷ and he is very negative towards Allatius and Le Quien. However he has a very good bibliography at the end of his article and most importantly he published the *Synodicon of Amathus*, which a useful source although it does not refer directly to the period which is studied in this thesis, it is a later source, after 1303, so I will not analyse it.

I wish to point out that in this introduction it is impossible to present all the articles and books written about the ecclesiastical history of the Frankish Cyprus which have been written by Greek and western historians, so I have selected what I consider to be the most important and well-known texts that have influenced the progress of the ecclesiastical history of Cyprus. Presenting the most significant points or comments about all of these books systematically however will lead to this introduction being too lengthy. A N Mitsides is a Greek historian who writes about the ecclesiastical history of Cyprus in, *The Church of Cyprus*, published in 1974, which is a short book and his chapter about the Greek and Latin Church during the Frankish era is really a summary of the events. The contents present nothing new and it contains only three footnotes. He is in agreement with the rest of the Greek historians. The same comments largely apply to B Englezakis’s article, “Cyprus as a Stepping-stone between West and East in the Age of the Crusades: the two Churches” in *XVe International des Sciences historiques*.

⁶ P. Kirmitsis, “Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας», *Κυπριακαί Σπουδές* 47, 1983, p.13.

⁷ Kirmitsis, “Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου p.38.

It can be argued that K. Kyrris is a very prejudiced historian. One of his most important articles is “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας” in *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* 2 in 1993. He starts with the *Bulla Cypria* and presents it as being a consequence of the subordination of the Greek Church by the Latin Church which commenced during the papacy of Celestine III. He uses a wide variety of both primary and secondary sources, by very remarkable historians, like Edbury, Hussey, Tsilpanlis and others⁸ and many of the sources such as Bustron and Amadi are not contemporary to the events he describes. It is a long, detailed article, and although it is useful, in my opinion it sometimes becomes rather tedious and confusing to the reader. Another drawback is the fact that he did not use papal letters at all, leading him to rely on speculation. An example of this is when he talks about the *Bulla* arguing that during the absence of Germanos in Rome, Hugh removed all the Greek representatives of the hierarchy from their office,⁹ an event which is not described in the sources. Another important comment is his reference to the Greek monasteries in paragraph 3.¹⁰

Schabel reverses this theory in his chapter about religion in the book *Cyprus, Society and Culture 1191 – 1374*.¹¹ My conclusion on this article though is that, despite the drawbacks and the fact that he takes the same line as the previous Greek historians he comes with a set of assumptions which casts the *Frankokratia* in a negative light, it is very good. The writer appears to be very well-read and familiar with this topic, as illustrated by the extensive use of footnotes and the fact that he referred to archaeological

⁸ K. Kyrris, “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξης της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας» in *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* 2, 1993, p. 168.

⁹ Kyrris, “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξης της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου p. 168.

¹⁰ Kyrris, “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξης της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου p. 155.

¹¹ See more in p.p. 191-94.

evidence as well. It is definitely a very useful article for research about ecclesiastical history and Kyrris is regarded as one of the eminent Greek historians.

Together with Kyrris, Papadopoulos is another great Greek historian and their contribution to Cypriot studies is paramount and despite the “model” they follow, they offer a lot to younger historians. Papadopoulos’s most important contribution to Cypriot studies is his role as an editor in a series published in 1995 by the Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, the monumental *History of Cyprus*, written in Greek. Papadopoulos wrote the chapter about the Church of Cyprus during the Frankish period. It is a long chapter which has been used as a reference by many historians and students, including myself. Although I disagree with regard to his perspective of the events, I believe it is an excellent chapter, informative and well organised with a very useful bibliography and footnotes. Moreover he provides a modern-Greek translation of many sources which were previously unpublished in this form and he offers comments about other secondary works in his text and his footnotes. His chapter is definitely an invaluable source for a researcher as he refers to almost all the bibliography pertaining to the Greek Church in the Middle Ages in Cyprus.

His edition *Μαρτύριον Κυπρίων*, about the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara is also of great significance. He edited an improved edition in which he used two sources, unlike Sathas, an earlier writer, who only referred to one, and in his introduction to this edition he made some useful corrections, like the one mentioned previously regarding the presence of Pelagius in the martyrdom of the thirteen monks.

The second group of historians who wrote about the ecclesiastical history of medieval Cyprus at the beginning of the 19th century made an important contribution to the history of Cyprus. Several of the works by members of this group, for example Hackett and Hill have become classics. Louis de Mas Latrie was the first “modern” scholar to study medieval Cyprus and his work was based on medieval sources. Mas Latrie was published most of Celestine III’s documents and the 1196, 1220 and 1222 material in 1801. He used new sources in order to explain the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus and to explain the agreements of 1220 and 1222 correctly. His books *Histoire de l’ île Chypre sous le règne de la Maison de Lusignan*, Paris 1861, vol I, “Histoire des Archevêques latins de l île de Chypre”, *Archives de l’ Orient Latins II*, 1884, made this material available to later historians like Philippou, Kouritis and the rest.

Another very important non-Greek historian is John Hackett. In 1901 he published his book *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* where he made extensive use of his sources. In his book he uses Lusignan, Loredano, Louis de Mas Latrie, papal letters, old editions, or contemporary ones like Migne, Baluze, the old edition of the *Cartulary of the Cathedral of Saint Sophia in Nicosia*, and all the available Greek and Latin sources of his time. As Schabel correctly states, “when it served his anti-papal purposes, however, Hackett employed doubtful sources”.¹² In his article Schabel devotes a whole page to a discussion of Hackett’s work.¹³ He criticises him for making the same mistake about Alice, that he asked for the reduction of the 14 bishoprics to four and he talks about efforts of subordination by the Latin Church to the Greek Church. Like other historians, he is against Allatius and accused him of defending the crime of the Latin Church to the Greek Church. It is worth mentioning that Hackett was an

¹² C. Schabel, “The Myth of the Queen Alice”, p. 272.

¹³ C. Schabel, “The Myth of the Queen Alice”, p. 272.

Anglican cleric which does not make a historian's work straightforward. As an Anglican priest, he disliked Roman Catholics and so he took the view that the other enemies of Roman Catholics deserved sympathetic treatment. Despite the fact that he is not Greek, he agrees on most points with the group of the Greek historians I have already mentioned. This text is an extensive book, full of detail, covering many issues and making good use of sources but unfortunately he lacks objectivity.

The next work is Sir George Hill and his book *A History of Cyprus*, specifically his third volume, published in 1948 which is about the Frankish period. Hill follows Hackett concerning the establishment of Latin Church and the subjugation of the Greek clergy in 1220-1222 but he used sources like Loredeno to 'fill in' the blanks. His book contains a lengthy chapter about the two churches and he covers many topics and a long chronological period. He uses many sources relying on old editions that were available during his time. He is not biased and as Schabel says "unlike Hackett, however Hill had no religious axe to grind".¹⁴ As in the case of Hackett, Schabel devotes a page in his article to Hill's points regarding Alice and he presents some details about Hill's book. In my opinion this is a very useful and reliable source and a careful study for his time (1948) by a historian who chose to overlook the outlook of other historians, especially contemporary Greeks.

The next work is of a Greek, H J Magulias' article, "A Study in Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Church relations in the island of Cyprus between the years A D 1196 and 1360", is published in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, in 1964. His article is not prejudiced, accessible to the reader together with a good combination of

¹⁴ C. Schabel, "The Myth of the Queen Alice", p. 273.

sources, although old editions are used there are a variety of sources; Greek, Latin, German, French and so on.

G Fedalto is a specialist on the Latin Church in the Medieval East. He wrote a chapter in Papadopoulos' edition of History of Cyprus, where he talks mostly about the Latin Church although some historical mistakes occur such as the fact that the agreements of 1220-1222 took place in 1213! Moreover he did not utilise the secondary literature well.¹⁵

Two other reliable historians are J Gill and J Richard. Joseph Gill was a Roman Catholic priest, a Jesuit better known for his work on Byzantium in the same period. Gill wrote the article "The Tribulations of the Greek Church in Cyprus 1196-c.1280" in *Byzantinsche Forschungen* in 1977. He presents the facts and he substantiates his arguments making use of sources which are mainly recent editions. He uses papal letters, primary and secondary works, Greek and Latin sources and he covers most of the events of the Frankish ecclesiastical history of Cyprus.

J. Richard is another excellent historian who wrote about Cyprus among a plethora of other topics. His article "A propos de la "Bulla Cypria" de 1260" published in *Byzantinische Forschungen* in 1996 is very important and as the title suggests, it refers to the *Bulla Cypria*. Richard is a very reliable and objective historian and his article portrays his own perspective about the *Bulla*. Although he makes good use of his Greek and Latin sources, the negative points in his work stem from the way it relates

¹⁵ C. Schabel, "The Myth of the Queen Alice", p. 259.

to the myth of Queen Alice.¹⁶ Another important work of Richard concerning Cyprus is his chapter in Papadopoulos' volume about the structure of the medieval kingdom of Cyprus. It is a very objective work regarding the establishment of the Latin Church. It is significant to emphasize that both Richard and Gill had a great effect, writing from a western Catholic perspective and are free from the anti-Latin prejudice of earlier Cypriot writers. It is upon their work that most modern writers build.

The third group of historians consists of the modern historians, both Greek and non-Greek who have written about the topic including C Schabel, A Konnari, N Coureas, C Galatariotou and M B Efthmiou. I believe the most significant contribution has been made by C Schabel who has written many articles about the relationship between the two Churches in Cyprus during the Frankish period. Despite the fact that ecclesiastical history is not his basic research interest, he has published a range of excellent work. The best work I have read on my topic is in his chapter "Religion" in *Cyprus, Society and Culture 1191-1374* edited by C Schabel and A Konnari. In this chapter he presents the events in a captivating way. While reviewing the facts, he manages to explain them in accordance with the thought processes of the middle ages which make his explanations fascinating and insightful. An example is his analysis of the reduction of the number of the Greek monks¹⁷. He uses a variety of sources, the latest edition of every source both Greek and Latin and this allows him to substantiate everything he argues and his viewpoint is the most objective of all the historians I have studied. I think it is the most accurate presentation of the events, adding new aspects and covering a long period in detail while maintaining the interest of the reader. Other pertinent work is his article about "The Myth of Queen Alice, and the

¹⁶ C. Schabel, "The Myth of the Queen Alice", p. 274.

¹⁷ C. Schabel "Religion", in *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374*, ed. C. Schabel – A. Konnari, Nicosia 2005, pp.190-94.

subjugation of the Greek Clergy in Cyprus” in *Identités Croisées eu un Milieu Méditerranéen: Le Cas de Chypre (Antiquité-Moyen Âge)*, published in 2006 which I have referred to before and his chapter about “The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus” in “*Sweet Land...*” published in 2006 which is a very careful presentation about the Greek clergy in Cyprus, his article about “The Latin bishops of Cyprus 1255-1313 with a note on bishop Neophytos of Solea”, in *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, Nicosia, 2004 and the article “The Greek Bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340 and the Synodikon Kypriou” in *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 2003. The previous article, together with his Introduction in the *Synodicum Nicosiense and other documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373*, published in 2001 and his forthcoming article about serfdom and the Greek clergy in the thirteenth century and the forthcoming *Bullarium* are works that every historian who studies the ecclesiastical history of medieval Cyprus will have to read. They analyse a variety of subjects like the *Synodikon Kypriou* which was published earlier by Kirimitsis and other matters which I have found extremely useful for my thesis. Other works of Schabel which also relate directly to my topic is his article “Antelm the Nasty, First Latin archbishop of Patras (1205-CA 1241)” in the *Diplomatics in the Eastern Mediterranean 1000-1500*, published in 2008, which offers a great deal of information about the situation in Patras despite limited sources. The other one is an article about “Archbishop Elias and the Synodicum Nicosiense” in *Annuaire de l'histoire des Conciles* in 2000 and the review about “Etienne de Lusignan’s Chronographia and the ecclesiastical History of Cyprus: Notes on a recent reprint and English translation” from which we can draw useful information. Although Schabel has written other articles about the ecclesiastical history of medieval Cyprus, I consider that the previous ones are the most useful.

Another excellent historian is A Nicolaou-Konnari, who like Schabel represents the new movement of historians who are not prejudiced and despite being Greek she retains a very objective viewpoint. She did not write about ecclesiastical history but her chapter about the Greeks in Cyprus is of assistance.

Grivaud is another modern historian who has written about the history of early Frankish Cyprus and has written significant works like his chapter about literature in Schabel-Konnari's book about Frankish Cyprus. C Galatariatou has also written a book about Neophytos the Recluse, *The Making of a Saint, The Life, Times and Sanctification of Neophytos the Recluse* published in 1991, containing a chapter about ecclesiastical politics. Her work is very analytical and contains evidence to back up what she asserts and it is a reliable source, with useful footnotes and a good bibliography.

M B Efthimiou published his MA Thesis in 1987 about Greeks and Latins in Cyprus in the thirteenth century but in his chapter about the Orthodox and Latins: Ecclesiastical Differences, he really does not add anything new.

Finally the only other Greek historian who is a specialist on the ecclesiastical history of Cyprus is N Coureas. Coureas's Phd thesis is *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312* published in 1997. Coureas is the first Greek writer who presents the situation from a different perspective to his predecessors. He presents the events objectively and makes use of many modern editions, using Latin sources (papal letters etc) and Greek sources. In his chapter about the Latin and Orthodox Churches, he presents the events as they took place and not in favour of the Greeks. In his text he offers the

opinion of other historians like Hill or Richard and he refers to the situation in Antioch and Constantinople. Although it is very good there are some points that could be streamlined for example, the organisation of the events, some aspects are repeated or refer back to the same events and he lacks evidence to support his opinions or follow a chronological order and the way he presents the events is dull for the reader at times. He did not try to see beyond the events, or search for the deeper reasons behind what occurred or present the events from a medieval perspective. On pages 268-69 where he discusses the agreements of 1220 where he refers to a 'dilemma' of the Orthodox prelates of Cyprus. I do not agree with the word 'dilemma'. The agreements of 1220 are factual and if the Greek Clergy had not agreed they could have left the island and there are only two letters which discuss this issue. In addition when he talks about the martyrdom of the thirteen monks he claims Eustorge "did not have time to handle the matter himself and so handed the monks back to the Dominican Andrew".¹⁸ I do not believe that it was really a matter of time rather it was more a matter of responsibility. However, taking into consideration that it was his Phd thesis and he was at the beginning of his career, such factors are expected. My overall comments are that it is an important book as it was written by a Greek historian who managed to be objective and not allow the influence of his origins to interfere with his writing.

I have presented the recent bibliography about Cyprus but as regards Constantinople and the Morea, unfortunately there is no historiographical tradition as such in existence. Beginning with Constantinople, there is a very limited number of articles about the ecclesiastical history after the fourth Crusade. The secondary works about

¹⁸ N. Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195 – 1312*. Aldershot 1997, p. 282.

this topic which I found to be extremely useful and reliable and have used in this thesis are M Angold's article "Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile" in *Latin and Greek in Eastern Mediterranean* published in 1989, J Gill's article "Innocent III and the Greeks: Aggressor or Apostle?" in *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, published in 1973 and his book, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, published in 1979. In addition, J M Hussey's book proved to be of assistance, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, published in 1986 which I believe to be an objective and well-written book. Moreover, I make good use of J Richard's "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople, 1207-1277" in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, published in 1986 and three other not very recent but helpful articles of R Spence, "Gregory IX's attempted expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople: the Crusade for the union of the Latin and Greek Churches" in *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* published in 1973, and two articles by R L Wolff "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204-1261" in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, published in 1954, and "The Organisation of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople", in *Traditio*, 1948. It is interesting to observe that none of the previous works are written by Greek historians, despite the fact that the topic is Constantinople. We can only speculate about this and perhaps offer a theory which implies their disinterest. This topic was mostly studied by Byzantine historians.

The Morea was more difficult and challenging as all the work I found is written by Greek historians. Two of them present an unprejudiced viewpoint and in general they are good. I refer to M S Kordoses's book, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204-1262), a Study of the Greek population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish*

dominion, published in 1987, and N Coureas's article, "The Establishment of the Latin Secular Church of Patras under Pope Innocent III: Comparisons and Contrasts with Cyprus" in *Mesogeios*, 2001. The other two secondary works about the Morea are not as objective, in particular, N G Zaxaropoulos's, *Η Εκκλησία στην Ελλάδα κατά τη Φραγκοκρατία* published in 1981, and D A Zadynthinos's article, "Ο Αρχιεπίσκοπος Αντέλμος και τα πρώτα έτη της Λατινικής Εκκλησίας Πατρών" in *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, in 1933, about which Schabel wrote an article presenting an objective interpretation about Anselm.

With regard to Cyprus we have a much wider range of material in both primary and secondary sources. The lack of primary sources about Constantinople and the Morea is a difficulty I had to contend with when I was writing this thesis.

It would be appropriate for this introduction to include a brief discussion of the secondary literature relating to other areas where the Greek Church had been conquered by the Latins, eg Southern Italy, Sicily, Jerusalem and Antioch. Useful information about the situation in Jerusalem can be drawn from J Pahlitzsch's article, "Georgians and Greeks in Jerusalem (1099-1310)" in *East and West in the Crusader State*, published in 2003, in which he discusses the situation of the Greek Church of Jerusalem after the conquest. Similarly, his article "The Greek Orthodox Church in the First Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099-1187)" in *Patterns of the Past Prospectus for the Future*, published in 1999, he covers a shorter period and discusses matters like the objectives of the Crusades and the policies of Urban II to the Eastern Church.

This dissertation aims to present the situation in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople while simultaneously making a comparison with areas where the Greek Church was under the Latin conquest. Therefore examining the Church in the Latin East, B Hamilton's book, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, published in 1980 has been studied. It was a very helpful book as I wished to use reliable secondary works in order to make the comparison and not primary sources as the Latin East is not the topic of my thesis. Regarding South Italy, Rome and Sicily, I have used another work of B Hamilton, "The City of Rome and the Eastern Churches in the tenth Century" and the article of P Herde "The Papacy and the Greek Church in Southern Italy between the eleventh and thirteenth century" in the *Society of Norman Italy*, published in 2003. G A Loud is also a very cautious writer and significant historian who wrote about Italy. I used his article "Byzantine Italy and the Normans" in *Conquerors and Churchmen in Norman Italy*, published in 1999. In general, the experiences of Cyprus and Frankish Greece are comparable with the experience in the kingdom of Jerusalem or Norman Sicily which shows that the papal policy was similar everywhere, including places where there were Greek Churches. In Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople the Greek Churches were seen by the Latins as part of the Roman Church so they treated them as members of this church. The comparison made in this thesis serves to prove that the situation in Cyprus and Greece was not unique or special. It was very customary behaviour for the Latin Church and in the Latin East and South Italy where they were Greek churches, the situation was not altogether different.

It can be concluded that the best modern historians have managed to a large extent to escape the partisanship of earlier generations. Historians now have more sources and better edited sources to utilise. It is my aim to build on the ideas of Schabel and others.

Chapter One

The Establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople, Cyprus and Achaea

The establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople, Cyprus and the Morea was very significant for ecclesiastical history and the relationship between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Latin Church.

Cyprus was the first of the three places to be conquered by the Latins. In 1192, Guy de Lusignan bought Cyprus from the Templars and in 1197, after Aimery's request to Pope Celestine III, the pope took the initiative in establishing the Latin Church in Cyprus. Celestine III sent a letter to the people and clergy of Cyprus, regarding the establishment of the Latin Church on 20 February 1196, suggesting that Aimery had asked the pope to take action to recall Cyprus from its errors and return to the Roman Church, as the mother and head of all churches.¹⁹ The Latin Church was to comprise three bishoprics - Paphos, Limassol and Famagusta - and an archbishopric in Nicosia. The ordination of Alan, the first Latin archbishop, is described in a letter of 1197, sent by Pope Celestine III to the cathedral chapter of Nicosia.²⁰ The fact that the Latin Church of Cyprus needed papal assent for the creation of bishoprics and the canonical ordination of the Latin bishops, illustrates that, from the outset the Latin Church in Cyprus was directly answerable to the pope.²¹ The later efforts of the first Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas Morosini, to place the Church of Cyprus under his jurisdiction proved unsuccessful.²² Some letters survive from Pope Celestine III

¹⁹ *The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia*, eds. N. Coureas and C. Schabel, Nicosia 1997, doc. no. 2, pp. 76-78

²⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. nos. 2, 4, pp. 74-76, 81-82

²¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 3, pp. 78-80

²² Innocent III, "Opera Omnia", *PL* 215, cols. 962-63, 966-67

to the Latins in Cyprus, in which the pope celebrated the establishment of the new Latin Church. He made known his decision regarding the structure and property of the new church, urging both the population and the clergy to obey and assist the new Latin hierarchy.²³

Constantinople and Achaea were the next places to be conquered by the Latins some years later, beginning in 1204. The Fourth Crusade and the sack of the city led to the establishment of a Latin hierarchy and a Latin patriarch in Constantinople. After the conquest of Constantinople, the Venetians in Constantinople chose Thomas Morosini as the Latin patriarch, without informing Pope Innocent III of his election. The pope was unaware of this development for several months. When he was informed about their action, he rejected Morosini's election as uncanonical in a letter sent on 21 January 1205, and asserted that no layman or secular authority had the right to select a patriarch. Moreover, Innocent questioned the right of the Venetian clerics who had appointed canons in St Sophia and also questioned the legitimacy of the canons.²⁴ In spite of his letter, Innocent III eventually confirmed Morosini's election in 1205 in order to avoid further problems. He gave three reasons that had made him change his mind: he wanted to have good relations with the Latin emperor of Constantinople, and he had confirmed Morosini's election in order to please him. In addition, he wanted to ordain bishops in the sees of the Latin empire of Constantinople and he wanted to urge the Venetians to render services to the Latin Church.²⁵ The Greeks of Constantinople now had a new Latin patriarch, who had replaced the Greek patriarch, John Camateros, and a Latin hierarchy, but in their eyes Camateros remained their

²³ *Cartulary*, doc. nos. 1, 8, pp. 69, 75-82, 85-89

²⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, ed. T. Haluskynskyj, *PCRCICO*, II, Rome, 1944, doc. no. 68 pp. 285-89

²⁵ *PL* 215, col. 517

spiritual leader.²⁶ Morosini wanted to make changes in the existing ecclesiastical organization and he asked the pope to reduce the number of bishops in Constantinople. He wanted to decrease the number of bishoprics in his patriarchate as it was too large and the revenues of some of them were small.²⁷ Innocent gave his permission in 1206 and ordered his legate, Benedict of St Susanna, to reduce the number of bishops in cases where he and Morosini thought necessary. Furthermore, he gave the Latin patriarch of Constantinople the right to continue making changes after Benedict's return to the West.²⁸ The new bishoprics of the Church of Constantinople, which had been formed after the arrival of the Latins, were the former Greek metropolitans of Selymbria, Pegae, and Chalcedon, the former Greek autocephalous archbishopric of Derkos, and the former suffragan bishoprics of Heracleia, Athyra and Panion.²⁹

The conquest of the Morea by the Latins is described in detail in the *Chronicle of the Morea*. According to the chronicle, in 1204-1205, after the Fourth Crusade and the capture of Constantinople, the Franks arrived in the Morea and in 1209 they organized a new principality with Geoffrey II of Villehardouin as their first prince.³⁰ Geoffrey of Villehardouin, the nephew of the historian, had been planning to go to Palestine as a pilgrim, but, when he heard about the deeds of the crusaders in Syria, he decided to go to Constantinople instead. Eventually he came to Modon, where a local Greek noble asked for his help against some other Greeks. Geoffrey agreed, but later, in association with William of Champlitte he conquered the Morea for himself. In 1210, after the death of William of Champlitte, Geoffrey was recognized as the prince of

²⁶ D. M. Nicol, "The Papal Scandal", *Studies in Church History*, 13, 1967, p. 148

²⁷ R. L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople", *Traditio* 6, 1948, p. 44

²⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, pp. 317-20

²⁹ Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople", p. 56

³⁰ *Το Χρονικόν του Μορέως*, ed. P. P. Kalonarov, Athens 1940, 2 edn. 1985, pp. 82-105

Achaea. Some years earlier, around 1204-1205, the Franks had begun to establish a Latin Church in the Morea. William of Champlitte and the clergy of Achaea had selected a certain Anselm as the archbishop of Patras and asked Pope Innocent III for confirmation. As it says in a letter sent to the chapter of Patras in 1207, the selection of Anselm was invalid as he was the choice of the prince of Achaea, not the pope, and thus contravened ecclesiastical laws. The pope expressed doubts as to whether he was going to confirm the election, but eventually he gave his permission. Innocent III himself consecrated Anselm.³¹ The Franks established and organized the Church of Achaea, according to the Greek model. In accordance with Greek ecclesiastical status, Achaea was divided into seven ecclesiastical baronies. They also made changes to the Greek diocesan structure by adding more sees to the jurisdiction of the Latin archbishopric of Patras, in addition to the sees of Coron, Modon,³² Amyclae, Volena and another whose name is unknown. They added the sees of Zakynthos, Cephalonia, Corfu, the new see of Andravida and Durrazzo.³³ Apart from the archbishopric of Patras, there was also another archbishopric, the archbishopric of Corinth. According to a letter of Innocent III, Corinth had been conquered by the Franks in 1210, despite the efforts of the defender of the city, Leon Sguros. As a result of the conquest, Corinth became part of the Latin Church of Achaea and the second archbishopric of Achaea.³⁴ According to the *Notitia Episcopatum*, which dates from Byzantine times, Corinth had the sees of Damala, Argos, Malavesia, Monemvasia, Zemaina and Marina under its jurisdiction.³⁵ According to a letter sent by Innocent in 1212, the sees were Damala, Argos, Malavesia, Cephalonia, Zakynhos,

³¹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 101, pp. 329-31

³² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 98, p. 326

³³ Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople", pp. 48, 56

³⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 139, p. 376

³⁵ Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople", p. 58

Gillas and Ginema.³⁶ The *Notitia Episcopatum* or *Τακτικά* are Greek lists of bishoprics. The Greek Church used to make such lists, which included the *αρχιεπισκοπές*, the autocephalous archbishoprics and the *μητροπόλεις*. There are many problems regarding the published editions of *Notitiae* and their dates. In his article ‘The organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople’, Wolff gives further information and details.³⁷

Was there or was there not a papal plan?

With regard to the establishment of the Latin Church in Greek territories, there is one particular question, which has puzzled many historians: whether or not the pope had had a plan from outset. According to some modern historians, in the case of Cyprus, with the establishment of the Latin Church and the Latin hierarchy in Constantinople and the Morea, Pope Celestine III and his successor Innocent III wanted to have control. Moreover, he expected to lead the Greeks to the true faith and unite them with the Roman Church. According to a letter from Innocent III sent on 7 November 1204 to Baldwin, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, the kingdom of the Greeks had deviated from the obedience to the Apostolic See. The Greeks had thus gone from bad to worse, and due to this situation, God had decided to transfer the kingdom from the schismatic Greeks to the Latins.³⁸ The phrase the *kingdom of the Greeks*, “*regnum Graecorum*”, is significant in itself as it was not a phrase that the Byzantine emperors would have used themselves. The phrase was used by a westerner, the pope, who was deliberately insulting the Byzantine emperor. Something similar happened in the report of Liudprand of Cremona back in the tenth century, when he

³⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 192, p. 426

³⁷ Wolff, “The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, pp. 49-51

³⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 64, p. 276

called Nicephoros II Phokas “imperator Graecorum”.³⁹ Moreover the phrase “necessarium ut ritus sacerdotii transferatur”⁴⁰ in the letter sent to Baldwin on 15 May 1205, has led some modern historians to think that he was referring to the establishment of a Latin hierarchy. Hussey was of this opinion, claiming that the creation of a Latin hierarchy would lead to the union of the two Churches. Moreover she wrote about the “ultimate Romanization of the Greek Church”.⁴¹ In addition, the patriarchate of Constantinople was very important to the pope, as he considered the Greek Church as second in importance to that of Rome and above the Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem.⁴² The pope told the archbishop of Reims and papal legate Peter Capuano in 1205, the union of the two Churches would lead to the recovery of the Holy Land.⁴³ What is more, in a letter sent to Emperor Alexius III⁴⁴ and the patriarch in 1198, Innocent claimed that the Roman Church was the mother church, and that the Greek Church (the daughter church) had left the mother church and the true faith.⁴⁵ According to the pope, the Greeks must return to the truth of the Roman Church and unite with it, as a daughter returns to her mother.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the conquest of Constantinople effected that return⁴⁷ and the Greek Church was required to offer obedience to the Latin Church.⁴⁸ As the pope stated in a letter of 13 November 1204, sent to the bishops, abbots and the clergy of the crusaders in Constantinople, the sack of Constantinople was an act of God.⁴⁹ Significant too, is another letter sent by Innocent III on 7 December 1204, again to the abbots and the army of the crusaders in Constantinople. In it, the pope asked for their

³⁹ A. Nicolaou-Konnari, “The Encounter of Greeks and Latins in Cyprus in the Late 12th and 13th Centuries” (PhD Dissertation, University of Wales, Cardiff 1999), p. 123

⁴⁰ *Die Register Innocenz' III*, eds. O. Hageneder and A. Sommerlechner, Vienna 2001, vol. 8, doc. no. 56 (55), p. 97

⁴¹ J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 1986, p. 187

⁴² *PL* 215, cols. 575, 711, 728, 960

⁴³ *PL* 215, col. 636

⁴⁴ *PL* 214, col. 326

⁴⁵ *PL* 214, col. 328

⁴⁶ *PL* 214, col. 327

⁴⁷ J. Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400*, New Jersey 1979, p. 28

⁴⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 3, p. 550

⁴⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 65, pp. 277-83

help in order to establish Latin priests in Constantinople, in order to serve in Latin rite churches for the benefit of pilgrims and merchants.⁵⁰ In another of Innocent's letters in 1204-1205, we learn that Baldwin had urged the pope to call a council in Constantinople, at which the Greeks would be present and where he could show them that he (the pope) was the heir to their tradition.⁵¹ In his reply, Innocent repeated the idea that the empire had been transferred from the schismatics to the Catholics⁵² but, contrary to the previous letter, he did not imply or say anything about the establishment of a Latin hierarchy in Constantinople. Robert Lee Wolff believes that Innocent III had not made any decision in 1204-1205 and that there was going to be a Latin patriarch in Constantinople. Wolff claims that Innocent III was not sure if he would elect a Latin patriarch in Constantinople⁵³ but Hussey takes the view that "the establishment of a Latin patriarchate, Latin bishops, clergy and monastic orders was inevitable".⁵⁴ In addition, Joseph Gill claims that, "in his [Innocent III's] eyes the military conquest of the Greek Empire involved automatically the union of the Eastern and the Western Churches".⁵⁵ However, in another letter from Pope Innocent III to the marquis of Montferrat, this time dating from 1205, the pope claimed that the conquest of Constantinople was not part of his plans. Innocent had not wanted to attack and damage Christian cities, and the sack of the city was God's will.⁵⁶ In addition, in a letter sent in 1205, Innocent III presented the capture of Constantinople as a consequence of events that aimed to liberate Jerusalem, and it was only "unexpectedly" that he had learned about the capture of Constantinople.⁵⁷ According to Gill, "The establishment of the Latin Empire of

⁵⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 66, pp. 283-84

⁵¹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 18, pp. 579-82

⁵² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 64, pp. 276-77

⁵³ R. L. Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204-1261", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8, 1954, p. 228

⁵⁴ Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 186

⁵⁵ J. Gill, "Innocent III and the Greeks: Aggressor or Apostle?", *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. Derek Baker, Edinburgh 1973, p. 100

⁵⁶ *Die Register Innocenz'III*, vol. 8, doc. no. 134 (133), pp. 244-48

⁵⁷ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 90, pp. 315-17

Constantinople took Innocent by surprise...⁵⁸ Schabel believes the same and in addition, states that at the beginning, the pope chose the model of Sicily, “with a Greek bishop for an overwhelmingly Greek population and a Latin bishop with a Greek protopapas for a mixed population.”⁵⁹

Innocent did not plan the conquest of Constantinople; he had no pre-conceived plan for an ecclesiastical establishment. The election of Morosini which took Innocent by surprise constituted *a fait accompli*. In addition, it seems that the establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople was a consequence of the Fourth Crusade, rather than a papal plan. There is no evidence in Innocent’s letters prior to 1203-1204. In addition, if there had been a papal plan, we would have expected there to have been some evidence in the sources, but there is no proof as to what Innocent had been thinking before 1203. Contrary to modern historians, the populace in the Middle Ages had their answer. During this period, people used to think that God was behind events such as the fall of Constantinople. The Greeks attributed its fall to their own sins, and Innocent to the Greeks’ schism. According to a letter of 17 March 1208, sent to the Greek emperor Theodoros Laskaris, the capture of Constantinople by the Latins was “iudicio Dei”, God’s decision because of their disobedience and disagreement.⁶⁰ In the Middle Ages, every event was explained or interpreted in retrospect, but these explanations or interpretations do not provide a guide as to what people were planning beforehand. All that is known for certain is that pope opposed the diversion of Constantinople, as is proved by many papal letters. These deal with the events of the Fourth Crusade, an issue well established in the modern literature. In addition, he tried to maintain the cohesion of the Latin Church and bring the Greeks back to

⁵⁸ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400*, p. 29

⁵⁹ C. Schabel, *The Synodicum Nicosiense and other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373*, Nicosia 2001, p. 51

⁶⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 114, p. 347

the Catholic faith; as he repeated in a letter to his legate, Peter Capuano, written on 12 July 1205, he had no intention of conquering the Byzantine Empire.⁶¹

The establishment of the Latin Church in the Morea is a moot point. On the one hand, it appears to be a consequence of the conquest of Constantinople. After the sack of the city, the crusaders spread out in Greece and conquered new areas where they set up new principalities. In order for these new states to function and succeed, papal recognition was needed for the establishment of a Latin Church and a Latin hierarchy. The pope was willing to give his permission, especially as it enabled him to achieve his purpose of bringing the Greeks back to the “true” faith. However, we must have in mind that popes had, for a long time, claimed that the pope and only the pope could sanction the creation of a new diocese or the amalgamation of existing dioceses. This policy of the popes was nothing new in the 1200s, and so the pope had to try to assert control over what was happening in Greece and Cyprus, even though it might frequently appear that all he was doing, was consenting to what the people had themselves decided.

In Cyprus, the Latin Church had been established after the Third Crusade, earlier than in the other two places. In 1197, Aimery of Lusignan asked the pope’s permission in order to establish the Latin Church. In Cyprus, like Achaea, we do not know whether there was or was not a papal plan, and we may ask whether the decision to locate the bishoprics in Nicosia, Famagusta, Limassol and Paphos had been suggested to the pope by the king’s envoys. However, in Cyprus and in Achaea, the matter was not as clear as the pope presented it. We cannot be sure that the pope was simply being

⁶¹ *Die Register Innocenz’s III*, vol. 8, doc. no. 127 (126), pp. 230-33

asked to approve what the local people had already decided and implemented. Furthermore, the Third Crusade, in the case of Cyprus, and the capture of Constantinople, in the case of Achaea, marked a new departure for the Latin Church. It was a great opportunity for the pope to establish a Latin hierarchy and a Latin Church in Greek areas, enabling the Greeks to be brought back to the “true” faith and the pope could not leave it unexploited. In addition, it is worth considering that Innocent III and his predecessor Celestine III, in the case of Cyprus, were very pleased with the establishment of the Latin Church. In his letters, Celestine expressed his joy and celebrated the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus.⁶²

One further important point concerning the establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople and the Morea, is the promptness of the Latins in establishing their Church. Immediately after the conquest by the crusaders, the Venetians of Constantinople elected a Latin patriarch. The explanation for the swiftness of the Latins electing a new patriarch, was probably because they were anxious to proceed to the coronation of the Latin emperor and did not think they needed papal sanction; after all the Latin patriarchates in Antioch and Jerusalem were created at the time of the First Crusade without reference to the pope. On the other hand, the Venetians’ failure to inform Innocent III of the patriarchal election strengthens the opinion that there was no pre-determined papal plan for Constantinople. The establishment of the Latin hierarchy in Constantinople was thus a consequence of their conquest, a necessity for the Latins in order to establish the new empire. Regarding the Morea, the establishment of the Latin Church, as in Constantinople, took place after the conquest by the Franks. In order for their conquest to be recognized as a principality,

⁶² *Cartulary*, doc. nos. 4, 2, pp. 81-82, 76-78

they needed the presence of a Latin hierarchy. In the Morea, just as in Constantinople, the establishment of a Latin Church was a very significant event for the Latins, and, after their arrival, the rulers of both asked for the establishment of Latin clergy very quickly.

Compared to Greece, the rulers of Cyprus were slow to seek papal permission - five years after Guy of Lusignan bought Cyprus from the Templars. The explanation for this delay is not straightforward. One possible but not very convincing explanation is, that Cyprus was the first of these former Greek areas to have been conquered by the Latins, and it took more time for the Franks to organize themselves there, than in Constantinople or the Morea. We cannot accept this explanation as, when Celestine III instituted the church in Cyprus, he had already had the experience of different Christian rites in Sicily and Southern Italy, in Jerusalem and in Antioch.⁶³ Another more persuasive theory is Guy's background. As it is well known, he and his nobles came to Cyprus from Jerusalem, a place where the Latins had already established a Latin Church and where they lived with the Greeks and were familiar with the Greek Church. Indeed, as it has been pointed out "The Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem was modeled very closely on the Orthodox pattern"⁶⁴ and for the crusaders living in the Latin East, the Orthodox were part of the Catholic Church.⁶⁵ Moreover, there is no evidence that the Greek Church created difficulties for them, or placed them in a position in which they needed a stronger and more powerful Latin Church immediately. As long as they brought some Latin priests to Cyprus who could perform their religious duties, they had no need of a Latin hierarchy. They asked for the establishment of a Latin Church partly so that their rule in an autonomous Cyprus

⁶³ *Synodicum*, pp. 49-50

⁶⁴ B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, London 1980, p. 84

⁶⁵ Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, p. 18

would be recognized, and partly because they needed a Latin hierarchy before Aimery and his heirs could be crowned. The alternative, coronation by the Greek bishops, would presumably have been unthinkable. It was more likely that the Latin clergy themselves would have pressed for the creation of a Latin hierarchy, for the simple reason that it would have seemed odd not to have one. In addition to these possible answers, there is also the rather unconvincing view of a Greek historian: according to Kirimitsis, Guy did not ask for the establishment of a Latin Church in Cyprus because he wanted to avoid ecclesiastical problems with the local population of the island.⁶⁶ There is no certain answer regarding the delay of the Franks of Cyprus in asking for the establishment of a Latin Church, as documents give no satisfactory indication.

Similarities and differences in the establishment of the Church of Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus

The establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople show a number of noteworthy similarities and differences. A comparison of the actions of Celestine III and Innocent III towards the establishment of the Latin Church shows that they followed a similar policy. Both had the same reasons for the establishment: the existence and organization of a Latin Church, and to place the Greek population under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church. A difference is that the Crusaders of Constantinople selected a Latin patriarch without asking for papal recognition as in the Morea where the Latins of Achaia elected the Latin archbishop of Patras, without prior papal agreement. Only in Cyprus is there evidence to suggest that the Latins followed the correct process in order to establish a Latin hierarchy. Significantly, there is another difference between Cyprus and the Morea. The Latins needed papal permission in order to be recognized as a principality. In Cyprus

⁶⁶ P. I. Kirimitsis, "Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας", *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 47, 1983, p. 13

there was a coronation ceremony in contrast to the Morea, where the princes were not anointed and crowned. Additionally, Constantinople was one of the five Christian patriarchates and the capital of the Byzantine Empire, the centre of the Greek world. The election of a Latin patriarch in Constantinople was of paramount importance. The conquest of Constantinople was a very significant event and affected all the Greeks and changed the flow of Greek history; the conquest of no other Greek region was as momentous.

Cyprus and the Morea were important places but not as important as Constantinople. For the Greeks, Constantinople was the heart of their empire, the centre of the Orthodox Church and thus the most significant part of their empire. The loss of Constantinople meant the loss of the Byzantine Empire for the Greeks.

As the evidence reveals, the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople, was not accompanied by any violent events. The Greeks did not react in an aggressive way when the Latins were trying to establish their church. According to the sources, the Greek higher clergy of Constantinople and Achaea preferred to be in exile rather than remain in place, as they were afraid for their safety. This is in contrast to Cyprus, where the clergy preferred to stay after the conquest. Only in 1223, did the Greek archbishop Neophytos refuse to accept the terms of the agreements of 1220 and 1222 and left the island.⁶⁷ He later returned however. The Greek archbishop of Cyprus left the island again with the Greek higher clergy in 1240, as is revealed in a letter from Pope Gregory IX to King Henry I.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Sathas, M. B., *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, Bibliotheca Graecae Medii Aevi*, Venice and Paris 1872-1894, vol. 2, p. 7

⁶⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 71, pp. 177-79

For Cyprus, there is no specific evidence to suggest any violent reaction on the part of the Greeks towards the Latins during the first years of the establishment of the Latin Church. In making this point, it must be emphasized that there is a problem here. During the Frankish era, the Latins occupied existing church buildings and used them for Latin-rite services, but there is no record of any violent reactions, at least, not until some riots occurred in the fourteenth century. Despite the lack of written evidence, we can assume that the Greeks were angered. This opinion regarding the anger of the local population against the conquerors, can be strengthened by a comparison with the situation in Antioch.

In Antioch, in the 1190s, there were attempts by the Armenian invaders to convert a Catholic church for Armenian use, thus sparking a violent reaction. Because of its significance, it is worth presenting the event in some detail:

“When these knights came to Antioch to turn the city over him...After they had gone into the city, they occupied the Bridge Gate and came to the palace. When they were within the court, a eunuch whom Hethoum had sent to take possession looked around and saw a chapel that Prince Raymond had built in honour of Saint Hilaire of Poitiers. On seeing it, this eunuch asked the people in the court what it was, and, on being told that it was the chapel of Saint Hilaire, said We do not know how to say Saint Hilaire. But we will have it baptized and known as Saint Sarquis. Immediately... the prince’s men who were there were extremely angered by this outrageous comment and because of the sorrow that they felt for their lord the prince. Then a serving man who had happened to be present cried out, Sirs, how can you suffer this shame and disgrace? To think that Antioch should be taken from the power of the prince and his heirs and handed over to such vile people as the Armenian! He thereupon picked up some stones and threw them at the eunuch and struck him such a blow to his back that he fell to the ground. The others shouted out, To arms! and all the people of the city with one accord and with one voice rushed together to the Bridge Gate and occupied it, seizing all the Armenians. ...They quickly assembled in the cathedral church of Antioch, and the patriarch Aimery was there with them. They came to some decisions and formed a commune, something they had never had before...the people of Antioch had rebelled against the prince’s orders and had arrested Leo’s men...”⁶⁹

⁶⁹ P. W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, Aldershot 1996, pp. 130-31 from the text of the Lyon of the Old French Continuation of Tyre

If there were protests at the Latins requisitioning Greek churches on Cyprus, they have not been recorded.

One similarity is the fact that, in order to establish the diocesan structure of their church, the Latins in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople, followed a process whereby the pope's permission was necessary. Their churches had a similar structure and furthermore, the pope's involvement during the establishment, as well in the organization and in the domestic affairs of the three new churches, was very intense. So the pope asserted his jurisdiction over the Latin churches of Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea, although Achaea lay within the patriarchate of Constantinople, and concerned himself with the domestic affairs of local churches. For instance, there are three letters from the early years of the early thirteenth century showing the pope's interference in the domestic affairs of the Church of Patras. The first letter was sent to the bishops, abbots and all the clergy of Achaea, and concerned the pope's problems with the archbishop of Patras. Archbishop Anselm had refused to go to the Apostolic See and Innocent asked for the help of the clergy in dealing with him.⁷⁰ In the second letter sent to the archbishop of Patras, the pope asked for the help of the clergy regarding a domestic affair of the Church of Patras. The third letter was sent to all clergy of Achaea and Innocent asked them to help Archbishop Anselm.⁷¹ The most important point concerning the church of Patras reveals a difference from the church of Cyprus, which made the pope's actions even more interesting. Unlike Cyprus, which was under the direct jurisdiction of the pope, the church of Patras lay within the patriarchate of Constantinople, as proved by a papal

⁷⁰ *PL* 215, cols. 1141-1142

⁷¹ *PL* 215, cols. 1142-1143

letter sent on 24 April 1207, to the chapter of Patras⁷² and another one sent on 19 November 1205, to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas Morosini.⁷³ Arguably, the pope should have left the internal affairs of the archbishopric to the patriarch of Constantinople, but he did not do so. It appears that he wanted to have control over the ecclesiastical affairs of Achaea and he used to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Church of Patras. The pope also had the same attitude to the Church of Cyprus and Constantinople. He had no hesitation in writing letters to the king of Cyprus, to the Latin emperor of Constantinople, the nobles, the archbishop of Cyprus and the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, in order to resolve the problems of the Latin Church. Of course it must be stressed that his attitude was not unusual; involving himself in the *minutiae* of church affairs at all levels and asking the lay rulers to help was very common in the West as well.

The structure of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus after the establishment of the Latin Church

Not much information pertaining to the structure of the new churches can be ascertained regarding the situation in Achaea. The primary sources for the ecclesiastical situation of Achaea are limited, mostly papal letters referring to the domestic affairs of the Latin Church and the agreement of Ravennika, which dates from 1210. Concerning Cyprus, information about the structure of the Church can be gathered from the texts of the ecclesiastical agreements made by Queen Alice of Cyprus, the nobles and the Latin hierarchy of the island, concluded in 1220 and 1222. These two agreements referred to the rules that the Latins imposed in order to instigate the functioning of the new Church and to live

⁷² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 101, pp. 329-30

⁷³ *Die Register Innocenz'III*, vol. 8, doc. no. 154 (153), pp. 269-71

peacefully with the Greeks. Other primary sources also have useful evidence, notably during the period from 1222 to 1260.

Initially in Cyprus, there were fourteen dioceses when the Franks arrived. After the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, according to the agreement of 1222,

“...only four Greek bishops will remain permanently in Cyprus and they will be obedient to the Roman Church and to us, the archbishop and our suffragans in the accordance with the custom of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and they will live in the corresponding places named below. These places are in the Nicosia diocese, in Solea; in the Paphos diocese, in Arsinoe; in the Limassol diocese, in Lefkara; in the Famagusta diocese, in Karpasia,”⁷⁴

This provision was subsequently enshrined in Pope Alexander IV's *Bulla Cypria* of 1260.⁷⁵ It is worth noting that the 1222 agreement did not envisage the continuation of a Greek archbishopric in Cyprus but that in the event Germanos, archbishop at the time of the *Bulla Cypria*, was the last Greek archbishop of the island.

This reduction of the dioceses from fourteen to four is a much-discussed issue and many modern historians talk about the effort of the Latins to subordinate the Greek Church of Cyprus and to strengthen the Latin Church.⁷⁶ However, there are other ways of approaching this issue. It has been pointed out that the Latin diocesan boundaries largely followed the boundaries of groups of Greek dioceses,⁷⁷ and it could be argued that the Greeks would have been better served by four bishops, with larger dioceses made up of an amalgamation of two or more former dioceses, than by fourteen bishops with very small dioceses. The fourteen dioceses date from the late Roman era, and as it is well known, the population of the Mediterranean region fell

⁷⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, p. 251; *Synodicum*, p. 295

⁷⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 194-230; *Synodicum*, pp. 311-20

⁷⁶ See T. Papadopoulos “Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου κατά την περίοδο της Φραγκοκρατίας” in *Ιστορία της Κύπρου Μεσαιωνικών Βασιλείων-Ενετοκρατία*, Nicosia 1995, pp. 554-665

⁷⁷ P. W. Edbury, “Latin dioceses and Peristerona: a Contribution to the Topography of Lusignan Cyprus”, *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 8, 1978, pp. 45-51

sharply from the fourth to the sixth century. Many of the towns in which the bishops lived were virtually deserted, long before the Latins arrived, and although the fourteen bishops should have been able to exercise copious pastoral care within their dioceses, none of them would have been prominent enough to exert much weight politically.

Schabel offers another possible explanation for the reduction in the number of the Greek sees. He claims that the Latins saw the reductions as economical, as with the small, poor sees in Sicily, Latin Greece, and Jerusalem. The Latins in Cyprus were following the model of the Latin Church of Jerusalem, which was characterized by the reduction of the number of bishoprics, and the abolition of some small bishoprics outside the cities.⁷⁸ If we compare the situation in Cyprus with the situation of the Latin Church in the Crusader States, it is possible to conclude that the Latins followed a similar process in Antioch and Jerusalem, in order to establish a Latin Church. The conquest of Palestine took place over a long period. In Antioch, in 1098, the Latins took the Orthodox ecclesiastical records containing the list of the dioceses, which date from the sixth century. Despite these records having no direct connection with the ecclesiastical situation of the eleventh century, the patriarch located the dioceses and ruled, making changes in the structure of the Church. The Latin Church structure evolved into something quite different from the Greek structure as the Latins amalgamated several Greek sees in one Latin diocese, following the Western model, where the dioceses tended to be bigger than the Greek dioceses.⁷⁹ In that way, they reduced the number of Greek sees, just as they several decades later in Cyprus. In Cyprus, from the 1220s, there was a tidy arrangement with one Greek bishop in each of the Latin bishoprics. In Jerusalem and Antioch, we do not know if that was

⁷⁸ *Synodicum*, p. 57

⁷⁹ Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, pp. 19-20

implemented. We know for certain that Greek bishops were replaced by Latins and there were probably not many of them, in the lands conquered by the crusaders in the patriarchate of Antioch and Jerusalem, during the period of the crusader rule. Bohemond also forced the Greek patriarch of Antioch to leave his see and the Greek patriarch did not come back after 1099. When the Greeks did impose a patriarch on Antioch in 1165, the Latin patriarch left the city.⁸⁰ The important point here is that from the beginning of the twelfth century, the Greeks maintained a line of patriarchs of Antioch in exile in Constantinople. This, in itself, was a sign of the developing sense of schism between East and West. As Pope Gregory X noted in a letter of 1274, regarding the union of the two churches, there was a double hierarchy in the East.⁸¹ Despite such difficulties, in the Holy Land, the Latin and Greek churches seem to have managed to coexist.

When considering the situation in Cyprus, it is necessary to mention that there is the opinion that the Latins in Cyprus did not only reduce the sees from fourteen to four, but they followed exactly the same process as in Jerusalem. They amalgamated several Greek sees in one Latin diocese. This opinion is based on the foundation charters of Celestine III of 1196 and 1197, where there is reference to the ecclesiastical properties and the tithes that some former bishoprics paid to the archbishopric of Nicosia. According to Celestine's foundation charters:

“In addition we confirm as yours and your successors by Apostolic authority, the tithes of these areas of Cyprus, which by ruling of the Apostolic see pertain to the same Nicosia Church, namely: Nicosia with its appurtenances, Solea, Tamassos, Tremithousa, Kiti, Kythrea, Kyrenia, Lapithos, Milias, Maratha, Sigouri, Kambi, Synta, and the fief Briem, and Asshia, and Pighi, and Peristerona. We also establish that the following bishoprics, namely

⁸⁰ J. Richard, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople, 1207-1277”, *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, p. 45

⁸¹ *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X*, ed. A. L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, V. i, Rome 1953, doc. no. 50, p. 136

Paphos, Limassol and Famagusta, are from now on subject to your and your successors' metropolitan jurisdiction."⁸²

In his article, Edbury argues that the Latin archbishop would draw tithes from the former Orthodox bishoprics of Nicosia, Solea Tamassos, Tremithousa, Kiti, Kythrea, Kyrenia and Lapithos, as well as a group of villages, which would appear to have been detached from the former orthodox diocese of Constantia/Salamis.⁸³

The opinion of Pope Honorius III is very significant concerning the new ecclesiastical situation in Cyprus and the policy of reducing the number of Greek sees. In a letter sent to the patriarch of Jerusalem, Ralph of Merencourt, and the archbishops of Tyre and Caesarea, he stated that it was impossible for a Greek bishop and a Latin bishop to coexist in one diocese, likening the case to a body with many heads.⁸⁴ The pope was clearly attempting to implement a decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, perhaps drawn up with the situation in the eastern Mediterranean in mind, which forbade the existence of two bishops with the same diocesan title. It was thus no longer allowable to have two men, one Latin and one Greek both calling himself the 'Bishop of Paphos'. There is another important point here that is fundamental to this discussion. The Latins did not regard the Greeks as schismatics, instead they regarded them as members of the universal church, who had misconstrued certain things and thus needed correction. If they had been schismatics or heretics like the Nestorians, Copts or others, the Latins would not have minded if they had had their own bishops. However, as they were part of the universal church, the Latins could not allow a situation in which two bishops claimed the same authority to continue. On this point,

⁸² *Synodicum*, p. 279

⁸³ Edbury, "Latin dioceses and Peristerona", pp. 45-51

⁸⁴ *Synodicum*, pp. 289-90

the question arises as to why it took thirty years before the Latins decided to bring the Greek Church into subordination. The answer is not straightforward.

One possible explanation, albeit lacking evidence to support it, is the fact that the Latins wanted to give the Greeks time to accept them. The Latins thought of the Greeks as if they were members of the same Church and they thought that the Greeks would eventually accept papal primacy, and the other dogmatic differences. In addition, the Latins had experience with other Christian rites in Sicily, Antioch and other places, and they were convinced that the Greeks would return to the true faith. The pope believed that he was saving the Greeks. They however believed that they had been robbed “of their legitimate and traditional rights by order of the pope, who was moreover showing hostility to their natural protector, the emperor at Constantinople”.⁸⁵ The Latins decided to subordinate the Greek Church when they realized that the Greeks were not willing to cooperate.

Another more convincing explanation is that the Latins were trying to negotiate with the Greeks, but the negotiations moved very slowly and unsatisfactorily.⁸⁶ Regardless of the reason for which the Latins delayed subordinating the Greek Church for thirty years, we must emphasize that the Latins did not allow Greek bishops to operate anywhere else in lands subject to their rule, unless they were subsumed within the Latin structure and had full charge of their dioceses, as in parts of the kingdom of Sicily; or where assistant bishops subordinate to their Latin counterparts. The Cypriot situation is unique, possibly because the Latin hierarchy there and the secular authorities were very slack and did not wish to create trouble. In addition, we must underline the importance of the presence of Pelagius in

⁸⁵ S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, Oxford 1955, p. 117

⁸⁶ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, p. 292

Cyprus. Pelagius was the papal legate in the East as a papal representative on the Fifth Crusade. We cannot underestimate the efforts and the significance of his actions. In all likelihood, without Pelagius's initiative, the issues addressed in 1222 settlement would have remained unresolved.

With regard to the ecclesiastical situation of Cyprus, we know that there was a Latin archbishop who lived in Nicosia, and there were also three Latin bishops; one in Paphos, one in Limassol, and one in Famagusta. The first Latin archbishop of Nicosia was Alan,⁸⁷ who, together with the bishop of Paphos, the former archdeacon of Laodicea, had been endowed with legatine authority, and Alan received his pallium from the pope by his messengers; the bishop of Paphos and his canons brought it to Cyprus with their luggage.⁸⁸ In Greece there was no thought-out strategy implemented early on, as in Cyprus, but the Latin diocesan structure carried on in a piecemeal fashion over an extended period of time. In Achaea, the bishopric of Elos was united under the bishopric of Lacedemonia, as it was very poor and it did not have any bishops. In 1224, the bishopric of Zemainia was united under the archbishopric of Corinth, and the bishopric of Damala was split between Corinth and Argos. Cephalonia and Zakynthos were united in 1213, under the bishopric of Patras. In 1222, Pope Honorius III sent a letter to the archbishop and the chapter of Corinth, regarding the union of the provinces, reorganizing the bishoprics which were under the jurisdiction of Patras. The bishopric of Veligoste was split between Modon and Coron, and the bishopric of Amyclae was united under the bishopric of Lacedemonia.⁸⁹ Innocent IV confirmed this union on 25 July 1245, as proved by a

⁸⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 1, pp. 74-76

⁸⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 4, pp. 81-82

⁸⁹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 93, pp. 122-24

letter sent to the chapter of Lacedemonia.⁹⁰ In addition, the see of Lacedemonia was transferred under the jurisdiction of Corinth and one new bishopric, Maina, replaced the bishopric of Elos. During the years when the Latin Church of Achaea flourished, it was under the jurisdiction of the bishopric of Patras, the bishoprics of Volena, Cephalonia, Coron, Modon and the archbishopric of Corinth, which had under its jurisdiction the bishoprics of Argos, Monemvasia, Lacedemonia and Maina. In other words, the bishops of Volena, Cephalonia, Coron and Modon were under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Patras. The same also happened in Constantinople. The entire structure of the sees of Constantinople had been changed, abolishing the autocephalous of the see Derkos and putting it under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. They made bishoprics, the metropolitan sees of Selymbria, Pegae and Chalcedon, and they took the bishoprics of Athyra and Panion, which were under the jurisdiction of the archbishopric of Heracleia, and placed them under the patriarchate of Constantinople.⁹¹

One very important difference between Cyprus and the Morea and Constantinople, regarding the structure of the Church, is the fact that in Cyprus, unlike the other two places, the Greek bishops were not replaced by Latins. Of course it must be emphasized that we do not know for certain that all fourteen bishops were present in Cyprus and residing in the sees until 1220; there is no evidence to prove this, although there is no evidence to the contrary either. Most of the Greek hierarchy of Constantinople and Achaea left their sees. Further analysis of a letter from Innocent III to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, sent on 2 August 1206 reveals information about the situation in Constantinople. According to this letter, the Greek bishops refused to obey to the pope

⁹⁰ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 24, pp. 56-57

⁹¹ Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople", p. 56

and the patriarch of Constantinople and accept papal primacy and had abandoned their sees.⁹² Evidence from various sources suggests the acceptance of papal primacy was a very significant matter for the Latins and the Greeks, and influenced their relationship not only in Cyprus, Greece and Constantinople, but in all the places where Greeks were living. For instance, in South Italy after the conquest of the Greek areas by the Normans in the second half of the eleventh century, Pope Urban II decided that, "Greek bishops should remain in office if they would acknowledge the papal primacy and should have authority over all the clergy in their dioceses, both Greek and Latin. Greek clergy were to keep their own rites and customs in so far as they did not infringe Catholic principles..."⁹³ in the council of Bari in 1098. Indeed in South Italy, in some places Greek-rite bishops remained in office until several centuries later and where the majority of the population was Greek, the Greek bishops remained in their sees,⁹⁴ or a Latin bishop took over with a Greek protopapas for the Greeks. According to G A Loud, despite the process of latinisation, in 1200 there were seven Greek-rite sees in Calabria; Rossano, Gerace, Bova, Oppido, Crotona, Isola Capo Rizzuto, S. Severina and Gallipoli. Gerace and Crotona were among the richest sees in Calabria. The Greek sees resisted the efforts of latinisation and kept their rite for a long time, only in the mid-thirteenth century were Crotona, Isola and S. Severina latinised, unlike the other five which kept their Greek rite until 1400. The last see to be latinised was Bova in 1573.⁹⁵

Back to the situation in Constantinople, according to a letter regarding the status of the Church of Constantinople, the Latins asked the Greek bishops to return three times but they did not adhere. When Innocent III realized that all his attempts were without

⁹² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, pp. 317-20

⁹³ B. Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, London 1986, p. 158

⁹⁴ Richard, "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople", p. 45

⁹⁵ G. A. Loud, "Byzantine Italy and the Normans" in *Conquerors and Churchmen in Norman Italy*, 3, Aldershot 1996, pp. 228, 233

result, he threatened them with suspension, but they continued to resist and refused to obey. Eventually, the pope instructed the papal legate in Constantinople, Benedict of St Susanna, to transfer the Greek bishops from their sees and replace them with other suitable persons.⁹⁶ The ecclesiastical hierarchy changed after the conquest as, in addition to the Greek clergy, there was a Latin patriarch, Latin archbishops and Latin clergy. Furthermore, the Greek patriarch, John Camateros, left with his bishops as he refused to obey and recognize the papal primacy. He had sent a letter to Innocent III regarding papal primacy in 1199, some years before the conquest by the Latins and the establishment of the Latin Church. He expressed his doubts and his uncertainty relating to the pope's primacy, and the union of the two Churches, and he explained his disagreements regarding various ecclesiastical matters.⁹⁷

In Constantinople, after the flight of the Greek high hierarchy, the Latin bishops took the place of the Greeks who had left. In a reply to Thomas Morosini's letter in 1206, Innocent ordered the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, that in dioceses where both Greeks and Latins were living, he should appoint Latin prelates; in areas with a solely Greek population, the Latins should appoint Greek bishops. According to the directions of the pope, Thomas Morosini should find suitable candidates who were devoted and faithful to the Latin Church, and willing to accept the Latin rite, in order to be consecrated. Moreover, the pope gave orders to Morosini, regarding the Greek bishops and others, who had left their sees for more than six months and were still taking the revenues, to warn them three times before excommunicating them. Innocent also wrote to the Latin patriarch about the Greeks who had abandoned their dioceses, requesting he remove them from office but not degrade them, in order to

⁹⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, pp. 317-20.

⁹⁷ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 2, pp. 547-49

give them the opportunity to change their mind in the future. The Greeks were not forced to change their rite “if they cannot be dissuaded, until such time as the Apostolic See after more mature consideration may think fit to decide otherwise.”⁹⁸ The situation in the Morea was similar to Constantinople, as appears from a brief letter from Innocent III to the archbishop of Patras, sent in 1207. After the arrival of the Franks in the Morea, the Greek bishops left and Benedict of St Susanna looked for suitable replacements for the Greeks, resulting in a Latin bishop taking the place of the Greek bishops.⁹⁹ Together with his bishops, the Greek archbishop of Patras went to Theodore of Negropont in 1205. Theodore was one of the few bishops, who, even under the jurisdiction of Latins, was still active and sheltered many refugee Greek clerics.¹⁰⁰ The case of Patras is unique as it was planned to replace the “secular canons with a community of regular canons from the congregation of St Rufus of Valence, to which Archbishop Anselm intended to assign the possession of half the property of his church,” this attempt however was unsuccessful.¹⁰¹ A situation similar to the Morea and Constantinople prevailed in Antioch and Jerusalem too. There is evidence to suggest that the Greek bishops had been replaced by Latin bishops. Bernard Hamilton gives a fascinating explanation for this replacement. According to him, the new bishops, who were to replace the Greek bishops, could be Latins or Greeks as there was no distinction between them in religious terms. The Latins considered the Greeks part of the Roman Church, but the Latins preferred, for political reasons, to choose bishops from their own rite,¹⁰² and they did not appoint Greeks to bishoprics in Syria. Not much is known about the Greek bishops in the Crusader State in Syria. However, one aspect that is certain concerns the Latins. In

⁹⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, pp. 317-20

⁹⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 100, pp. 328-29

¹⁰⁰ Wolff, “The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, p. 37

¹⁰¹ Richard, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople”, p. 50

¹⁰² Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, pp. 18, 52

the Crusader States, they adopted the model of south Italy; with one modification, all the bishops of the dioceses were Latins but, in places with a large Greek population, they appointed Greek bishops. In south Italy, most of the Greek bishops were replaced by Latins after they died, and eventually the Greek monks disappeared from Western Europe.¹⁰³

In addition to the agreement of 1222, we can draw information about the establishment of the Latin hierarchy in Cyprus from narrative sources, like *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, Entitled 'Chronicle'* by Makhairas and the *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*. Even though it is a later source and not contemporary to the events, Makhairas has significant details about the new ecclesiastical reality in Cyprus after the arrival of the Franks, as perceived by a member of the Cypriot Orthodox community. According to Makhairas, the Latins worried about the absence of a Latin Church in Cyprus and they sent envoys to Pope Innocent III to ask him to establish a Latin Church, in order to chant in the holy church of God. Moreover, together with their king, Aimery Lusignan, they asked for bishops, metropolitans and priests. The pope replied,

“...I will send you as many as you need, that the name of God and the Holy Trinity may be glorified in your land, in accordance with my own rite, and the Latin bishops shall ordain deacons, priests, and all the other men of the church. And he appointed ten (learned) canons for each several bishopric (to drive out all heretical blasphemy from the holy church of God; and I shall send four bishops) ...”¹⁰⁴

In addition, Makhairas provides a list of notable archbishops and bishops who were in Cyprus before 1191. However, the value of this list is limited, as he did not say anything new, he just repeated what was known already, pertaining to where the

¹⁰³ Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p.158

¹⁰⁴ Makhairas, *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, Entitled Chronicle*, ed. R. M. Dawkins, Oxford 1932, vol. 1, p. 27

fourteen bishoprics were located.¹⁰⁵ A different tradition is preserved in two codices, a seventeenth century manuscript at the monastery of the Megistis Laura on Mount Athos, and an eighteenth century codex, owned by the bishopric of Paphos, which relates that before the Latins came to Cyprus, there were six metropolitan archbishoprics and twenty-five bishoprics on Cyprus. However, according to Greek historian Hadjipsaltis, who has considered this material, the number of Greek dioceses on Cyprus at the time of the establishment of the Latin Church was not more than fourteen or fifteen.¹⁰⁶ In addition, two sixteenth-century sources, the *Chronique d'Amadi*,¹⁰⁷ and the related narrative by Florio Bustron agree that there were fifteen (fourteen).¹⁰⁸ Amadi says specifically that there were fourteen dioceses and, although the list is a bit confusing, he states that there were eight that comprised the archdiocese of Nicosia, and a further two each for Paphos, Limassol and Famagusta.¹⁰⁹ Moreover there are two earlier Greek sources, *Συνέκδημο του Ιεροκλέους* and *Περί θεμάτων πόνημα του Κωνσταντίνου του Πορφυρογένητου*, which provide information regarding the number of Greek sees.¹¹⁰ As revealed by the existing material, there is a variety of evidence and its authenticity presumably dates from before the Arab conquest in the seventh century. Evidently the number of bishoprics was not stable because of decisions taken by the ecclesiastical and secular authorities, as well as administrative and demographic changes which took place during these centuries.

¹⁰⁵ Makhairas, *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, Entitled Chronicle*, vol. 1, p. 29

¹⁰⁶ K. Hadjipsaltis, "Μητροπόλεις και Επισκοπές της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου και το Σχετικό Κείμενο τριών Κωδίκων", *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 93, 1949, p. 32, 33,37

¹⁰⁷ *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie, Paris 1891-1893, vol. 1, pp. 85-86

¹⁰⁸ Florio Bustron, in collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France: Mélanges historique, v, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie, Paris 1886, pp. 32-33

¹⁰⁹ *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, vol. 1, p. 85

¹¹⁰ Papadopoulos, pp. 545-46; For more information regarding the number of the Greek bishoprics see Papadopoulos pp. 544-48

The *Chronique d'Amadi* also contains a brief reference to the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus.¹¹¹ Other later sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, like Lusignan, also have information about the Latin Church. In his two works, *Chrorograffia* and *Description de l'île de Chypre*, Lusignan¹¹² describes the establishment of the Latin Church in some detail. Lusignan, however, was not a contemporary observer and his information for the early centuries of Frankish rule in Cyprus, is unreliable.

The status of the Greek clergy under the Latin rule

At this point, it is useful to digress from the question of diocesan structure, and consider some aspects relating to the status of the Greek clergy under the Latin rule. From the agreements of 1220, it can be ascertained that the Greek priests and deacons were in future to remain in the *casale*, the “village” and the lands in which they lived.

The Greek priests and deacons had to show obedience to the archbishop and his church, especially those who lived in his dioceses. The Greeks needed the permission of their lords and bishops in order to be transferred or ordained because they were *paroikoi*,

“...if any of the Greeks is to be ordained, he must be ordained with the assent and will of his lord. And if the aforesaid archbishop and bishops that are and will be in Cyprus at the time should ordain one of them differently, they are bound to give an equally good peasant to his lord...”

Besides controlling ordination to the priesthood, the 1220 and 1222 agreements also sought to limit the number of *paroikoi* who could become monks:

“when the multitude that exists at the present is reduced to a small number by death or transfer, that should not admit anyone to be a monk beyond the

¹¹¹ *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Stambaldi*, vol. 1, pp. 85-86

¹¹² Etienne de Lusignan, *Chorograffia et breve historia universale dell' isola di Cipro*, Bologna 1573; *Description de toute l' isle de Cypre*, Paris 1580

prefixed number, but rather, when one dies, another man wishes it shall be admitted from the land the abbey lies, without the lord's permission".¹¹³

What was happening in 1220 and 1222 was that the Latin Church and the Latin secular authorities had combined in their attempts to prevent the loss of *paroikoi* on their estates. The *paroikoi* were seeking to escape their servile status by being ordained as priests or joining a monastery. In other words, the Latin authorities' primary concern was to safeguard the income from their estates rather than making things difficult for the Orthodox Church.

Regarding the number of the Greek priests "papades" in the Morea, we can draw useful information from the modification of the text of the agreement of Ravennika. The Ravennika agreement was reached in 1210 and mainly settled matters concerning church property and the taxation of the clergy. The prince of Achaëa, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, and the clergy produced a new version of the agreement in September 1223. The importance of this agreement is paramount as it illustrates how secular Latin landowners were trying to impose control on the Greek clergy, who were themselves *paroikoi*, and tied to the landowners' property. According to the text, in a *casale* where there were twenty-five to seventy households, there should be two *papades* with their families, unless their sons were living in their father's houses, which would be under the church's control, and entirely free and immune from lay jurisdiction. Where the number of the households in the *casale* exceeded seventy, they had the right to have four *papades*, who would be free and immune with their single domestic in the manner from lay jurisdiction. In addition, if the number of households grew beyond one hundred and twenty-five, then they could have six

¹¹³ *Cartulary* doc. no. 95, p. 251; *Synodicum*, p. 295

papades and the number of *papades* was then increased in this way. Conversely, when a *casale* had fewer than twenty-five households, “enough of the neighboring *casales* or locales will be joined with it that the aforesaid number of twenty-five is reached and thus there will be two *papades* in it...” Additionally, “each *papas* shall have one free domestic in his services...” For the remaining *papades* of the cities, “the same thing that was established for the rural *papades* would be observed ... the prelates will not appoint nor promote to holy orders anyone of the men of the lay [lords], either in the cathedral churches or in the other churches of cities or *casalia*, beyond the prefixed number of *papades*, without the will of the lay [lords].”¹¹⁴ It seems that, in both Cyprus and Greece, the Greek *paroikoi* were trying to escape their servile status by being ordained as priests.

In Cyprus, in addition to the agreements of 1220, there were also some new terms in the agreements of 1222, from which we can draw information regarding the organization and the structure of the Latin Church in Cyprus, and the changes in the structure of the Greek Church of the island. More specifically, according to the new agreements, all the Greek priests and deacons owed canonical obedience to the Latin Church, as was true of the Greek clergy in the kingdom of Jerusalem. A very important point is the reference to some Greek priests and deacons as serfs.¹¹⁵ In the case that “anyone should have himself ordained in the kingdom by a Greek bishop who so promoted him shall be suspended from the office of conferring holy orders by the Latin bishop, and he who was so ordained shall be forced to return to the customary servitude of his lord.”¹¹⁶ Furthermore, we learn from the first letter of the

¹¹⁴ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 115, pp. 154-57, C. Schabel translated the text of the agreement of Ravennika in the forthcoming *Bullarium Hellenicum*

¹¹⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, pp. 249-52 *Synodicum*, pp. 293-94

¹¹⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, pp. 249-52 *Synodicum*, p. 294

Greek patriarch Germanos (1223) to the Greeks of Cyprus that if a Greek *paroikos* wanted to be ordained, he had to secure the permission of his lord; he would also need to be seen by the Greek bishop who would decide if he were worthy of ordination. What is new in Germanos' letter is the idea that the ordained also had to be approved by the Latin bishop.¹¹⁷ The reaction of the Greek patriarch is illustrated by a letter he wrote to the Greeks in 1223, ordering the Greek priests to raise their hand to the sky and not feel guilty about their actions.¹¹⁸ It can be assumed that the Latins did not have the same custom as in Constantinople. From the modification of the text of Ravennika, we learn that in the Morea, the rest of the rural *papades* were forced to offer all the services or aids that had been customary to the laymen.¹¹⁹

Another significant point regarding the structure and the functioning of the Greek Church during the Frankish era is the policy of the Latin Church towards the monasteries. Some monasteries of the Greek Church in Achaea, Constantinople and Cyprus had special privileges from the pope.¹²⁰ The Greek monasteries were released from the payment of tithes on property before the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, and some of them in these three places were under the protection of the pope. In the West, monasteries were under the jurisdiction of the local bishop, unless they were taken under papal protection and exempted from episcopal control. In the eastern Mediterranean, in Cyprus for instance, the monastery of the Greek monks of St Margaret of Argos, in the diocese of Nicosia, had special treatment from the Apostolic See. Significantly, in a letter from Innocent IV sent in 1243 to the abbots and monks of

¹¹⁷ *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος} -15^{ος}*, ed. B Neranzi-Varmazi, Nicosia 1996, pp. 121-26

¹¹⁸ Papadopoulos, p. 567 “έξεσται αυτοίς οσίας χείρας επαίρειν πρός τόν θεόν και δίχα σκινδαλμού τινός και προκρίματος τά της ιεροτελεστίας αναπληρούν”

¹¹⁹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 115, pp. 154-157, trans. Schabel

¹²⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, pp. 273-74; *Acta Honorii III*, doc. no. 6, p.13

the monastery, he stated, “The Holy Roman Church has been accustomed to loving more readily its devout and humble children from the duty of its customary piety and to supporting them like a good mother in the shelter of its protection so that not disturbed by the harassment of depraved men.”¹²¹ The abbots, the monks and their possessions were under the protection of Innocent IV, and he relieved them from paying tithes on the properties they owned or would acquire in the future.¹²² Furthermore, St Mary of Cape Gata in the diocese of Limassol was also under the pope’s protection.¹²³ St Mary was a grange, which meant that it belonged to St Margaret, and it was not an independent abbey with its own abbot. There were a group of monks living there in obedience to the abbot of St Margaret, under the direction of a monk who in a Latin context would have been called a “prior”. The pope did not find this satisfactory on its own and, in 1245, he also wrote a letter to the papal legate, Robert of Nantes, patriarch of Jerusalem, ordering him to protect the monastery from anyone who might try to cause damage to it.¹²⁴ The essential point is that the abbey must have taken the initiative in requesting the pope to issue these letters. So, here we have a significant case, a Greek-rite Basilian abbey, which not only acknowledged papal authority (the monks would not have requested the papal privilege if they had not), but were even prepared to incur the anger of other Greek clergy who did not. They followed this course of action because they needed papal help against the infringement of their rights, presumably by Latins. The reference to the tithes suggests that there might have been disputes with the Latin bishops. The mentioning of the grange (or dependent house) at Cape Gata suggests that the problem could have arisen there. There was perhaps a dispute over property or a neighbouring lay lord tried to take their land. Here was a

¹²¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, pp. 273-74; *Synodicum*, p. 299

¹²² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, pp. 273-74

¹²³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, p. 273; *Synodicum*, p. 299

¹²⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 108, pp. 275-76

Greek abbey that had clearly complied with the demand to show obedience and acceptance of Latin authority.

In Constantinople there were many monasteries which were under the protection of the pope and the Latin Church. For instance, in a letter from Honorius III in 1217,¹²⁵ there is evidence that the Latin patriarch took the Stavropigiaka monasteries of Constantinople under his protection.

In 1223, Pope Honorius III wrote to the archbishop of Corinth, and to the bishops of Amyclae and Modon, referring to the agreement of Ravennika. The letter contains a reference to the Greek monks, who were living in the abbeys which were on the land of Geoffrey. By the terms of the agreement, the Greeks were obliged to serve and help the princes of the secular authority for twenty years and to pay tithes.¹²⁶ In general, Innocent III and his successor Honorius III favoured the Greek monasteries that obeyed the Latins, and took them under their protection and accepted some others as they paid tithes. In 1218, Honorius III took the monastery and the property of St Meletios under his protection and the monks were released from paying tithes for lands cultivated by them, and from the costs of cultivation.¹²⁷ The abbeys that refused to show obedience to the pope did not have any privileges. When some abbots and monks of those monasteries came and asked for exemption, the pope refused to help them and ordered the Latin clergy of Constantinople to do the same.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 7, pp. 25-26

¹²⁶ "decimis et spiritualibus secedisiis. Cathedralibus plenare responsuri", *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 119, pp. 162-63

¹²⁷ *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, compiled by A. Pressutti, Rome 1888-1895, doc. no. 1630, p. 271

¹²⁸ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 91, p. 120. See Jean Richard, "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople", in *Latins and Greeks in Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 51-54

The Greek Ecclesiastical Properties and the payment of tithes in Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea

Another critical question that puzzles many modern historians is what happened to the ecclesiastical properties in Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea, when the Latins founded their own Church. Information about the ecclesiastical properties in Cyprus can be taken from the agreements of 1220 and 1222. Before we move to a more detailed examination of this matter, there are two issues we need to distinguish. The first one concerns ecclesiastical property: what did the Greek clergy manage to keep and what happened to former Greek Church property? Regarding the first question, the 1220 agreement confirmed the donations of the Latin Church to the Greek Church and the rights of the Greeks to properties they had held since before the Latin conquest. Schabel's comments are very interesting regarding the information which we can draw from the agreements of 1220-1222 about the ecclesiastical property. He said, "one vague point in both the 1220 and 1222 agreements is the question of ecclesiastical property. In the first pact, the Latin clergy agreed not to say anything further about the property that the Greek Church had during Byzantine rule. It is clear that the property in question is what the Frankish crown had confiscated from the Greek Church but it is not clear to what extent the Latin Church would want this property transferred to it or returned to the Greeks."¹²⁹ The agreement of 1222 states that regarding the possessions of the Greek churches, the Latins would not raise any questions or controversy against the queen. However, the queen,

"will endure no molestation or controversy from now on, but will possess them quietly and peacefully except for the cathedrals and other churches of the Latins, all *casalia*, *prestarias*, and the collective possessions that they hold at present or which they will be able to acquire in the future with royal consent

¹²⁹ *Synodicum*, p. 58; See also C. Schabel, "Religion" in *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, ed. A. N. Konnari-C. Schabel, Leiden, 2005, pp. 157-219

from the donation of kings or of others, with which, along with the tithes and other things mentioned above, the churches must be content.”¹³⁰

The Latin Church stated that church property ought not to be placed in lay hands. Therefore any former Greek property in the hands of the queen, or the lords, ought to be given to the Latin Church. But by the terms of the 1222 agreement, the Latin Church undertook to stop making these demands on the secular rulers. There is no suggestion that the Greek Church should have gained back any property it had lost, or that this clause in any way guaranteed the Greeks in their ownership of existing possessions. It seems that in 1222 the Latin Church in Cyprus gave up its demand for the former Greek property in return for a promise to pay tithes.

Innocent III took steps to protect Church property in Constantinople. According to the treaty of 1204, between the Venetians and the crusaders, it was decided that the Church property be divided between them. According to the agreement, “...from the possessions of individual churches sufficient should be provided for the clergy and for the churches to enable them to live and to be supported honourably. The remainder of the property of the churches is to be divided.”¹³¹ A letter from Innocent III, sent to the doge of the Venetians in 1205, spoke about the agreement and described the Crusaders’ plans for dividing up Greek ecclesiastical property. It also described the plans of the Crusaders, regarding the division of the Greek ecclesiastical property, monasteries, churches, and abbeys. According to it, the Venetians were planning to take one quarter and they were going to divide the remaining three quarters with the Franks, under the supervision of twelve men; six Franks and six Venetians. The letter also described the violent ways used by the Latins in order to take the treasures from

¹³⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, pp. 249-52; *Synodicum*, p. 295

¹³¹ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204-1261”, p. 255

the Greek churches, and offend the dignity of the Roman Church. According to the same letter, Innocent III refused to confirm this treaty and supported that the property of the Church must stay in the possession of the Latin Church, and he could not defend such a treaty, as it could harm the newly elected Latin patriarch of Constantinople.¹³² In addition, another of the pope's letters in the same year, sent to the Latin emperor of Constantinople, refers to the same topic. Innocent III was against the division of ecclesiastical properties by the secular authority. He claimed that the secular authority could not divide the church's properties and ignore ecclesiastical laws. Moreover, he repeated that the agreement not only harmed the interests of the church, but the agreement was also a blow to the dignity of the Roman Church.¹³³ In other words, the pope refused to accept the idea that Crusades should take excess endowments from the Greek Churches and divide them among the lay lords, the same principle applied in Cyprus: former Greek Church property should go to the Latin Church and not be secularized. The pope was opposed to the secular authority deciding the fate of church property and, at the same time, he did not want the secular lords to keep church property.

In a papal letter, dated in 1206 and addressed to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, we learn about another agreement between the patriarch, Thomas Morosini, and Henry, the Latin emperor, his barons, and the population of Constantinople. The purpose of this new agreement was a readjustment of the previous provisions regarding Church property. The two parties had decided that all the monasteries that were situated inside and outside Constantinople, were to belong to the Latin Church. Furthermore, if there were a problem in a monastery, a group of three persons, one of

¹³² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 69, p. 290

¹³³ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 70, pp. 291-92

each party, and an independent adjudicator, who would be chosen by both sides, would assist in the resolving of it. If the secular authority wanted to use a former monastery to defend Constantinople from an enemy attack, they would need the permission of the patriarch or the bishop of its diocese. If the patriarch or the bishop refused to cooperate, then a commission of three persons would be responsible for the matter.¹³⁴ Wolff believes that,

“the text of the treaty directly implies that the properties which had been held by the Byzantine church under the Greeks, were now deemed by Morosini and the legate and the pope to be beyond recovery. The fifteenths of lay property were not restitution of what had been lost, but were to be given to the churches in compensation...The chance of the Latin churches recovering former Greek Church property was probably very small. Thus the Latin Church in the empire was to start afresh, with new lands to administer.”¹³⁵

Apart from the previous treaties, there is also the text of the agreement of Honorius III, regarding the ecclesiastical property in 1222. According to the treaty, all property and the possessions of the cathedral churches at the time of Alexius III Angelus (1195-1203), should be confirmed. In addition, the clergy could not give their permission to men who belonged to the empire to stay on their land, and the emperor or barons could not receive men who belonged on church lands. Furthermore, the Latin emperor of Constantinople and his nobility could not take full reward for the ecclesiastical property which was inside the walls of the city, or for the possessions of the churches situated outside the walls of Constantinople, which did not have all their property. In addition, the emperor could not compensate in full for the damage, which had been done to all churches inside and outside the city. The same was applied for the revenues and tithes, as some of the ecclesiastical possessions had been extensively destroyed.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 92, p. 320; *PL* 215, cols. 967-69

¹³⁵ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, p. 258

¹³⁶ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, pp. 270, 298-301

The situation in Achaea was similar, as is shown by a letter of Innocent III, regarding the properties of the Greek Church after the establishment of the Franks.¹³⁷ In two letters sent by Honorius to the church of Patras, and to the prince of Achaea, there are also references to the division of the Greek Church properties among the Latin lords of the Morea.¹³⁸ Another letter, sent to the Latin emperor of Constantinople in 1210, says that the Latins kept ecclesiastical properties prohibited by law; Pope Innocent III was in favour of the re-establishment of monasteries and churches with former Greek ecclesiastical property taken from the barons and nobles and from the Latin Church.¹³⁹ Moreover there are letters, which talk about the violent, illegal occupation of ecclesiastical properties, the monasteries, churches and abbeys.¹⁴⁰ Another important letter from Innocent III to the archbishop of Patras, the bishop of Modon and the bishop-elect of Coron, in 1210, describes the actions of Geoffrey of Villehardouin and the other lords, the knights of Achaea. They took the fiefs of Achaea while the lay lords themselves, kept the money paid in tithes that should have gone to the church. Those who stayed became friends with the Greeks and decided to fight against the other Latins. The pope warned them before punishing them.¹⁴¹ Another letter sent to the bishop of Lacedemonia, the dean and archdeacon of Corinth, confirmed the agreement between the bishops of Argos on the one hand, and Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens, on the other, regarding the ecclesiastical properties of the Church of Argos.¹⁴² Of great significance is another letter sent to senior clergy in Constantinople, Patras and the archbishopric of Corinth, by Pope Innocent III in 1215. In this letter there are many details regarding the division of the ecclesiastical goods,

¹³⁷ *PL* 216, col. 223

¹³⁸ Pressutti, doc. no. 3842, 3856, pp. 49, 52

¹³⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 156, pp. 388-89

¹⁴⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. nos. 156-59, pp. 388-91

¹⁴¹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 141, pp. 377-78

¹⁴² Pressutti, doc. no. 4477, p. 158

moveable wealth and landed wealth, among the new secular authorities that had been established and the problems that had arisen between the ecclesiastical and the secular lords. There are also the names of some Latins, people of major importance who took the churches, the monasteries and the goods of the Greek Church.¹⁴³

One of Innocent III's letters sent in 1213, to the bishop of Amyclae, the bishop elect of Coron and the prior of Patras, illustrates the secular authority's resistance to returning ecclesiastical property to the Latin Church. It also illustrates the difficulties which the Latin Church had to deal with, in order to succeed the transmission. As the papal letter says, the pope gave orders for the archbishop of Thessaloniki to hurry over the transmission of the Greek ecclesiastical property to the Roman Church. He also ordered the prince of Achaëa, Geoffrey II of Villehardouin, and the other nobles of Achaëa, who had illegal church property in their possession, to obey to the pope's will.¹⁴⁴ Geoffrey and his nobility refused to give the properties, the monasteries and the abbeys to the Latin Church, and the archbishop of Thessaloniki punished them with the order of excommunication. John, the papal legate, announced the decision of the Latin archbishop to Geoffrey, and the lords of Achaëa, and advised them to write to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁴⁵ In addition, the Latin archbishop of Thessaloniki asked the pope to confirm the excommunication. The Latin nobility lodged an appeal and claimed that they were not aware, as they did not have copies of papal instructions before they had refused to obey his orders. Innocent accepted their excuse and he commuted the sentence of excommunication to a caution.¹⁴⁶ In addition to the previous letter, there is also reference to Geoffrey's excommunication

¹⁴³ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 217, pp. 462-65

¹⁴⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 209, pp. 448-49

¹⁴⁵ Pressuti, doc. no. 3162, p. 516

¹⁴⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 209, pp. 448-49

in Honorius III's letter,¹⁴⁷ and in the Greek version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*. According to the *Chronicle*, Geoffrey's refusal to leave the Churches of Achaea was due to the fact that he wanted to construct the castle of Chloumoutzi, in order to defend the Franks' possessions in the Peloponnese. As a result of his refusal, the Latin Church excommunicated him.¹⁴⁸ It is worth mentioning that, according to some modern historians like Coureas, the papal instructions which Geoffrey II of Villehardouin refused to accept were based on the Ravennika agreement which had taken place some years before, in 1210. This agreement was between Thomas Morosini, the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, the archbishops of Athens, Larissa and Neopatras, and it covered all the churches located in the region between Thessaloniki and Corinth. Moreover the lords of Achaea "obtained a copy of the provisions of the Ravennika agreement and implemented them," and Coureas believes that Innocent succeeded in his purpose of getting the Latin lords in Achaea to accept the terms of this agreement.¹⁴⁹ Geoffrey was not excommunicated for long. In a letter from Pope Honorius III to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Gervasius, on 11 February 1217, the pope gave orders to release Geoffrey from the sentence of excommunication.¹⁵⁰

To return to the Ravennika agreement, the terms of the text which concern the ecclesiastical properties in Frankish Greece, including Achaea, are as follows:

1. "[These barons] for themselves and their faithful and vassals, gave up all churches, monasteries, possessions, incomes, moveable and immoveable goods, and all rights of God's Holy Church, into the hands of the aforementioned lord patriarch who received them for the Church in the name of the pope and his own

¹⁴⁷ Pressutti, doc. no. 4483, p. 160

¹⁴⁸ *Το Χρονικόν του Μορέως*, p. 112

¹⁴⁹ N. Coureas, "The establishment of the Latin secular Church at Patras under Pope Innocent III: comparisons and contrasts with Cyprus", *Mesogeios*, 13-14, 2001, pp. 155-56

¹⁵⁰ Pressutti, doc. no. 332, p. 59

name and that of the archbishops and bishops and of all churches located within the aforesaid boundaries.

2. From themselves and their successors, men, knights, vassals, faithful, servants and serfs, [the barons] wish and most firmly promise that said churches, the monasteries with all their things that they have and will have and the persons located in them and who will be located in them, and the enclosures of the churches, and the servants and serfs and maids and men, and all furnishings and goods, will remain forever free and exempt from all *angarias* (corvées), *perangarias* (another form of tax), duties, services and any obligations.
3. And the aforesaid barons must not claim anything else in the aforesaid churches or monasteries either for themselves or for their successors, vassals, men, faithful, servants and serfs, nor usurp anything in the future. But if anyone of the aforesaid clerics, both prelates and others, should wish to destroy churches or monasteries, [the barons] must rightly fight against and impede this as much as they are allowed so that [the clerics] do not do what they wickedly conceived to do.
4. Also, [the barons] shall not capture or detain or have detained or captured, the heirs or sons of the clerics or priests and their wives, as long as [the barons] are able to put their hands on [the clerics'] moveable goods, or [the barons] can be compensated from [the clerics'] moveable goods according to the amount of the debt.
5. If any of the Greek priests or monks occupy or work lands of the barons that do not pertain to the rights of churches or monasteries, [these Greek priests] shall answer to the aforesaid lords in the same way as lay people who occupy and work their lands.
6. Otherwise, if the aforesaid barons go against these [clauses] mentioned, or any of those set out before, after a warning they shall be excommunicated by their prelates and shall remain in excommunication until they make satisfaction canonically for the damages and injuries sustained.”¹⁵¹

It appears that the agreement of Ravennika was difficult to put into effect as is shown by some papal letters. According to a letter from Pope Innocent III to the Latin bishops of Larissa and Cithotiensis sent in 1210, the Latins of Achaea took the property of the Greek Church and divided it among themselves; they had done this, following the decisions of their courts, going against the ecclesiastical laws of the Latin Church. Moreover, Pope Innocent III accused the Latins of Achaea of taking and distributing ecclesiastical revenues, monasteries and ecclesiastical possessions,

¹⁵¹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 48, pp. 73-75, I am indebted to Dr Schabel for kindly letting me use this unpublished translation.

without asking the permission of the Latin bishops. They also ignored the Latin bishops and appointed priests.¹⁵² Additionally we learn from a letter, sent to the archbishop of Patras, from Innocent III in 1210, that Geoffrey of Villehardouin took a field from the Church of Patras. In another letter it is revealed that Anselm, the Latin archbishop of Patras, was trying to retrieve the lands of the Greek Church from the nobility of Achaea, by offering to pay them an amount of money annually.¹⁵³ The pope was not pleased by the attitude of the Latin nobility of Achaea, and his annoyance is obvious in his letters.¹⁵⁴ It must be mentioned that Geoffrey of Villehardouin and the lord of Athens, Othon de la Roche, did not sign the first text of the agreement of Ravennika and they had various other problems with the pope, which will be discussed in detail in another chapter of this dissertation.

As previously mentioned, not only did Innocent III make various efforts to solve the problems of the division of the Church properties, but so did his successor Honorius III. Honorius was responsible for the 1222 settlement. According to this new settlement, the churches and abbeys which were situated on the hither side of the royal river (*citra fluvium regium*) in Romania, “were to have all their possessions as had been decreed by the emperors...”¹⁵⁵ In another letter, sent one year after the treaty in 1223, Honorius III again mentioned the agreements and the division of property of the Greeks.¹⁵⁶

The division of the ecclesiastical properties was not the only matter which needed to be resolved after the establishment of the Latin Church in Greek areas. The payment

¹⁵² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 171, pp. 400-01

¹⁵³ *PL* 216, cols. 339-40

¹⁵⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, pp. 524-25

¹⁵⁵ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, p. 269

¹⁵⁶ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 114, pp. 152-53

of tithes is another significant question; were the Greeks made to pay tithes? What exactly did the Latin Church demand from the Greeks? The surviving evidence from Cyprus is largely limited to the agreements of 1220 and 1222. According to the first term of the agreement of 1220, Queen Alice gave her consent that the Latin Church should have the full tithes of the revenues of her kingdom, those of her son, and her nobles. This also included the taxes *chevagia* and dues *dimos*, which the Greek Church had given her. Significantly, there is no reference to the Greeks paying tithes and the emphasis is on the Latins paying tithes. In addition, the Greek priests and deacons did not have to pay poll taxes or *angarias*, but show obedience to the archbishop and his church, especially those who lived in his diocese. In other words, the Greek clergy were exempted from taxes but in return they had to give spiritual obedience to the Latins. We can conclude that Greek priests were recruited from among the servile population, the ordination did not release men from servile status and so, the lord retained his rights over him and his family. If priests were going to be exempted from taxes, then lots of people would want to be priests and this was unacceptable since the lord would not want to lose their income or labour.¹⁵⁷ The agreements of 1222 confirmed the agreement of 1220, all Greek priests and deacons were free not to pay *chevagia* and *angarias* but they owed canonical obedience to the Latin Church, just as the Orthodox clergy did in the kingdom of Jerusalem. The tithes were to be paid by Latin lords on their revenues. The later evidence of the tithe account for the Limassol diocese for 1367-1368 shows clearly that tithes were only payable by the Latin lordes on their revenues.¹⁵⁸ The corollary was that the no tithe was payable on that part of the produce of the land retained by the peasantry.

¹⁵⁷ *Synodicum*, p. 287

¹⁵⁸ J. Richard, *Chypre sous les Lusignans, Documents Chypriotes des Archives du Vatican (XIV et XV Siècles)*, Paris 1962, pp. 80, 62-63

In Constantinople, the Greeks were in a similar position as in Cyprus. According to the treaty of 1206, between the Latin Church and the Latin emperor, his barons and nobles, the Latin emperor and the knights, the barons and the rest of the nobility of Constantinople had to pay the annual tithes required by the Latin custom. The Greeks, however, were not obliged to pay tithes. The Greek clergy and all their possessions were free from lay jurisdiction.¹⁵⁹ In addition, the agreement of 1222, between Pope Honorius III and the secular authority, says that that the Latins were forced to pay full tithes for their properties but the Greeks, had to pay a thirteenth of their properties over ten years. At the end of the tenth year, the Greeks had to pay the tithes in full, however there was a possibility that the Latin Church would give them an extension.¹⁶⁰

In Achaea, the terms of the agreement of Ravennika were valid, as they had been extended in 1223, in order to cover the principality of the Morea. According to the terms of the treaty:

1. "This is except for the *akrostikon* (land tax) alone, which all people owe to [the barons] be they Latins or Greeks, both those who are in higher and in lower offices and orders, on account of the lands that they hold from [the barons] or will hold, in accordance with what was paid by the Greeks at the time of the capture of the Queen City of Constantinople. And they owe nothing else."
2. "But if there are any Latin or Greek clerics, whether they are monks, priests or *calogeris* (monks) in higher or minor orders or offices, who occupy and work the said barons' lands and wish to pay the *akrostikon* within the deadline establishment between them, unless they pay what they are obliged, the aforementioned barons shall have the power to take from [the clerics'] goods as much as is their debt, and nothing more shall be paid, but rather afterwards [the clerics] shall always remain absolutely free in all things with respect to their person and their churches' things that are in excess of the debt."¹⁶¹

Geoffrey of Villehardouin obtained the right,

¹⁵⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 92, p. 320; *PL* 215, col. 967

¹⁶⁰ Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople", p. 271

¹⁶¹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 48, pp. 73-75, trans. C. Schabel

“to continue this taxation for another twenty years, for the defence of the empire. However, in order to compensate the churches for what they should have received up to 1223, annual rents were to be paid to the archbishops of Corinth and Patras and to the bishops of Nikli (Amyclae), Argos, Lacedemonia, Modon, and Volenos”.¹⁶²

In addition, the later modified agreement of Ravennika states that:

1. “... The insolence of the princes of the Empire of Romania, which should be confuted, grew into the corruption of this confusion, so that at one time they confer goods on and at another they take goods away from the churches at their will, and they apply what has been contributed especially for the monasteries to their own use according to their pleasure... You, depending on this corruption, retained the abbeys and church possessions in your hands, applied their fruits to your own use, and granted them to whom you wished at your will, so that you have kept the *papades* just as peasants. Because while you were warned to abolish the aforesaid corruption, you did not want to cease, it finally happened that you were bound by the noose of excommunication...”
2. “The clergy shall possess free and lay tax and jurisdiction all cathedral churches situated within the limits of your aforementioned territory and all possessions that they obtain in the present or are known to have obtained at any time since the moment of the coronation of Alexios Bambacoratos (Alexius III Angelus), except for the right and proper *akrostika*, according to the guidelines ... not withstanding any agreement that are found to have been made for all time, nor those for which no document are apparent, unless some of them are fittingly accepted by the prelates and their subjects after the churches’ welfare has been inspected.”
3. “But even the *papades* who are free from the jurisdiction of the lay [lords] will pay the lay [lords] the proper and ancient *akrostikon* without trouble, if they owe it for lands, if they hold lands from those that they held at the aforesaid time.”
4. “But you and the Latins subject to you will pay the tithes in full and have the Greeks subject to you and not in rebellion pay them in a similar way.”
5. “Furthermore, the prelates and other clerics of your territory will wholly cease to discuss with you and your men the treasuries of the churches and their other moveable goods and also injuries inflicted, except personal ones,”¹⁶³

It seems that the agreement of Ravennika did not function smoothly, not only as regards the ecclesiastical properties, but also concerning the payment of the tithes. This is proved by a letter from Innocent III in 1210, to the archbishop of Larissa, and the bishop of Cithonensis. The Latin nobility of Achaea did not keep his oath which was taken during

¹⁶² Richard, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in Constantinople”, p. 56

¹⁶³ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 115, pp. 154-57, trans. C. Schabel

the war against the lord of Epiros, to pay *decati*, and they forced the Greek and Latin population of Achaea not to pay either.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, we learn from a significant number of letters, which replied to the complaints of the bishops, that “the lords of the land retained the tenths for themselves.”¹⁶⁵ More evidence regarding the payment of tithes is also in the aforesaid agreement of Honorius III in 1222:

“...and laymen were not to receive any more revenue from them than they had been required to pay by imperial decree; and they were to be under ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Moreover, if the prelates should try to extract more than was their due from abbeys in which laymen had the right to collect the *acrosticon*, the laymen were to oppose this, and place their complaints before the prelates’ ecclesiastical superiors.”¹⁶⁶

In addition, according to a letter from Innocent IV, sent in 1247, the Lateran Council of 1215 did not exempt the Greeks from *decati*, only some monasteries were exempted by Innocent III and at that point Innocent IV confirmed the decision.¹⁶⁷ Innocent IV’s letter suggests that there was a lack of clarity about who owed what, possibly inferring that the earlier agreements and papal instruction had not been implemented. The excommunications and the continued stream of papal letters suggest that the local lay lords largely ignored what the Latin Church told them.

The importance of the agreement of 1220-1222

The importance of the agreement of 1222 in Cyprus, is seen in the letter of the same year, which Pope Honorius III sent to the patriarch of Jerusalem, Ralph of Merencourt, and the archbishops of Tyre and Caesarea. It is obvious that the purpose of this letter was the prevention of a lack of discipline and disobedience in Cyprus and the defence of the rights of the Latin Church. Honorius told the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the archbishops of Tyre

¹⁶⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 172, pp. 401-02

¹⁶⁵ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, p. 39

¹⁶⁶ Wolff, “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, p. 269

¹⁶⁷ *Acta Innocentii IV*, ed. T. Haluscynskj and M. Wojnar, *PCRCICO*, i, Rome 1962, doc. no. 38, pp. 81-82

and Caesarea, to prevent the Greek prelates from remaining as bishops in their dioceses, and to compel the priests and deacons to show canonical obedience to the Latin archbishop and his bishops, in accordance with the agreements of 1220.¹⁶⁸ We can also see the desire of Honorius to unite the Greek and Latin Churches, despite the difference in their customs and ceremonies, as well as his efforts to excuse his attitude.¹⁶⁹ In his letter in 1222, sent to Eustorge and the bishops of Paphos and Limassol, Honorius wanted to confirm the agreement of 1220. It could be assumed that the Greeks' behaviour did not satisfy him, perhaps because the Greeks refused to obey the Latins. A similar problem of Latin disobedience concerned the Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians and Maronites, as recorded in a letter sent to the archbishop of Caesarea, in which the pope expressed a similar concern.¹⁷⁰ Honorius's fear of the disobedience of the Greek bishops forced him to send another letter, this time to Queen Alice, and the barons, the knights and other men of the kingdom of Cyprus, after the agreement of 1222, to ensure that the terms of the agreements were fully observed.¹⁷¹ As Schabel correctly says Honorius was afraid of a possible rebellion against the crown and the Latin Church, and his fear was taken seriously by the secular arm, as a decade later the Latins executed the thirteen monks of Kantara.¹⁷²

According to some Greek historians such as Papadopoulos, "the decisions tied down the Orthodox Church in an odious way, constituting it administratively disabled."¹⁷³ He also argues that the agreement satisfied the interests of the pope, but the Greeks were ignored. There were no representatives of the Greek Church at this meeting.¹⁷⁴ This was because the agreements were made by Queen Alice of Cyprus, the nobles

¹⁶⁸ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 87, pp. 116-17; *Synodicum*, pp. 289-90

¹⁶⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 86, pp. 223-24

¹⁷⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 35, pp. 12-24; *Synodicum*, pp. 291-92

¹⁷¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 80, pp. 208-09

¹⁷² *Synodicum*, pp. 56-57

¹⁷³ Papadopoulos, p. 560

¹⁷⁴ Papadopoulos, p. 563

(barons, knights) and the Latin hierarchy of the island. What the agreement reveals is that there had been disputes between the Latin Church and lay landowners over tithes. Schabel argues that, “there are similarities to the Concordat of Ravennika” and that “Cyprus had moved in the direction of the model of Frankish Greece”.¹⁷⁵ A more analytical interpretation offered by Schabel suggests,

“the first items are tithes and the feudal dues of the Latin hierarchy’s peasants, but afterwards the queen grants Greek priests and deacon - but not their children - their freedom from serfdom, although they are to show obedience to the Latin clergy. Certainly the Latin hierarchy sought the freedom of the Greek clergy, so that one could say that the Latins were the Greeks’ advocates. The Latins also won the obedience of the Greek clergy...But the Greeks’ freedom from serfdom and their control by the Latins came at a price, for as in Greece the crown and nobility, it appears, wanted limits placed on the ordination of Greek priests and deacons and the Latin archbishop and bishops had to pledge to replace any serf whom they had allowed to be ordained. Although it has been complained the Greeks played no roll in the negotiations, it is plausible that the Latin clergy had some of their interests at heart.”¹⁷⁶

Although the 1222 agreements restricted the Greeks, they did not do away with them. The Greek Church continued to exist even with restricted rights. There are differences between the agreements of 1220 and 1222, due to the effort of the Latin Church to strengthen its measures and to succeed in its purpose, which was to prevent Greek unity. The agreements were an effort by the pope to weaken the Greeks in order to make it easier for him to subordinate them. The differences show how intense the desire of the pope was to succeed in his purpose, since the agreement took place only two years after the agreement of 1220 and was the crowning of them. The Greeks were not pleased with these agreements, as proved by their action of asking that the agreements be revoked, and their suggestion of independence from the Latin Church of Cyprus and the desire to be subjected directly to the pope.¹⁷⁷ However, it must be borne in mind that these agreements are complex issues and there are other opinions as well. If we look at these

¹⁷⁵ *Synodicum*, p. 56

¹⁷⁶ *Synodicum*, p. 56

¹⁷⁷ *Synodicum*, p. 62

agreements from another point of view, we can understand that, in contrast to Honorius III's actions, which were aimed at the complete abolition of the Greek bishops, the agreements of 1222 did not do that. Instead they sought to reduce the Greek bishops in number and turn them, in effect, into assistant bishops to the Latins. The agreement of 1222 was an attempt to make good the deficiencies of the 1220 agreement, which was clearly not working. According to Kyrris, Honorius III was obviously worried that nobles, barons and knights, were not going to keep to the terms of the agreements and the pope was particularly interested in the provisions which dealt with the Greek properties, which at that point belonged to the Latin Church.¹⁷⁸ Surely Kyrris is wrong. The former Greek Church properties that belonged to the Latin Church were not an issue. What was an issue in 1220 and 1222, was the fate of former Greek Church properties that had passed into secular hands.

The Cyprus agreements of 1220 and 1222 did not have any effect on the Morea, or Constantinople. There is no evidence to suggest that the changes that were introduced by the papal legate, in 1220, influenced the situation in these two places. Although there is evidence of similar actions in Constantinople, and the Morea, like the Concordat of Ravennika, and the later modified agreement of Ravennika, the treaty of 1204 between the Venetians and the Crusaders and the settlement of Honorius III in 1222. There are many similarities among the treaties, especially the Cyprus agreements of 1220 and 1222, and the two agreements of Ravennika. Apart from the fact that their main topic concerns the settlement of the Greek properties, and the taxation of the populations, they also deal with matters like the ordination of priests, the lack of the Greek laymen, the Greek clergy and other practical issues. The main

¹⁷⁸ C. P. Kyrris, "Η Οργάνωση της Ορθόδοξου Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας", *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* 2, 1993, p. 152

purpose of all of the agreements was the smooth functioning of the new churches, the peaceful co-existence of the Greek and Latin populations, and the ironing out of the relations between the secular authority and the church.

In addition, we cannot be sure if the agreements, which took place in Achaea and Constantinople, were part of a deliberate papal policy in the Eastern Mediterranean, or if they were more separate arrangements between the pope and the locals. They contained information regarding the domestic affairs of the local churches and there is no evidence to support their origins. We can only assume that the agreements were part of the general policy of the popes, to arrange local problems, which functioned in some places and not in others.

Chapter 2

Relations between the Greek Church of Cyprus, Constantinople and the Morea, and the Latin Church

Introduction

The topic of the second chapter of this dissertation is the relationship between the Greek Church of Cyprus, the Greek Church of Constantinople, and the Morea, and the Latin Church in these places. This chapter answers questions concerning the development of the relations between the Latins and the Greeks. It considers the first years of the establishment and growth of the Latin Church in these three areas, focusing on the extent to which the pope, became involved in the domestic affairs of the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople, and the local churches of Cyprus, and the Morea. It examines the relationship between the archbishop, and the bishops of Cyprus, and the Morea, and the Latin archbishops. The first part of this chapter considers the Greeks' reaction to the Latin Church in Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus with regard to the role of the papal legates, and the relationship between the Greek and the Latin senior clergy. It also examines the papal policy towards the Greek Church, the ecclesiastical differences between the Greeks and the Latins and, finally, the use of the sentence of excommunication on Greeks.

Modern historians agree that after the crusader conquest of lands with an Orthodox population, the situation between the Greeks and Latins was difficult. M S Kordoses's words reflect this view, "The relations between the Greek and the Latin clergy were not to the level Pope Innocent III would have wished. Great problems

arose and a solution acceptable by both sides could not be found.”¹⁷⁹ According to

Geanakoplos, the Fourth Crusade was an event which,

“brought to a dramatic climax the centuries-old antagonism between Greek and Latin Christendom - a gradually developing estrangement based not only on political, ecclesiastical and commercial rivalries but on diverse cultural traditions and mental attitudes. Nevertheless despite unmistakable indications of widening cleavage, such as schism between the churches, the differences between East and West before 1204 had not yet become insuperable.”¹⁸⁰

The ecclesiastical differences between the Greeks and the Latins

The different rite between the Greeks and the Latins played a significant role in the development of the relations between the two churches, and caused problems regarding the functioning of the Church of Cyprus, Constantinople, and the Morea. Although the Greeks and the Latins had a common faith, they used different liturgical forms and observed a different code of canon law. Furthermore, they also had some differences in rite besides the obvious difference in language. Most of the decrees of the local church councils, and some of the agreements between the Greek and the Latin Church, refer to this matter. Starting from Cyprus in chronological order, useful information can be obtained regarding matters of rite from the ordinances and the correspondence of the papal legates, Eudes of Châteauroux. This is exemplified in the ordinance of 1251-1252, issued either by Eudes or by Hugh of Fagiano the archbishop of Nicosia, the writer of the text. From the text it can be inferred that the decrees seem to demand doctrinal conformity and a profession of obedience. Paragraph six talks of the sacraments, of confirmation and marriage, and obliges the Greeks to conform to Latin usage. The context of this paragraph is obscure as it is hard to believe that a Greek would decide hold a wedding ceremony in a Latin-rite

¹⁷⁹ M. S. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204-1262) a Study of the Greek population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish dominion*, Ioannina 1987, pp. 65-66

¹⁸⁰ D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West 1258-1282, A study in Byzantine-Latin relations*, Massachusetts 1959, p. 13

church. It probably refers to mixed marriages of a Latin and a Greek, in a Latin church, and therefore that they and their children should worship as Latins henceforth.¹⁸¹

A letter from Pope Innocent IV to Eudes, dated March 1254, is concerned with “the limiting of the Greeks’ rites and the manner from that is to be observed in [clerical] orders and in the sacraments of the Church.” The terms which deal with the Greeks and their rite are the following:

- 1) “...because some of the Greeks have for some time returned to their duty to the Apostolic See, and are heeding and obeying it reverently, it is both fitting and expedient to tolerate their rites and usages so far as we can before God, to retain them in their obedience to the Roman Church, although on those points that appear dangerous to their soul or where we cannot do so with integrity, we neither ought nor wish to defer to them in the least bit.”
- 2) “... The Greeks of that kingdom are to hold and observe the way of the Roman Church in the functions that occur during baptisms. But their rite or custom that they are said to have whereby they anoint the whole body of those to be baptized, if it cannot be abolished or removed without scandal, it should be tolerated, since whether it occurs or not it has little to do with the efficacy or effect of Baptism. Nor does it matter whether they baptize in cold or hot water, since they are said to insist that baptism has the same force and effect in both.”
- 3) “All individual bishops can make the chrism... But if the Greeks wish to observe their old rite for this instead, namely that the patriarch along with the archbishops and his suffragan bishops make the chrism together, they are to be tolerated in their custom.”
- 4) “...in the use of water in the sacrifice of the altar, whether cold or hot, the Greeks are to follow their custom if they wish, as long as they believe and assert that the observed form of the canon is equally conferred with each.”
- 5) “But they (Greeks) do not keep the Eucharist that is consecrated on the day of the Last Supper for one year on the pretext of the sick, namely so they give communion to them from it. Nevertheless they are to be allowed to prepare the Body of Christ and to preserve it for fifteen days for the sick, and for not any longer span of time...”
- 6) “Concerning fasting on Saturday during Lent, although the Greeks would act more honorably and salutarily if they were to abstain for the whole time such

¹⁸¹ *Synodicum*, p. 155

that they did not violate the establishment fast even for one day, they are to maintain and observe, their custom as they wish.”

- 7) “...the Greek bishops are to confer seven orders according to the manner of the Roman Church, since until now they are said to have neglected or passed over for those to be ordained three of the minor orders. But those who have already been ordained by them in that way are to be allowed to remain in such orders, because of their great multitude.”
- 8) “...the Greeks are not to reprehend or condemn to any extent second, third, and even more marriages but rather they should approve them between people who otherwise are able to be joined together in matrimony licitly. And since it has been the custom among them to contract marriages between people who were related to each other in, according to their calculation the eighth degree...we firmly forbid them from presuming to do this from now on, strictly ordering that whereas marriages may licitly be contracted in higher degrees, they are not to presume to marry within the aforesaid fourth degree of consanguinity or affinity anymore... However, we allow by dispensation those who have already contracted marriages within this degree to remain in the marriage thus contracted.”
- 9) “The Greeks themselves are said to believe and affirm truly and without doubt that the souls of those who die having undertaken penance, but not having finished it, or those who die without mortal sin, but rather with venial and small sins, are purged after death and that they can be helped by offering to the Church. But they say that their doctors did not indicate the place of this purgation to them with a certain and proper name whereas we call it ‘Purgatory’, in accordance with the traditions and the authorities of the Holy Fathers. Therefore, we wish that they also call it by this name from now on.”
- 10) “...we command that the Greek abbots and monks inviolably observe the Holy Father’s ordinances and regular laws concerning the life and situation of monks.”¹⁸²

From the above, it is apparent that the pope gave orders to the Greeks regarding their liturgical rites, but also showed tolerance towards some of the Greek customs, and respected the Greek monastic observance. This can be seen in his attitude towards the sacraments of baptism, chrism and fasting on Saturday during Lent, as he allowed the Greeks to observe their old custom. On the other hand, concerning matters of belief which were of great importance to the Latin Church like the issue of Purgatory, the pope was strict. It must be emphasized that this is the first time in history that

¹⁸² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 93, pp. 240-43; *Synodicum*, pp. 307-10



there is a reference to the word “Purgatory” by a pope. Innocent’s letter therefore, marks the beginning of the process by which the doctrine became official, but the doctrine of Purgatory was not formally defined as an article of faith until 1439, in the Council of Florence. In the mid-thirteenth century it had not yet become an issue with the Greeks.¹⁸³

Innocent ordered the Greeks to use the term “Purgatory” as he thought that they believed in Purgatory, but for the Greeks it was a new concept. The Greeks did not have a name for the stage where the souls were after death. They believed that after death, the soul was waiting for the second arrival of Jesus Christ on Earth, in order to judge them, and decide where they would go, to Heaven or to Hell. As Angold appropriately states, initially the western church adhered to the Orthodox Church’s views on the fate of the soul after death, as they were similar to their own. Innocent IV (1243-54) held the view that they were very similar. The “difference” was in the Greeks’ failure to provide the correct terminology. The Dominican, who compiled the *Contra Errores Graecorum* of 1252, was also of the belief that the Greeks’ ideology was close to western teaching on purgatory.¹⁸⁴

The question which arises here is, whether the Latins were trying to make the Greeks change their beliefs or not. In the case of Purgatory, Innocent asked them to accept Purgatory but, as the Greeks believed in Purgatory, it was not really an effort to change the Greek belief. The same happened with the event of the thirteen monks of Kantara. The martyrdom took place because of the refusal of the Greek monks to accept the use of

¹⁸³ W. Duba, “The afterlife in Medieval Frankish Cyprus”, *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 26, 2000, p. 172

¹⁸⁴ M. Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni 1081-1261*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 451-52

unleavened bread (azymes) at the sacrament of Eucharist. The Greek monks claimed that the Body of Christ should not be made of unleavened bread, but rather of leavened bread and they accused Latins as heretics. The Latins preferred unleavened bread and the Greeks refused to accept the use of the unleavened bread. In addition, the accusation of being called heretics because they used unleavened bread was very serious for the Latins. At this point it must be considered that the Greek and Latin way of thinking had fundamental differences. For the Greeks, 'schismatic' and 'heretic' are very similar in meaning and they considered the Latins heretical. Conversely, for the Latins, the term 'schismatic' and 'heretic' are very different. 'Heretic' is someone who has a different religious belief, opposed to the official or generally accepted one. 'Schismatic' is someone who is separated from the holy Church as a result of a disagreement. The Greeks often called the Latins heretics. For instance, Beccus, the Greek patriarch of Constantinople (1275-1282), called the Latins heretics because of the use of the *Filioque* in the creed and the attitude of most of the Greeks, like the Greek patriarch, Germanos, was similar.¹⁸⁵

The Latins, however, used to call the Greeks schismatic, as illustrated in a letter sent by Gregory IX to Patriarch Germanos on 26 July 1232. Only Innocent III, in his correspondence with the Greeks, after the Fourth Crusade and the conquest, avoided calling them schismatics. There is a further opinion regarding this matter as Spence claims that Gregory did not regard heresy as a problem in the Greek East. Rather the term 'heretic' and its canonical baggage was the device he employed to divest the supporters of heretics. Regarding this, Gregory's policy was parallel to that of Innocent and Honorius although he increased the canonical sanctions against heresy

¹⁸⁵ J. Gill "An Unpublished letter of Germanos", *Βυζάντιον* 44, 1974, p. 142

to include schismatic Greeks.¹⁸⁶ A Dondaine has drawn attention to a relevant statement about Greeks holding ‘heretical opinions’.¹⁸⁷ The statement does not maintain that the Greeks were heretics, but that they held heretical opinions, which implies a subtle difference. These heretical opinions presumably included the Greeks’ condemnation of the use of the *Filioque* in the Creed, but perhaps, their claim that the Latins were heretics because of their use of the azymes, was also involved.

A similar factor can be observed in the oath of obedience that the Greek bishops had to give to the Latins and the Roman Church. The Roman Church asked for obedience from the Greeks, something prevalent in the West as all the Latins gave the oath. In Greek areas however it was different. For the Greeks it was not the same to give the oath as it was for the Latins, and it could be argued that with this action, the Latins were intent on changing the Greek jurisdiction, as they asked them to obey the pope and to accept papal primacy. It could be argued that it was more a question of acknowledging papal jurisdiction rather than agreeing to doctrinal and liturgical conformity. Whether the Latins changed the Greek jurisdiction or not, is a complex question. The Council of Bari took place in 1098 with Pope Urban II, concerning the Greeks of South Italy;

“Greek clergy were to keep their own rite and customs in so far as these did not infringe Catholic principles. They might celebrate the liturgy in Greek in their traditional rite; they might continue to have married, secular priests; they might celebrate mass with leavened bread, and they might even recite the Nicene creed in the traditional way without the inclusion of the *Filioque* provided that they did not criticize the Latins for using it.”¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Spence, “Gregory IX’s attempted expeditions”, p. 169

¹⁸⁷ A. Dondaine, “Contra Graecos Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d’ Orient”, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21, 1951, p. 328

¹⁸⁸ Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p. 158

Moreover, in the Latin East there was no attempt to make the Orthodox conform to Latin usage, or doctrine, at the points where their own practice and faith differed from the norms applying to the western church.¹⁸⁹ There is also a letter from Innocent to the Latin patriarch, Thomas Morosini, on 2 August 1206, telling him to permit the Greeks to keep their own rite.¹⁹⁰ It seems that the Latins made efforts to change the Greek rite and they were not very tolerant of the Greek jurisdiction, because they considered the Greeks as part of one church. Moreover, because they considered them as part of the Roman Church, they had the same demands from the Greeks as from the Latins and they expected them to behave like the Latins.

In Constantinople, the situation was more complicated than in Cyprus, as some years after the conquest, the Greek emperors made various efforts to unite the two churches. After 1261, Michael VIII feared that a Western army would seek to recover Constantinople for the Franks and it was that fear that prompted these discussions, attempting to make the Greek Church part of the Roman Church, as Alexios III had done before 1204. In spite of the efforts towards a union, the dogmatic differences always existed between the Greek and the Latin Church. Before continuing this analysis, it is necessary to present the main dogmatic differences between the Greek and the Latin Church. Many papal letters were written on this topic, for example, a letter sent by Pope Gregory IX to the Greek archbishop in Cyprus on 18 May 1233, analyzing the efforts towards union and the use of leavened and unleavened bread.¹⁹¹ Many modern historians have studied and written about this.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p. 163

¹⁹⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, p. 319

¹⁹¹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 193, ed. A.L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, III, I, Rome 1950, pp. 266-68

¹⁹² For ecclesiastical differences see Duba, "The afterlife", pp. 167-94; Schabel, *Synodicum*, pp. 34-86; D. M. Nicol, "The Papal Scandal" in the *Orthodox Church and the West*, ed. D. Baker, *Studies in*

According to the Latins, in particular Thomas Aquinas,

“it is sufficiently clear that there is a Purgatory after this life. For if the debt of punishment is not paid in full after the stain of sin has been washed away by contrition, nor again are venial sins always removed when mortal sins are remitted, and if justice demands that sin be set in order by due punishment, it follows that one who after contribution for his fault and after being absolved, dies before making due satisfaction, is punished after this life. Wherefore those who deny Purgatory speak against the justice of God: for which reason such a statement is erroneous and contrary to faith...”¹⁹³

In accordance with Jewish thought at the time of Christ, “leaven” was seen as a metaphor for “spiritual corruption” hence the importance of unleavened bread for Jews at Passover. In the passages quoted from Aquinas, Jesus sees “leaven” in a morally neutral or even positive way, thereby challenging contemporary Jewish ideas.

With regard to the use of leavened and unleavened bread, Aquinas quotes the words of Jesus: “The Kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven.” (Matthew 13:33, Luke 13:21), and comments: “It is not however necessary for the sacrament that the bread be unleavened or leavened, since it can be celebrated in either.”¹⁹⁴ On the contrary, the Greeks were against the use of unleavened bread, and they only used leavened bread. Michael Cerularius, the patriarch of Constantinople in the eleventh century, talks in

Church History, vol. 13, 1976, pp. 141-68; P. Ricard, *The present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, 1678, pp. 177-304; J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology, Historical Trends and doctrinal Themes*, New York, Chapter 7, pp. 91-100; M. Angold “Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile” *Latins and Greeks in Eastern Mediterranean*, eds. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, and D. Jacoby, Ilford 1989, pp. 63-86; S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, Oxford 1955; S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge 1988, pp.18-37, pp. 86-111; C. Androutsou, *Συμβολική ἐξ απόψεως Ορθοδόξου*, Athens 1930; J. Darrouzes, “Le Memoire de Constantin Stibes”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 21, 1963, pp. 61-91, “Azyme”, *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* pp. 2653-54; T. M. Kolbaba, “Byzantine Perception of Latin Religious “Errors”: Theme and Changes from 850 to 1350”, *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, DC 2001, pp. 117-43

¹⁹³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Supplement (Appendix II), article 1, <http://www.newadrent.org/summa>, 2003

¹⁹⁴ *Summa Theologiae*, Part 3, Question 74, article 4

his letters about the use of leavened bread and other disagreements between the Latins and the Greeks, including the *Filioque* and the celibacy of the Latin clergy.¹⁹⁵

Apart from the above, perhaps the most important difference is the *Filioque*. The Greeks believed that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and not the Son,¹⁹⁶ whereas the Latins believed that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and from the Son. In his *Summa Theologiae*, Aquinas discusses the basic dogmatic differences between the Greeks and the Latins; he begins by presenting the Greek view and then by the use of syllogisms he attempts to refute it.¹⁹⁷ The dispute over the use of the *Filioque* in the Creed went back to 1009, when Pope Sergius IV included it in the profession of faith he sent to the patriarch of Constantinople, if not further.¹⁹⁸ Greek and Latin theologians have been interested since the *Filioque* became an issue and still examine it today. Both Greeks and Latins, including the twelfth-century writers Anselm of Canterbury¹⁹⁹ and Anselm of Havelberg,²⁰⁰ as well as Aquinas in the thirteenth century, composed treatises on the topic without managing to come to an agreement. In addition, many papal letters from popes such as Clement IV, Gregory IX and John XXI discuss the use of leavened and unleavened bread in the sacrament of Eucharist, the *Filioque* and how wrong the Greek view was, and the seven sacraments of the Church in general.

¹⁹⁵ Michael Cerularii, *PG*, vol. 110, cols. 754-820

¹⁹⁶ *Georgii Acropolitae Opera*, ed. Peter Wirth, vol. 2, pp. 46

¹⁹⁷ *Summa Theologiae*, Part 1, Question 36, article 2

¹⁹⁸ Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p. 156

¹⁹⁹ Anselm of Canterbury, *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*, trans. J. Hopkins and H. Richardson, Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, Minneapolis 2004, pp. 466-514

²⁰⁰ Anselmus of Havelberg, *Dialogorum libri III*, PL 188

The fourth matter is papal primacy, which probably dates back to the ninth century if not before but it became an issue, and made the Greeks anxious, after the Fourth Crusade and the Conquest of Constantinople.²⁰¹ The pope was the successor of the Apostle Peter, he enjoyed primacy of honor by the churches of East and West, but he also wanted jurisdiction. In addition, the pope claimed that, “no council could make authoritative pronouncements about doctrine unless the pope was represented at it and ratified its decisions... In that sense the pope was the final arbiter of doctrine in the western church.”²⁰² This matter became a significant issue in 1046 because the pope was trying to “assert his claims to primacy of jurisdiction in ways which were unacceptable to the patriarchs of Constantinople.”²⁰³

The Greeks refused to accept the primacy of the pope²⁰⁴ and their opinion was that Christ was the true head of the church, with the church on earth being headed by a pentarchy of patriarchs. Among these, the *bishop* of Rome had a primacy of honour.²⁰⁵ Contrary to papal opinion, the Greeks believed that only the ecumenical council, attended by representatives of the five patriarchs of the East and West, could take decisions concerning the canons and serious ecclesiastical issues.²⁰⁶ A Greek of the mid-fourteenth century, Barlaam, did not hesitate to tell the pope that the dogmatic differences were not as important as the authority of the ecumenical council, and he noted how much the Greeks had suffered due to the Latins.²⁰⁷ Barlaam was one of many Greeks who supported the idea that an ecumenical council could end the

²⁰¹ Nicol, “The Papal Scandal”, vol. 13, p. 144

²⁰² Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p. 39

²⁰³ Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p. 157

²⁰⁴ *Dositheos, Ιστορία περί των εν Ιεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχουσάντων άλλως καλούμενη Δωδεκάβιβλος*, books 8-9, Thessaloniki 1982, p. 184

²⁰⁵ Nicol, “The Papal Scandal”, vol.13, p. 146

²⁰⁶ D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and West: Two worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance, Studies in Ecclesiastical and Culture History*, Oxford 1966, p. 86

²⁰⁷ PG 151, col. 1332

schism; other Greeks, like Nicephorus Gregoras, Nilos Cabasilas and John Catacuzenos shared the same opinion. Of course these writers had their reasons for this attitude, they were writing in the fourteenth century, at a time when the Byzantines needed a Western alliance against the Turks. The differences between East and West were of great significance and had very deep roots which were not easy to remove, as they represented two antithetical ways of life and two different worlds.

Returning to the matter of primacy, in two letters in 1204, Innocent talked about the daughter who had come back to her mother and the sheep back to the shepherd, the Greek Church who had to return to the devotion of the Roman Church, otherwise the patriarch could not exercise his authority over his flock.²⁰⁸ The *Decretals* stated the same things. The decretals were papal letters, usually written in response to a particular problem, that were then seized upon by canon lawyers and treated as an authoritative statement of law; in other words they were answers to questions regarding specific legal matters. They were the major source of law during the twelfth century, more abundant than the decrees of councils but not as easily applied. The increase of the papacy's judicial activities made *decretals* more necessary.²⁰⁹ In the Innocent III's *In dignitate patriarcharum*, there is a statement suggesting that the Roman Church was the first of all the churches, the mother of all the others and, after the Roman Church, there followed the patriarchate of Constantinople, the patriarchate of Alexandria, and the patriarchate of Antioch and lastly, the patriarchate of Jerusalem.²¹⁰ In addition, it underlined the disapprobation of the Greeks against the 'wrong' Latin customs and the encouragement of the Roman Church towards the

²⁰⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. nos. 43, 44, pp. 244-46

²⁰⁹ J. Sayers, *Innocent III, Leader of Europe 1198-1216*, London-New York 1994, p. 101

²¹⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 2, p. 483

Greek customs.²¹¹ Additionally, there is the opinion that papal primacy was the most important dogmatic difference, even more important than the *Filioque*. For instance, at the Council of Lyon in 1274, the pope referred only to papal primacy and Beccus considered the *Filioque* more as a divergence in words than a dogmatic matter.

It can be observed that the Greeks were thus opposed to the Latins, their rite and their customs. After the sacking of Constantinople, the Greek patriarch, John Camateros, wrote against the Latins, just as other Greek patriarchs were to do during the Frankish rule. Germanos wrote books mostly about dogmatic matters like the *Filioque*, leavened and unleavened bread and Purgatory. His most important works are *Λόγος περί τής εκπορεύσεως τού αγίου Πνεύματος*, *Περί αζύμων πρός Θεόδωρον τίνι Στουδίτην*, *Περί τού Καθαρτηρίου πυρός*, *Επιστολή πρός τον έν Κωνσταντινούπολει Πατριαρχήν τών Λατίνων, κρατήσαντα τούς ιερείς τών Γραικών και αναγκάζοντα τούτους μνημονεύειν τού Πάπα και αυτού* in a letter sent to Pope Urban IV in 1264.²¹²

The Greek emperor, Michael Paleologus, when trying to achieve the union with the Latin Church, did not hesitate to claim that the pope was the prince of the priesthood and that the Greek and the Latin Church did not have a different dogma. He also stated that the Holy Fathers of the Greek and the Roman Church agreed in dogmatic matters and he mentioned the names some of them; Pope Sylvester, John Chrysostomos, Basil, Cerularius, Athanasius and others.²¹³

As well as the dogmatic differences between the Greeks and the Latins, obedience was of paramount importance to the Latins too. In many letters, the pope asked the Greeks to obey

²¹¹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 1, p. 482

²¹² A. Demetracopoulos, *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς ήτοι περί των Ελλήνων των Γραμμάτων κατά Λατίνων και περί των Συγγραμμάτων αυτών*, Leipzig 1872, pp. 39-40

²¹³ *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregori X*, doc. no. 10a, pp. 38-40

his decisions, and by extension, the Latin rite. According to a letter sent to all the clergy of Constantinople on 22 August 1212, Innocent III asked for obedience to the Apostolic See;²¹⁴ in another letter two years previous to that, on 6 July 1210, he asked the respect of all, Greeks and Latins.²¹⁵ In addition, some years later, in 1216, Innocent III did not hesitate to remind all the clergy of Constantinople of their obligations towards the Apostolic See, established by the Lateran Council of 1215.²¹⁶

With regard to Cyprus, by the terms of the *Bulla Cypria* of 1260, the Greeks were obliged to go to the synod of the Latin bishops of their dioceses and had to accept the decrees.²¹⁷ According to the Regulations of the Church of Nicosia (1252-1257) by the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Hugh of Fagiano, synods should be held twice a year and absentees would be punished.²¹⁸ The Greeks were not forced to go to the provincial council but they had to accept a procuration, a visit from the Latin bishops for inspection purposes. The Latin archbishop should receive five procurations annually from the Greeks of his diocese and city, four from the bishop of Paphos, and three from the bishops of Limassol and Famagusta. The cost of the procuration was paid by the Greeks and was a good pretext for the Latins to obtain money from the people 'visited'.²¹⁹

In 1278, Ranulph was ordained archbishop of Nicosia by the new pope, Nicholas III. Circa 1283, he published his *Constitutio instruens Graecos*. This regulation acted as a reminder or confirmation of the basic ecclesiastical matters and rights, as Ranulph believed it was the Greeks who were disrupting the Latin service. Some expressions in the text showed that it

²¹⁴ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 201, p. 437

²¹⁵ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 152, p. 386

²¹⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 220, p. 468

²¹⁷ *Cartulary* doc. no. 78, p. 200; *Synodicum* p. 317

²¹⁸ *Synodicum*, p. 91

²¹⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 200; *Synodicum*, p. 317

tried to be fair to the Greeks and that there was equality between the Greeks and the Latins.²²⁰ Ranulph also explained the reasons why he published this constitution. He apparently found that many things “which foster many dangers to their souls have arisen among the nation of the Greeks and the Syrians of the kingdom of Cyprus out of ignorance, simplicity and what is worse... we are obliged to bear as a duty of the rank we have assumed ...we are standing guard in the watch tower...”²²¹

The constitution repeated what had been stated in earlier decrees; the existence of four Greek bishops and their duty, according to the canon of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which states, “...we absolutely forbid that one and the same city or diocese have more than one bishop, one body” and “if anyone shall act otherwise, let him consider himself excommunicated and if even he will not amend, let him be deposed from any ecclesiastical ministry and if need be, let the secular arm be employed, that such insolence may be curbed...”²²² Ranulph reiterated the earlier provision that Greek bishops were not to take their titles from places with Latin bishops, a provision that looked back to the Fourth Lateran Council. It also repeated the Greek status regarding the doctrine and obligations of the Greek Church and clergy towards the Latins. Some important terms were as follows:

- 1) The Latin teaching on the seven sacraments; baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, ordination, extreme unction, matrimony, is imposed on the Greeks.
- 2) The Greeks were ordered to follow the Latin practice in baptism and eucharist. It is worth noting that while there is no question of the validity

²²⁰ *Synodicum*, p. 116

²²¹ *Synodicum*, pp. 119-21

²²² *Synodicum*, pp. 119-21

of Greek episcopal or priestly office, nor of their liturgy, there is a derogatory remark about Greek ignorance.

- 3) The term concerning penance is also important. Moreover the Greek laity preferred to confess to the Greek priests who did not have significant obedience to the Latins. The conclusion is that even in 1280s, obedience was a problem. The lengthy quotation from the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 is evidence that reveals Ranulph's insistence on imposing Latin canon law on the Greeks.
- 4) The term which concerns penance is also significant. Ranulph followed the lead of Innocent IV, explicitly accepting the Greek practice of having married priests and openly condemning the refusal of the Greek laity to confess to a married priest.
- 5) Concerning the sacrament of ordination, Latin approval was needed for a candidate to be ordained to the Greek priesthood.
- 6) Concerning marriage, the Latins forced the Greeks to follow the Latin usage as to whom one could – or could not (prohibited degrees of conanguinity) marry.

According to Latin opinion, this Constitution was one of their many efforts to lead the Greeks to the right faith. It can be observed that some of the points are repeated in most of the agreements or regulations, such as Ranulph's regulation. Schabel says that he "regards the Greeks prelates as merely tolerated by the Latins and as deputies appointed by the Latin bishop rather than elected bishops with real jurisdiction over the Greeks."²²³ Thus it may be concluded that the validity of the Greek clergy, or

²²³ *Synodicum*, pp.72-73

liturgy, need not be questioned and there was indeed much insistence on the Greeks to follow the Latin practice.

In 1280, Matthew, the archbishop of Caesarea, was puzzled by the significance of the rite and in a letter examining the ruling of Hugh of Fagiano,²²⁴ he re-issued a decree dated 1253, concerning the divine service. Indisputably, both the Greeks and the Latins would have viewed anyone who disrupted divine services with extreme displeasure. In our case, the question concerns those guilty of interrupting services in the Latin cathedral, be they Greeks or Latins.

In Constantinople there was an incident that took place which revealed the Latin efforts to change Greek customs, and the consequent reaction of the Greek clergy towards these efforts. When Nicholas of Santo (1234-1251) was the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, some Greek priests, who had been imprisoned by Nicholas's predecessors, were not immediately liberated, probably because of their refusal to commemorate the pope in the liturgy. The Greek patriarch, Germanos, sent a letter to Nicholas in order to help them, stating that, "either it should be proved that Greek priests, by not yielding to a church that had changed the creed, had contravened the canons, or they should be released. They are either Orthodox or heretics; if heretics, they should be treated kindly; if they observe the canons, they should be set free." It must be emphasized that Gill doubts that their denial to submit to the Roman Church was the actual reason for their imprisonment.²²⁵

²²⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no.29, pp.115-16

²²⁵ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, p. 77

In Achaea, there is not much evidence regarding the matter of rite, but it can be assumed that the situation was similar to Constantinople. As the Greek version of the Chronicle of the Morea says, in the thirteenth century the nobility of the Morea managed to convince the prince of Achaea, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, to promise that the Franks could not force them to change their faith or their customs. According to Kordoses, “it is not known if some Greek laymen adopted the Latin faith” and “basically the Greeks remained Orthodox.”²²⁶

Papal policy towards the Greek Church

Papal policy is another important issue regarding the development of the relations between the Greek and the Latin Church, and before the presentation of each pope’s policy, it is necessary to mention the determinants which affect the creation of the papal policy. It must be borne in mind that papal policy was often reactive rather than proactive: many of the papal decisions or rulings were reactions to the requests or demands of the clergy or laymen who sent petitions. Moreover, sometimes papal decisions were made as a result of the report of the legate who was his representative in a specific area. The papal legate would send his account, and the pope would follow the legate’s recommendations. The important role played by the papal legates will be discussed in another part of this thesis.

It is difficult to assess Celestine III’s policy towards the Greeks of Cyprus, as he had little time to do anything apart from establishing the Latin Church there at the request of Aimery. His great enthusiasm for, and pleasure in the establishment of the Latin Church is illustrated in his letters. They also show his efforts to urge the population and the clergy of the island

²²⁶ Kordoses, *South Greece under the Franks*, p. 65

to assist and obey the Latin Church, but there is no further evidence regarding his behaviour towards the Greeks. We can only conclude from the phrase, “when the Latins captured the island the churches remained in their usual order,” in the acts of the synod of Nicaea in 1209, that he did not want to harm the Greeks.²²⁷

His successor, Pope Innocent III, “was content to leave the Greeks alone: the fourteen Greek bishops, including the archbishop of Cyprus, remained independent.”²²⁸ His policy towards Constantinople was similar. Spence suggests that, “from the beginning of his pontificate, Innocent sent non-threatening letters to the Greeks...”²²⁹ and according to Angold, “had high hopes that the Greeks could be won over by the evident superiority of the Latin faith.”²³⁰ He respected the Greek bishops, priests and canons, and allowed the Greek bishops who remained in office to keep their positions. Conversely, like all his successors, he supported the supremacy of the Latin Church; he considered himself as the successor of Peter and tried to bring the Greeks back to the mother Church. Spence incorrectly claims that Innocent believed that the union of the two Churches was completed after the Fourth Crusade. He believes that the fact that Innocent wanted to re-enforce the unity of the church and the papal role, had a darker side to it; in areas under Catholic control or in lands newly-conquered and undergoing conversion, liturgical practice was often imposed on the population, the Greeks being the object of this policy.²³¹ Angold opposes this opinion by arguing that Innocent spent ten years seeking to find methods to implement the union of the Churches. His desire was not to create a union through force. Evidence of his good

²²⁷ Σύνταγμα βυζαντινών πηγών κοπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος} -15^{ος}, pp. 119-21; *Synodicum*, p. 53

²²⁸ *Synodicum*, p. 53

²²⁹ R. Spence, “Gregory IX’s attempted expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople: the crusade for the union of the Latin and Greek Churches”, *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. Derek Baker, Edinburgh 1973, p. 167

²³⁰ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 169

²³¹ Spence, “Gregory IX’s attempted expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople”, p. 166

will is exemplified by the fact that he took Greek prelates and ecclesiastical institutions under his protection. He held Byzantine monasticism in high esteem, expecting Greek bishops to stay in office, albeit under the authority of Rome. In actuality, Innocent III did not have that much control over the establishment of the Latin Church.²³²

Innocent's policy towards the Greeks of Constantinople, Cyprus and the Morea, can be generally characterized as tolerant, not hostile, contrary to the opinion of some Greek historians like N G Zaxaropoulos. Zaxaropoulos criticises Innocent's policy very harshly. He accuses the pope of attempting to impose himself on the Greeks and distinguishing himself as superior to the secular authority, a matter which was against the teaching of the Church.²³³ Thus Innocent III participated significantly in the affairs of the Latin and the Greek Church, sending legates and showing interest in the Greek situation.

The next pope was Honorius III, and during his papacy important events took place in Cyprus, most notably the agreements of 1220-1222. Honorius had a more severe attitude towards the Greeks which can be seen as a response to the activities of Pelagius in Cyprus. His Bull, published in 1222, contained important information concerning his attitude and policy towards the Greeks of Cyprus. According to his decisions, the Greek bishops could not take the same title as the Latin bishops and were not allowed to stay in the same sees as the Latin bishops,²³⁴ as mentioned in Chapter One. In Cyprus the pope insisted on putting the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council into practice. In other areas, for example in England, the decrees of

²³² Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 187

²³³ N. G. Zaxaropoulos, *Η Εκκλησία στην Ελλάδα κατά την Φραγκοκρατία*, Thessaloniki 1981, p. 75

²³⁴ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 87, pp. 116-17; *Synodicum*, p. 289

the Fourth Lateran Council were only sporadically enforced. In addition, Honorius III accused the Greeks of Cyprus of schismatic behaviour as some of them refused to obey the Latin hierarchy. This was due to his fear that the Greeks and the other Christians of the island, Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Maronites, might not obey,²³⁵ and he did not hesitate to send letters expressing his concern and warning Queen Alice that the Greeks could rebel against the Latin Church and the crown.²³⁶ From a consideration of the above, it could be argued that Honorius put the Orthodox on the same footing as the heretical churches, but in reality this was not so. The principle on which the Latins understood their relations with the Greeks is significant; the Latin Church believed that despite their errors, the Greek Church was part of the universal church. Honorius's policy, regarding Constantinople and Achaea, can be characterized as similar to that of the Greeks of Cyprus, even though not much of his correspondence has survived.

An example of Gregory IX's policy and his attitude towards the Greek Church appears in 1240, when he told Eustorge that Latin bishops were not to ordain Greek priests unless they swore obedience to the Latin Church and renounced heresy, especially regarding their stand against the use of unleavened bread. Eustorge gathered the Greek, Maronite, and Armenian bishops and informed them of the pope's instructions which he explained to them. To gain time, the Greeks asked for a copy of the instructions, and the archbishop, though he was not obliged to do so, gave them one. However, the Greek clergy then left Cyprus, taking the most valuable church objects with them and sailed to Cilicia. Before leaving, they urged those who stayed not to submit to the Latins and not to fear excommunication. Eustorge informed the

²³⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 35, pp. 123-24; *Synodicum*, pp. 291-92

²³⁶ *Synodicum*, p. 56

pope who demanded that the Greek priests, who refused to obey his orders, be excommunicated and expelled immediately and replaced by Latins.²³⁷ Regardless of the events in Cyprus, his policy towards the Greeks had similar aims to those of his predecessors. According to Spence, Gregory sought to protect the land route to the Holy Land and the eastern frontier of Latin Christendom. He continued the policy of Innocent and Honorius to endeavour to ensure the obedience of the Greeks to the Roman Church. His policy differed in that his attempts to reunite the Church were forceful, arguing that the Greeks were not only schismatics, but that schism created an appropriate environment for the spread of heresy.²³⁸ Furthermore, Spence claims that Gregory saw the crusade as an expedient for forcing the reluctant Greeks back into the Latin fold if peaceful attempts at negotiating were unsuccessful.²³⁹

After the death of Gregory IX in 1241, with the succession of Innocent IV in 1243, relations between the two Churches improved and the climate changed. When Innocent IV became pope, he tried to improve his relationship with the Greeks and was more moderate, concessive and perhaps more diplomatic than Gregory IX. In order to achieve his purpose, he understood that he had to be more lenient and took measures that would not provoke a reaction from the Greeks. He was also more protective towards the Greeks. At this point it is necessary to examine the reason for the change in papal policy.

Innocent IV adhered to a wider policy than Cyprus and his legates had instructions not only for Cyprus, but generally for the East. After the invasion of the Mongols in 1241-1242, when they pillaged Poland and Hungary, the pope tried to become closer

²³⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 71, pp. 177-79

²³⁸ Spence, "Gregory IX's attempted expeditions", p. 173

²³⁹ Spence, "Gregory IX's attempted expeditions", p. 163

to the Eastern Christians.²⁴⁰ According to Gill, Innocent IV's attitude to the Greeks of the East, in particular those in Cyprus and the orthodox patriarchate of Antioch, conveyed via his legates, Brother Lawrence and the Cardinal of Tusculum, Eudes of Châteauroux, reveals a genuinely conciliatory policy sincerely adhered to.²⁴¹ Moreover, the mission of his legate, Lawrence, included all Greeks living in the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem and in the kingdom of Cyprus, and he was told not to allow the Greeks of these areas to be harassed by violence, and compensate for whatever offences or injuries were caused them by the Latins.²⁴²

According to Schabel, Innocent followed the same line in policy as Celestine III. It is also important that "Innocent's instructions for the Greeks...are in response to the problems Hugh [of Fagiano, the archbishop of Nicosia] and his suffragans had with the Greeks."²⁴³ In addition, as Schabel correctly says, Innocent was more tolerant of the Greeks because of the circumstances and though he forbade Hugh from bothering the Greeks, this does not mean that he forbade the Latin archbishop from enforcing his commands, in cases where the Greeks of Cyprus contravened them.²⁴⁴ After the death of the Greek archbishop Neophytos, he and the Latin archbishop, Hugh of Fagiano, disagreed over the election of another Greek archbishop and finally Germanos became the last Greek archbishop during the Frankish rule. It does appear however, that Pope Innocent IV was genuine in his wish for peace on the basis of Greek obedience, in return for the sanction of Greek practices.

²⁴⁰ P. Jackson, *The Mongols and the West 1221-1410*, Harlow 2005, pp. 58-87

²⁴¹ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400*, p. 95

²⁴² *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 31, pp. 73-74; Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, p. 289

²⁴³ *Synodicum*, p. 66

²⁴⁴ *Synodicum*, p. 66

In 1243, in the first year of his papacy, Innocent IV placed the Greek monastery of St. Margaret of Agros and St. Marina at Cape Gata, in the Limassol dioceses, under his protection. From the above it can also be inferred that, together with a positive papal policy, some of the Greeks in Cyprus were ready to accept papal jurisdiction. Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to conclude whether it was a minority of the Greeks or a greater number who did so. Despite the fact that Innocent IV's behaviour was friendlier than his predecessor, his policy and his goals remained the same as those of previous popes.²⁴⁵

Innocent IV continued to have a close relationship with the Latin Church of Cyprus. He sent several letters which indicated his concern about the situation in Cyprus. In one of the letters to Archbishop Eustorge, the pope informed him that some Greek monks of his diocese had been "led astray by diabolical instigation are deviating from the path of truth,"²⁴⁶ they refused "to accept the commands of the Latin Church and he characterized their behaviour as shameful." Moreover, he accused the Greek monks of receiving and harbouring other heretic Greeks. He ordered Eustorge "to correct and reform the things."²⁴⁷ In spite of his commands in the previous letter, Innocent tried to be tolerant of the Greeks and their customs. He looked upon the Greeks as "devoti Ecclesiae Romanae" and urged the Latins not to annoy the Greeks.

After the official submission of the Greeks (1220s) and the renunciation of heresy, the Greek hierarchy asked the pope for several things, such as to be considered as Greek rite Catholics by the pope, the revocation of the agreements of 1220-1222 and the Greek hierarchy to be independent of the Latin Church of Cyprus, and to be under the

²⁴⁵ *Synodicum*, p. 66

²⁴⁶ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 30, pp. 70-71; *Synodicum*, p. 300

²⁴⁷ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 30, pp. 70-71; *Synodicum*, p. 301

direct jurisdiction of the Roman Church and the pope. Innocent asked the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Eustorge, to investigate the matters²⁴⁸ which can be viewed rather as a conciliatory gesture on his part; it would seem, however, that Eustorge would not agree to the Greek requests. Furthermore, as it is revealed in the *Regulations or Institutions of Innocent IV* in 1254 to his papal legate, Eudes of Châteauroux, the papal legate, the pope made some concessions to the Greeks and also made some important changes concerning the Greek customs. For example, the Greek bishops had to ordain all seven orders according to the manner of the Latin Church and were obligated to adopt the term 'Purgatory'.²⁴⁹

In Constantinople, Innocent IV's policy was friendlier than his predecessor, as was the case in Cyprus. In his papal letter he showed his interest in the requirements of the Church of Constantinople, sending letters to other places in order to assist them.

²⁵⁰ In Achaea, it can only be assumed that he followed the same policy as there is no written evidence pertaining to this matter.

The pope who succeeded Innocent IV, Alexander IV, followed a different policy to his predecessor towards the Greeks of Cyprus, even though the attitude of the Greeks was by then much more positive. By 1254, all the Greek bishops in Cyprus had acknowledged their obedience to the pope and their property, and many of their distinctive liturgical customs had been guaranteed by the papacy. Alexander's greatest accomplishment was the *Bulla Cypria*.

²⁴⁸ *Synodicum*, pp. 62-63

²⁴⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 93, pp. 238-43; *Synodicum*, pp. 307-11

²⁵⁰ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 13, pp. 22-23

The *Bulla Cypria* was a formal papal enactment, published in 1260 in order to bring peace between the Greeks and the Latins and a *modus vivendi* which would appease both groups. Initially, the *Bulla* appeared to the Greeks to safeguard their rights. However, modern Greek historians, such as Papadopoulos, are critical of the *Bulla* and its terms. Papadopoulos argues that the *Bulla* was part of the second stage in the relationship between the Greeks and the Latins which characterizes the systematic reaction of the Greeks towards the Latins and their subordination, the religious assimilation of the Greek Church by the Latins, and the imposition of the Latin dogmas.²⁵¹

Other historians like Coureas, claim that the terms of the *Bulla* conceal the contemporary tensions, since they presented a positive picture of cooperation, concession, and a peaceful co-existence between the Latin and the Greek Church.²⁵² Contrary to what most modern Greek historians assert, the *Bulla* was not entirely negative and did provide the Greeks with limited autonomy together with some additional benefits. What the *Bulla* did was to guarantee the continued existence of Greek bishops in Cyprus, although subordinated to the Latins, and smoothed the transition period. It gave the Greeks the opportunity to retain some independence from the Latin hierarchy in Cyprus.

The reaction of the Greeks to the Latin Churches in Constantinople and the Morea, and Cyprus

Initially, the Greeks of Constantinople and Achaea resented both the arrival of the Latins and the establishment of the Latin Church. The Greeks were opposed to

²⁵¹ T. Papadopoulos, *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I*, Nicosia 1984, pp. 11-12, 16, 17

²⁵² N. Coureas, "Conversion on Latin Cyprus: a new faith or a new rite?", *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών* 24, 1998, p. 81

changing their faith, their traditions and dogma. They viewed the crusaders as conquerors who had arrived in the East to destroy their civilization, change their faith and subordinate them, by making them part of the Roman Church. Michael Dendias presents the most pertinent and convincing answer to the issue of the Greeks' refusal to accept the Latins. He asserts that the Greeks did not want to go against their traditions and dogma, as it was one of the most important characteristics of their civilization, the Byzantine civilization.

Orthodoxy was of paramount importance to the Greeks as it represented a product of their philosophy, spirit, and culture; the essence of which provided cohesion between the inhabitants of the Byzantine Empire. In addition, Orthodoxy symbolized their common race, religion, culture and state.²⁵³ Hussey believes that the popes did not realize the strength of the Greek traditions and that “any *modus vivendi* in the Latin principality was hardly likely on the lines visualized by the pope and in any case the wider aims of the papacy were not realized.”²⁵⁴ Sir Steven Runciman also underlines the importance of the maintenance of the Greek traditions. In his view, when the Greeks of Constantinople accepted Henry, the brother of Baldwin, as their new emperor, “they were ready...to admit the supremacy of Rome as long as they could keep their old traditions;” after the death of the Greek Patriarch, John Camateros, “all that they (the Greeks) asked was that they should have a patriarch who shared their language, customs and traditions.”²⁵⁵ Angold agrees and adds that a Latin patriarch “was unable to carry out his duties most obviously so when it came to hearing

²⁵³ M. Dendias, “Sur les rapports entre les Grecs et le Francs en Orient après 1204”, *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 13, Athens 1953, p. 372

²⁵⁴ Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, p.187

²⁵⁵ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p. 174

confession,”²⁵⁶ and significantly the Greeks, “hoped that the pope would accept the continued existence of the Orthodox patriarchate.”²⁵⁷ Runciman believes that “the eastern Churches felt that they were being robbed of their legitimate and traditional rights by order of the pope...”²⁵⁸ In addition, his viewpoint on the Fourth Crusade and the capture of Constantinople is very harsh, more so than some Greek historians. He does not hesitate to judge the past, “there was never a greater crime against humanity than the Fourth Crusade. Not only did it cause the destruction or dispersal of all the treasures of the past that Byzantium had devotedly stored, and the mortal wounding of a civilization that was still active and great; but it was also an act of gigantic political folly.”²⁵⁹

It must be emphasized that the negative reaction of the Greeks, towards the Latins, was nothing new. In his *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, Eustathios of Thessaloniki describes the capture of the city in 1185 by the Normans. He refers to the Latins as barbarians and his narrative entails lengthy descriptions of the devastation, inflicted on the Greek Church and its people by the Normans.²⁶⁰ His hostility towards the Latins is understandable as his city suffered severely. His account is not the only one proposing such a view. Anna Comnene in her *Αλεξιάδα* is very negative towards the Latins and the pope in particular, and she presents the Latins as barbarians.²⁶¹

²⁵⁶ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 182

²⁵⁷ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 181

²⁵⁸ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p.117

²⁵⁹ S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, Cambridge 1951-1955, 3, p. 130

²⁶⁰ Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *The Capture of Thessaloniki :a translation with introduction and commentary*, ed. John R. Melville Jones, Canberra 1988, pp. 115-17, 125-43; Eustathios's words are very characteristic: “ἵνα μὴ μόνον τὴν τύχη ἡμῖν κατεδουλώσαντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἁγία θρησκεία ἐμπαροινήσωσιν. Ὡ, τίς ἀνάσχοιτο ἐκεῖνων”, p. 126

²⁶¹ Anna Comnene, *Αλεξιάς*, ed. N. K. Konstantopoulos, Athens 1938, pp. 125, 135-37, 141

Greek writers that followed had a similarly negative attitude towards the Latins, as illustrated by the work of Comnene and Choniates, particularly in the latter's account of the fall of Constantinople to the Latins after the Fourth Crusade²⁶² and the history of Byzantium in the twelfth century. Choniates, contemporary to the events, is thus a very useful example of how Greek writers thought during that era. As Angold explains in a detailed discussion of *Historia*, Choniates "presents the Fourth Crusade as a Venetian inspired act of revenge against Constantinople" and additionally, he saw the sack of the city as "divine judgment for the sins of the Byzantines,"²⁶³ but he was not always hostile to the Latins.²⁶⁴ Regarding this point, it must be emphasized that Choniates was a civil servant, not a member of the Orthodox clergy, so he was writing with a secular viewpoint and for a secular audience. Neither Anna Comnene, nor Choniates, were writing ecclesiastical history: they were writing the political history of the Byzantine Empire. George Acropolitis (1217-81) is seen to agree with Choniates in his chronicle, where he discusses the murder of men and women.²⁶⁵ However, due to the fact that Acropolitis wrote his account at a later stage, it cannot be considered a reliable source for Greek opinion at the time of the Fourth Crusade. It is however, significant to note how writers of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries interpreted what had occurred in 1204. Their construction of the past is a reflection of their contemporary intellectual environment. Acropolitis may have read about the events concerning the Fourth Crusade or, he may have listened to what had

²⁶² Nicetas Choniatae, *Historia, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. II, Series Berolinensis, ed. H. G. Beck, A. Kambylis, R. Keydell, Berlin 1975, "ου γάρ πω βουθοίνας εισωκίσαντο Λατίνους, και είδοσαν όπως μέν τόν οίνον άκρατον ομού και ζωρότερον ώσπερ και τον χόλον ακέραστον χέουσιν, όπως δέ Ρωμαίους έν υπερηφάνειαν και εξουδένωσει προσφέρονται", p. 594

²⁶³ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 8

²⁶⁴ See J. Harris, "Distortion, divine providence and genre in Nicetas Choniates's account of the collapse of Byzantium 1180-1204", *Journal of Medieval History*, 26, 2000, p. 31

²⁶⁵ Georgii Logothetae Acropolitae, *Chronicon Constantinopolitanum: complectens Historiam captae Constantinopoleos and quinquaginta annotum, a Balduino Flandro Augusto ad Balduinum ultimum, eius nepotem, Byzantij imp. Nunc primun Graece and Latine editum nostiq: ...Ex bibliotheca Theodori Donsae*, Βιβλιοθήκη Ιστορικών Μελετών, Athens 1974, p. 4

happened some years earlier. Often, subsequent writers embellished or altered the story for a number of reasons. Perhaps they had heard recounts of the events from older people, drawing from their memories of them, often making them appear worse than they were. Some of them were also extremely pious and described the Fourth Crusade as a divine judgment, or they added information, made changes and exaggerated different aspects.

In the crusader states the situation of the Greeks was similar. According to Hamilton, the Orthodox were legally viewed as second-class citizens but, according to the Latin Church, they were members of the one, holy, Catholic Church to which the Franks also belonged. In order to acquire legal equality with a Frank, an Orthodox member would have had to become a Christian of the Latin rite.²⁶⁶ The Latins in Antioch did not hesitate to expel the Greek bishops from their sees and replace them with Latins, who had canonical authority over the Greek clergy. The Greek monks and priests, who were under Latin obedience, retained full religious freedom but did not have a privileged position in the state.²⁶⁷ Concerning the relations between the members of the two churches, Hamilton believes that they “were shaped by attitudes which had been commonly held in the western church at the time of the initial settlement.”²⁶⁸ In other words, the western attitudes were based on superiority and contempt.

However, in Byzantine Italy, where the Latin Church had been established long before the First Crusade, the situation was entirely different. When the Normans conquered Byzantine Italy in the second half of the eleventh century, they accepted the Greek culture, protecting and encouraging the Greek Church. There is evidence of the existence of more than twenty

²⁶⁶ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p.162

²⁶⁷ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 178, 159

²⁶⁸ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p. 165

new, Greek monasteries and only four Latin monasteries in Sicily during the rule of Roger I.²⁶⁹ In his article, Hamilton discusses in detail the existence of Greek monasteries in Rome, during the tenth century.²⁷⁰ Angold argues that the Greeks submitted to Norman rule in a reasonably contented way and their monasteries benefited from Norman generosity.²⁷¹ P Herde also states that the papacy tolerated their rites and canon law, albeit unwillingly at times, and with occasional criticism. The attitude of the twelfth century papacy was not unfriendly towards the remnants of the Greek Church in Southern Italy. Herbe's explanation is straightforward; the popes respected the local ecclesiastical traditions and "the knowledge of the Greek rite on the part of papal curia in the West was generally not very profound."²⁷² The Latins slowly replaced the Greek rite and "Greeks' rite was tolerated within the limits set by the decretals of Celestine III and Innocent III."²⁷³

In Cyprus, the first, and arguably the most significant action of the Latins, concerning the relations between the two Churches, were contained in the agreements of 1220-1222. These took place thirty years after the establishment of Frankish rule. Many Greek historians²⁷⁴ have written about it, as a Latin effort to subordinate the Greeks. However, as P Edbury correctly claims, although it appears that the Greek Church was impoverished and subordinate, they had a large measure of autonomy regarding

²⁶⁹ G. A. Loud, "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", *Conquerors and Churchmen in Norman Italy*, 3, Aldershot 1999, p. 227

²⁷⁰ B. Hamilton, "The City of Rome and the Eastern Churches in the tenth century", *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)*, pp. 5-26

²⁷¹ Angold, "Greeks and Latins after 1204: the Perspective of Exile" p. 64

²⁷² P. Herde, "The Papacy and the Greek Church in Southern Italy between the eleventh and the thirteenth century", *The society of Norman Italy*, ed. G.A. Loud and A. Metcalfe, Boston 2003, p. 224

²⁷³ Herde, "The Papacy and the Greek Church", p. 250

²⁷⁴For example H. J. Magoulias, "A study in Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Relations on the island of Cyprus between the years A.D. 1196 and 1360" *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 10, 1964, p. 103; Ch. Papadopoulos, "Η εν Κύπρω Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία", *Εκκλησιαστικός Κήρυξ*, 1911, p. 408

their daily concerns.²⁷⁵ The evidence seems to suggest that although the Greeks lost some endowments, the Latins did not try to take control of the Greek Church until 1220. Even in 1220, it was only because the papal legate, Pelagius was present that change materialized. Otherwise the Greeks would have been left alone, and it is worth observing that the only issue that caused concern to the Latin laity appears to have been the ordination of Greek serfs and their consequent release from servile status. The Latin Church would have gone on quarrelling with the Latin nobles over the payment of tithes. What Pelagius tried to do was to get the Latins to pay the tithe and to enforce the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) over single bishops, which meant reducing the position of the Greek bishops.

The next incident which provides information regarding the reaction of the Greeks and the ecclesiastical situation in Cyprus is the narration of the “martyrdom” of the thirteen monks of Kantara, which had damaged the relationship between the Latins and the Greeks. The main text of the story is a partly fictionalized account which is not dated, and is certainly not contemporary to the events, but a later source. It was first edited by Sathas and later by Papadopoulos. According to this version of the story, the event took place in 1231, when two monks from Mount Athos, John and Kanonas, came to Cyprus together with Mark and Theodoros, and went to Kantara. A Dominican friar called Andrew visited Kantara too.²⁷⁶ Papadopoulos intimates that the arrival of Andrew was deliberate, even though there is no evidence to support this

²⁷⁵ P. Edbury, “The Lusignan Regime in Cyprus and the Indigenous Population”, *Kingdoms of the Crusades: from Jerusalem to Cyprus*, Aldershot 1999, 20, p. 7

²⁷⁶ *Μαρτυρολόγιον Διήγησις των Αγίων τριών και δέκα οσίων πατέρων των δια πρὸς τελειωθέντων παρά των λατίνων εν τη νήσω Κύπρω*, in Sathas, pp 20-25, vol. 2, rep. Athens 1972, pp. 20-5. Moreover the text of the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara has been published by Th. Papadopoulos in “Μαρτύριον Κυπρίων”, *Τόμος Αναμνηστικός επί τη 50 επετητίδι του περιοδικού “Απόστολος Βαρνάβας” (1918-1968)*, Nicosia 1975, pp. 320-37

opinion.²⁷⁷ Andrew asked the monks about dogmatic matters and disagreed with them about the sacrament of the Eucharist.²⁷⁸ The Greeks supported the use of leavened bread, not unleavened bread, as used by the Latin Church and were thus accused of being heretical.

From the source it is apparent that, in order to prove their opinion was right, the Greek monks proposed the following: one Greek and one Latin should go through a fire, one holding unleavened bread and the other, leavened bread. It is worth observing that since the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, ordeal by fire was no longer allowed by the Latin Church, but was permitted in the Orthodox Church. The result of this argument was an accusation against the Greek monks, suggesting they were heretics and putting them in prison.²⁷⁹ They endured intense suffering and Theodoros died as a consequence of the torture he received. His body was cast into the fire and then dragged through the streets of Nicosia. The Latin archbishop mentioned the matter to Pope Gregory, who in turn, ordered that the monks be accused as heretics if they continued to support their opinion. Following the departure of the Latin archbishop from Cyprus, Andrew, who was responsible for the interrogation, appealed to King Henry, who preferred not to involve himself in this case. As a result, the thirteen monks were sentenced to death, either by being tied to a horse and dragged through the streets until they died, or being cast into the fire.²⁸⁰

In addition to the above, information can be drawn from another primary source; a story written anonymously which Allatius, a Greek from Chios, whom Pope

²⁷⁷ Papadopoulos, p. 574

²⁷⁸ *Μαρτυρολόγιον*, p. 26

²⁷⁹ *Μαρτυρολόγιον*, p. 34

²⁸⁰ *Μαρτυρολόγιον*, p. 38-39

Alexander VI made librarian at the Vatican in 1661, quoted in his book. It must be emphasized that there is not much evidence regarding this source; it is known that Allatius quoted the story from an anonymous writer. Papadopoulos claims that the text of Allatius is possibly earlier than the “Δίηγησις των αγίων τριών και δέκα οσίων μαρτύρων τών διά πυρός τελειωθέντων παρά τών λατίνων έν τή νήσω Κύπρω έν τώ ςψλθ’ έτει,”²⁸¹ According to this story, the ordinary monks suffered death by being dragged through the streets and only the head of the monastery was burned to death. The bones of John, which were left untouched by the fire, were mixed with the bones of animals and returned later by the Latins. There is also a brief reference to the martyrdom in the work of Beihammer and Schabel who studied the manuscripts and made a compilation of the sources;

“Therefore, following this Michael until today, the Greeks do not shrink from publicly calling the Latins? azymites? Whence among them the mystery of the sacrament has become so accursed and scorned that not only do they refuse to take it when in danger of death, but they choose to endure the torture of the flames rather than acknowledge the sacrament. This Cyprus proves, which in our time made twelve Greek monks labouring under this error into new martyrs of the Devil through the flame of fire. For the aforesaid monks were saying that the Latins? sacrament was mud and not a sacrament, and that those who eat it are sacrificing to demons in the way of the gentiles.”²⁸²

The following year, Patriarch Germanos sent a letter to Pope Gregory IX, condemning the Latins’ behaviour²⁸³ and making a complaint to him. He also supported the Greeks.²⁸⁴ In a letter to Archbishop Eustorge, Pope Gregory mentioned that the monks had been imprisoned because they had refused to use unleavened bread for the Eucharist, and that the Greeks had accused the Latins of heresy for using unleavened bread and the Latins had reacted severely to this charge. It is worth noting that

²⁸¹ Papadopoulos, p. 309

²⁸² Alexander D. Beihammer and Chris Schabel, “Two Small Texts on the Wider Context of the Martyrdom of the Thirteen Monks of Kantara in Cyprus, 1231”, *Festschrift for Ioannis Hassiotis*, Grenada, 2007, (forthcoming)

²⁸³ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 179°, pp. 245

²⁸⁴ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no 179a, p. 244-45

Germanos and Pope Gregory's letters are the only contemporary sources available with regard to this incident. In the letter it is worth mentioning that the pope first discussed the illicit marriage of Balian of Ibelin and then the heretic monks. He confirmed the previous excommunication of Balian, his wife, Eschiva of Montbéliard, and their associates.²⁸⁵

It is necessary to examine three significant problems concerning Germanos' letter. Firstly, this was written some time after the events and it probably incorporates elements of other stories as the majority of the later sources did. In addition, there are problems in dating the text. It is not known when it was written or if it is a copy. The third problem concerns the lack of information regarding the story of the monastery. It is the first and last time we hear about the ecclesiastical community in Kantara, and little else is known about the monastery besides the martyrdom.

Furthermore, it is remarkable that the reference to 'martyrdom' is very brief and its omission from many of the Latin Church documents reveals that the original sources are limited. Some historians consider the execution of the Kantara monks to be an isolated case: no other violent incident is mentioned between the Latin and the Greek Church, so it cannot be argued that their relations were always bad. George Hill adheres to this view and argues that the persecution of the Greeks in Antioch, Constantinople, and elsewhere, did not present the same savagery. It was only in Cyprus that such an event occurred.²⁸⁶

Relating to this issue, it should be considered that in Southern Italy there is no evidence of

²⁸⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 69, p. 175

²⁸⁶ G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus, The Frankish Period 1432-1571*, vol. 3, Cambridge 1948, p. 1081

deliberate hostility by the Normans towards the Greek monks, but there were instances of hostility between Greek and Latin clergy.²⁸⁷

Other historians assert that the event is “indicative of the Latin attitude toward the Greeks in general, whereas others emphasize the exceptional character of the monks.” Furthermore, they excuse Latin behaviour by suggesting that it was a chaotic period, rife with problems like the civil war.²⁸⁸ Kirmitsis, for example, places the martyrdom and the agreements of 1220 in a chapter entitled “Repression of the Greek Church by the Latin Church” which is surely not correct.²⁸⁹

It is apparent that each side sees this incident from a different perspective. This severe act by the Latins might be justified by reference to the problems the Latin Church had in tackling heretics. In the West, from 1209 to 1221, the notorious “Albigensian Crusade” against heresy took place, when Pope Innocent III called the nobles of northern France to fight against the protectors of the Cathar heretics. The severest enemies of heresy were the Dominicans, the leading inquisitors, and Andrew’s actions were in keeping with his order’s vocation. Not only did Andrew regard the Greeks as heretics, but the Kantara monks considered Andrew, who had gone to their monastery and doubted their faith, as a heretic too.

Thus the ‘martyrdom’ from the Greek perspective, or the “right punishment” of the thirteen monks, according to the Latin perspective, had a negative effect on the relations of the two Churches. It can be argued that this problem is similar to the case

²⁸⁷ Loud, “Byzantine Italy and the Normans”, pp. 230-31

²⁸⁸ *Synodicum*, p. 59

²⁸⁹ P. I. Kirmitsis, “Η Ορθόδοξος Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 47, 1983, p. 14

of the Fourth Crusade. How contemporaries viewed the situation differs from how later generations chose to memorialize it. Greek writers, who later described the Fourth Crusade and also those who recorded the martyrdom of 1231, do not necessarily reflect the opinion held by the Greeks at the time. They may have presented the issues more simplistically than contemporaries might have seen them.

Another critical point in the development of the relations between the Greek Church and the Latin Church of Cyprus is the *Bulla Cypria*. The reaction of a section of the Greeks was negative, as expressed in a letter sent by Pope Urban IV, the successor of Alexander, to the Latin archbishop, Hugh of Fagiano, three years after the publication of the *Bulla* in 1263. According to the letter, the Greeks and Syrians had refused to accept and apply the terms of the *Bulla*.²⁹⁰ Urban wrote to Hugh,

“... some people, both ecclesiastical and seculars, namely Greeks and Syrians, go against this arrangement... They not only refuse to observe it as they are obliged, but they even arrogantly heap abuse on you and the churches of the Latins... They are not afraid to make conspiracies and pacts to your and to those churches’ injury with damnable presumption, annulling rights, honors and ecclesiastical freedom and immunity...”²⁹¹

In a similar letter from Urban to the *bailli* and nobles, the refusal of the Greeks to apply the *Bulla* and the lack of respect towards the Latin Church and the archbishop, is emphasized.²⁹² The pope says, “...a great many Greek and Syrian laymen of the kingdom of Cyprus, the more they aroused in rash audacity against the Roman Church...” He also wrote “some Greek priests and clerics venerate this church as the mistress and mother of all... Greeks and Syrians led by a spirit of wickedness presume to repel them from their society ...”²⁹³

²⁹⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 79, pp. 205-08; *Synodicum*, pp. 320-23

²⁹¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 79, pp. 205-08; *Synodicum*, pp. 321-22

²⁹² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 11, p. 95

²⁹³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 75, pp. 184-86; *Synodicum*, p. 324

One factor which must be taken into consideration at this point is that, the senior clergy of Cyprus, who sent the letters to the pope, came from Western Europe. A careful reading of the papal letters of 1263 reveal that someone, **probably** the archbishop of Nicosia, had complained to the pope that the Greeks were not keeping to the terms of the *Bulla*. The question arises here as to whether the scope for disagreement over the *Bulla* was voiced or not. Is it not possible that the dispute arose because the Latins were not prepared to make the concessions to the Greeks, as stipulated by the *Bulla*?

The reaction against the *Bulla* by some of the Greeks continued for several years. There are also testimonies pertaining to a revolt against the Latins. In 1264, Pope Urban sent a letter to the Latin archbishop, in which he indirectly referred to the complaints which the archbishop had made in Rome, concerning the disobedience of the Greeks.²⁹⁴ It appears that the terms of the *Bulla* did not satisfy some of the Greeks, although it is possible that the Latins were trying to thwart the *Bulla's* intention of regulating and guaranteeing the Greeks' rights. Their archbishop, Germanos, accepted the terms, but some Greeks and Syrians of the island were not inclined to follow them. Thus, although the Greeks used the *Bulla* in order to defend themselves, they did not want to honour it.

It is necessary to state that the Latins' actions were not intended to harm the Greeks, but in their attempt to bring about unification, they were led to extremes that brought about the opposite results. The Latins had failed to estimate the Greeks' readiness to

²⁹⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 77, pp. 190-94; *Synodicum*, pp. 325-28

defend their traditions which they saw to be under threat and as a result, they were ready to act in defense. The Latin clergy born in the East, or resident in the East for many years, were possibly more willing to compromise. 'Recent arrivals' might have been more 'hard line', but they would have had some knowledge of the situation. It must be noted that Pope Urban IV had been in the East himself, as a patriarch of Jerusalem before 1261, and that Hugh of Fagiano had the task of raising the standards of behaviour in the Latin Church in Cyprus, after the damning indictment of Eudes of Châteauroux, the papal legate.²⁹⁵ In addition, between 1253 and 1267, the king was a minor, and until the advent of Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan as regent on the death of Plaisance in 1261, there seems not to have been an effective ruler at the time. It is far from certain that the secular rulers would have wanted to support a hard-line policy by the Latin clergy against the Greeks.

Concerning Achaëa, it is extremely rare to find evidence of violent reactions on the part of the Greeks towards the Latins. The behaviour of the Greeks of Achaëa was similar to the behaviour of the rest of the Greeks in Constantinople and other parts of Greece. Primary sources prove that the clergy of Achaëa were not pleased with the establishment of the Latin Church and the hierarchy left, and the clergy who stayed were obliged to show obedience to the Latin Church. There are examples which prove this, for instance the letter from Innocent III to the archbishop of Thebes, sent on 21 May 1212, where the Greek abbots of the dioceses of Corinth were told to obey to their archbishop, or the archbishop be subject to ecclesiastical censure.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁵ *Synodicum*, pp. 160-73

²⁹⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 189, p. 421

The involvement of the pope in the affairs of the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople and the Church of the Morea, and the role of the papal legates

The involvement or interference of the pope in the affairs of the Greeks is not a simple issue. There are different views regarding the role and the extent to which the pope became involved in matters of the local churches. The pope considered himself as the successor of the apostle Peter, the head of the church, superior to all the other patriarchs. According to the pope, it was his duty and obligation to be interested in the affairs of his flock. Many modern Greek historians have differing opinions concerning this issue. They claim that the pope interfered in the domestic affairs of the Greeks and that he made efforts to subordinate them. His policy was a policy of subordination and interference, the main objective being to Latinize the Greeks and change their dogma, making them part of the Roman Church. Despite what most Greek historians contend, it must be stressed that the pope was involved in matters pertaining to the churches in all the Christian areas, not only in the Greek ones. His involvement was very prevalent in the West, he frequently sent papal legates, his representatives, in order to establish better control of his flock and so his involvement in the churches of the Morea and Constantinople was not new, but part of his overall papal policy. For example, according to Loud, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the pope actively interfered in southern Italy to resolve the unsuitable arrangement of the ecclesiastical provinces, and autocephalous sees, the result of prior tensions between Rome and Constantinople in the tenth century.²⁹⁷

In the three areas which this thesis examines, the involvement of the popes in the affairs of the Greek Church was frequent. Many of the popes, from Celestine III, who

²⁹⁷ Loud, "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", p. 230

established the Latin Church in Cyprus, to Pope Boniface VIII, sent letters to the Latin Church, the emperor, the king or the nobility, and became involved in the affairs of the Greeks during the Frankish rule. However, each pope was involved to a different extent. Papal legates assisted the popes in becoming involved in these affairs. A papal legate is the representative of the pope to some parts of the universal church. He is empowered in the matters of unity of the Catholic faith and the settlement of ecclesiastical matters. There was a *legatus a latere*, which means literally, the man with delegated powers [sent] from the side [*a latere*] of the pope. A legate such as Eudes de Châteauroux had clearly defined powers to represent the pope on Louis IX's Crusade, and exercise authority over the church in the East. In the thirteenth century, the patriarch of Jerusalem was usually, but not always a *legatus natus*, his powers were lesser extensive than those of a *legatus a latere*, and lapsed when there was a *legatus a latere* present in the East. The pope was careful not to address the patriarch as *legatus natus* when a *legatus a latere* was in the East. By giving the patriarch legatine authority, the pope cut through the tangle of conflicting jurisdictions with regard to the disputed status of the Latin archbishopric of Tyre and the fact that the patriarch had to live in Acre, itself a suffragan see of the archbishop of Tyre.

In Constantinople, the involvement of the pope in the affairs of the Greek Church was very intense. Innocent III was 'forced' to 'interfere' in the affairs of the patriarchate, mainly due to the election of a Latin patriarch, in order to have control of the ecclesiastical affairs in Constantinople, a matter which has been considered in Chapter One. There are also many other examples in papal letters which prove the involvement of the pope. For instance, there was a letter sent on 25 April 1205, by Innocent III to all the clergy of Constantinople regarding the arrival of his *legatus a*

latere, Benedict of St Susanna, in which the pope gave instructions concerning their behaviour to the legate.²⁹⁸ Innocent ordered them to be generous and honour his legate and behave to him as they behaved to the pope himself. Benedict of St Susanna was also the papal legate who had the duty of replacing the Greeks who refused to obey to the Latins in Constantinople²⁹⁹ and in Achaea,³⁰⁰ a matter also discussed in Chapter One. Cardinal Benedict's main obligation was to negotiate and convince the Greeks to unite with the Roman Church, and during a meeting which took place in Constantinople, he represented the Latins in a debate with the Greeks.

In a theological discussion at the house of Thomas Morosini, the Latin patriarch, on 30 August 1206, Nicholas Messarites, the Greek spokesman, refused to recognise the authority of the Latin patriarch. The Greeks refused to accept someone who was ignorant of the Greek language as their patriarch, a representative of the pope, in addition to the differences regarding the use of leavened and unleavened bread in the sacrament of Eucharist.³⁰¹ Furthermore, during a debate on 29 September 1206, Benedict again referred to the legality of the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas Morosini, and he declared papal primacy. In the second debate on 2 October of the same year, he claimed once again that the pope was the successor of the Apostle Peter and that he supported the primacy of the Roman Church. John Messarites spoke on behalf of the Greeks and rejected the Latin view.³⁰² Benedict had other responsibilities as well, such as solving the problem concerning the division

²⁹⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no 77, p. 299

²⁹⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 91, pp. 317-20

³⁰⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 100, pp. 328-29

³⁰¹ A. Heisenberg, "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion" in *Quellen und Studien zur Spätbyzantinischen Geschichte*, London 1973, Part 1, pp. 18-25

³⁰² See other works of Messarites regarding the discussions about the union in A. Heisenberg, *Analecta. Mitteilungen aus italienischen Handschriften byzant. Chronographen*, Munich 1901, pp. 19-39; three letters in E. Kurtz, *Βυζαντινά Χρονικά*, 1906, pp. 389-91, A. P. Kerameus, "Νικόλαος Μεσσαρίτης", *Βυζαντινά Χρονικά*, 1904, pp. 389-91; A. Demetracopoulos, *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς ητοι περί των Ελλήνων των Γραψάντων κατά Λατίνων και περί των Συγγραμμάτων αυτών*, Leipzig 1872, p. 43

of the ecclesiastical properties between the Latin clergy of Constantinople and the crown. He was also empowered to resolve the problems between the Franks and the Venetians, the Greek and the Latin clergy of Constantinople, and to make a decision about the future of the Greek monasteries.

Apart from Benedict, there is evidence for many papal legates being sent to the Church of Constantinople during the period after 1204, to assent the pope's jurisdiction over the Latin patriarch. Peter Capuano, who was a legate attached to the crusade expedition, was appointed before 1204 and had been sent to Constantinople before Benedict. In 1204 he presided at a council which was held in the Church of Saint Sophia, where they discussed the union. John and Nicholas Messarites spoke on behalf of the Greeks and the papal legate represented the Latins. Peter Capuano underlined papal primacy and asked for the obedience of the Greeks. The Greeks' reply was negative, with John refusing to accept the obedience of the Greeks to the Latins, and the result of the synod was disappointing for the Latins.

According to a letter sent by Innocent III to all the clergy of Constantinople, Pelagius, the bishop of Albano, was appointed as a legate to the East on 30 August 1213.³⁰³ Clearly he was seen by the pope as something of a specialist on Eastern Mediterranean affairs. Pelagius's missions were to make peace between the Latin emperor of Constantinople and Theodore Lascaris, and more importantly, to effect the union of the Greek and Latin Churches. He participated in discussions regarding the union. The Greeks sent many letters complaining about him to the pope, and making it clear that they refused to accept any change of their dogma without the permission of an ecumenical council, and without the

³⁰³ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 210, pp.449-50

presence of the Greek patriarch. In other words, Pelagius adopted a strict approach with the Greeks and was responsible for a tough line towards the Greeks in Cyprus in 1220 and 1222. The point is this; the Latin bishops in Cyprus wanted to get the lay lords to pay tithes and gain control of secularised Greek Church property. The lay lords wanted to stop Greek serfs evading their servile status by getting ordained as priests. The question which arises is who actually wanted to subordinate the Greek Church? Not the lay lords, and if the Latin clergy did, why did they wait thirty years? So, the reduction of Greek bishoprics was the idea of the legate who had already antagonised the Greeks in Romania several years earlier. It must also be noted that the pope did interfere in the affairs of the Church of Constantinople, sometimes in favour of the Greeks, as exemplified in a letter from Innocent IV to his legate, Lawrence, the Franciscan, sent on 7 August 1247, where the pope was very protective towards the Greeks about the injuries of the Latins.³⁰⁴

The situation in Achaea was comparable to Constantinople. The pope often became involved in the affairs of the local church and sent legates. One example of this policy is the Church of Patras, which was under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, but the pope still intervened directly, just as in the Latin East. According to a letter sent on 31 August 1213, from Innocent III to the Prince of Achaea, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, the pope had sent his papal legate Pelagius to the Morea, in order to bring the Greeks back to the mother church, the Roman Church. The consequence of their return would be the increase of the prosperity of the Church and the creation of great achievements. Furthermore, in a letter sent on 4 March 1210, when Innocent talks about the Church of Corinth, he claims that he took the Church of Corinth under

³⁰⁴ *Acta Innocenti IV*, doc. no. 40, p. 84

his charge, like the shepherd his sheep, and led the Greeks back to the devotion of the Apostolic See and to the law.³⁰⁵

In another letter sent to the archbishop of Corinth on 22 May 1212, Innocent's control over the Church of the Morea is apparent, as he confirmed the privileges of the Church of Corinth and he made decisions regarding Greek ecclesiastical property.³⁰⁶

The pope's involvement in the affairs of the local church is obvious, even in the election of the hierarchy of the Morea, when on 17 July 1255, Pope Alexander nominated the bishop Modon as metropolitan bishop.³⁰⁷ The significance here is that in the thirteenth century the popes made more frequent appointments to bishoprics in the West rather allowing the local clergy to elect the bishop, usually with the active participation of the local secular ruler. The most blatant example of the involvement of the pope in the affairs of the Greek Church of Achaëa, took place during the papacy of Innocent III. A letter sent to the Latin archbishop of Patras on 19 September 1207, states that the Greek bishop of Zante (Zakynthos), who was under the see of Corinth, was living a scandalous private life and by being a rebel was not showing proper obedience to the Apostolic See. The pope complained about this and ordered the Latin archbishop of Patras to try and make the Greek bishop conform.³⁰⁸

The relationship between the Greek patriarch of Constantinople and the Greek archbishops, and the pope, and the Latin patriarch and archbishops

Concerning Constantinople, there is evidence to show that the relationship between the Greek patriarch, the Latin patriarch and the pope was not very friendly. The Greek

³⁰⁵ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 139, pp. 375-76

³⁰⁶ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 192, pp. 425-27

³⁰⁷ *Acta Alexandri IV*, ed. T. Haluskynskyj and M. Wojnar, *PCRCICO*, IV, ii, Rome 1962, doc. no. 15, p. 18

³⁰⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 104, pp. 333-34

patriarch, John Camateros, was forced into exile in Didymotichus after the conquest because he refused to obey the Latins. He then died there after a short stay, due to old age and exhaustion. His attitude towards the Latins is revealed in his correspondence with Pope Innocent III, some years before the conquest of Constantinople, “when in fact the breach between the two great churches was not final and when rapprochement was not yet next door to impossible.”³⁰⁹ Innocent’s first letter has been characterized as, “a theological commentary on *Tu es Petrus*... he notes that the Greeks are outside of the arc of salvation - the Roman Church - which they must hasten to enter.” Papadakis and Talbot continue and say that the second letter, “is even more elaborate and contains a lucid and strict demonstration of the primacy of the Roman See... and both letters are in reality an invitation to union...”³¹⁰ The first letter from the Greek patriarch to the pope talks about Innocent’s zeal for the union and papal primacy. The second letter from Camateros to Innocent III “is longer than the first ...it is a more elaborate exposition of Peter’s primacy and may be described as a Byzantine commentary on *Tu es Petrus* and in general most of his context is about the primacy.”³¹¹ The attitude of the Greek patriarch, Michael Autoreianos (1207-1213), towards the Roman Church was more hostile. He stayed in Nicaea but he sent letters of excommunication to the Greeks of Constantinople in order to prevent them obeying the Latins, thus keeping them in line with the Orthodox faith. Autoreianos was excommunicated by Pelagius, the papal legate.

His successor, Theodoros Eirinikos (1213-1215), maintained the same attitude and in a letter sent to the Greeks of Constantinople, he denied Latin authority and opposed

³⁰⁹ A. Papadakis-A. M. Talbot, “John X Camateros confronts Innocent III: an unpublished correspondence”, *Byzantinoslavica* 33, 1972, p. 29

³¹⁰ Papadakis-Talbot, “John X Camateros confronts Innocent III”, p. 30

³¹¹ Papadakis-Talbot, “John X Camateros confronts Innocent III”, pp. 30-31, 33-41

the papal legate.³¹² The Greek patriarch, Germanos, who is known for his letters to the Cypriots, the letter to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, and the letter to Pope Gregory, was elected in Nicaea in 1222. In the letter to the Latin patriarch, Germanos expressed his complaints about the behaviour of the Latins towards the Greeks, calling them tyrants. In addition, he excommunicated all the Greeks who showed obedience to Rome and called them betrayers of the holy canons and the Orthodox Faith.³¹³ In a lengthy letter sent to Pope Gregory IX in 1232, Germanos discusses the primacy of the pope, the schism, the sufferings of the Greek Cypriot because of the Latins and the presuppositions for the union. In a letter sent in the same year to the cardinals, he continues his efforts towards union as he talks again in detail about the union of the two Churches and the primacy of Peter.³¹⁴ The pope's reply is of a similar content, the schism and the dogmatic differences between the Greek and the Latin Church.³¹⁵

In addition to this correspondence, in 1234 discussions took place in Nicaea and Nymphaeum, where the Roman Church was represented by four friars. However, the relationship between the Roman and the Greek Church did not improve.³¹⁶ In addition to evidence regarding the attitude of the Greek patriarchs towards the Latins, there is also evidence about the attitude of the Greek high hierarchy towards the Latins. In Achaea there are many examples of Greeks who refused to obey to Latins, like the archbishop of Cephalonia,³¹⁷ as well as examples of Greeks who were reconciled with the Latins. For example, in a letter from Innocent III in 1210, about the Church of Corinth, we learn that

³¹² A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Θεόδωρος Ειρηνικός, Πατριάρχης Οικουμενικός ἐν Νίκαια", *Byzantische Zeitschrift*, 10, 1901, pp. 182-92

³¹³ Demetracopoulos, *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς*, pp. 40-3

³¹⁴ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 179a - b, pp. 240-52

³¹⁵ Sathas, vol. 2, pp. 46-49

³¹⁶ J. Gill, "An unpublished letter of Germanus," *Βυζάντιον* 44, 1974, p.139

³¹⁷ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 208, p. 447

Nicholas, the Greek archbishop of Corinth, turned the Greeks back to the obedience of the Apostolic See³¹⁸ and in a further letter sent to the archbishop of Thebes in 1212, Innocent talks about the devotion of the Greek abbots to their archbishop.³¹⁹

Moreover, an important issue concerning the relationship between the Greeks and Latins is Constantinople, relating to the death of the leader of the Greek Church as illustrated in a Greek text. In a letter sent by the bishops and the Greek clergy of Constantinople to Pope Innocent III in 1206-1207, after the death of their patriarch, the Greek hierarchy of Constantinople went to the Latin emperor, Henry, asking him to nominate a new patriarch. In this they were following their customary practice that dated back long before the arrival of the Latins. Henry responded by referring the Greeks to the pope.³²⁰ So the election of a patriarch changed after the Latin conquest and the Greeks of Constantinople were obliged to follow the Latin rules, as were the Greeks of Cyprus. After the death of John Camateros, the Greek clergy of Constantinople sent a letter to Innocent, asking for the right to elect their patriarch³²¹ but he refused. The Greeks elected Michael Autoreianos who lived in Nicaea. The second time, after the death of Autoreianos, the Greeks of Constantinople elected Theodoros Eirinikos as their new patriarch without reference to the Latins; instead they sought and received the permission of the Nicaean emperor.³²² In the Morea, however, there was no Greek archbishop as he, along with the higher clergy had preferred to remain in exile after the establishment of the Franks. As we have seen the Greek archbishop of Corinth turned the Greeks towards obeying the papacy. In

³¹⁸ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 139, pp. 375-76

³¹⁹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 189, p. 421

³²⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 22, p. 592

³²¹ J. B. Cotelerius, *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, Paris 1677-1692, p. 514

³²² Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Θεόδωρος Ειρηνικός ,πατριάρχης οικουμενικός εν Νίκαια", *Byzantine Zeitschrift* 10, 1901, pp. 182-92

other words a contradiction therefore arises. It is not known why the Greek bishops went into exile in the Morea and not in Cyprus. There is no information regarding whether there were Greek bishops resident in the Morea, and because of the lack of evidence we can only speculate.

Relations between the Church of Cyprus and the Latin Church

Relations until the *Bulla* in 1260

The involvement of the pope and his legates

With regard to Cyprus, it must be taken into consideration that in Cyprus, the Latin Church was directly subject to the papacy and not to any of the Eastern patriarchates. Information regarding papal legates in Cyprus can be drawn from various papal letters, an example of which refers to the activities of a papal legate in a section of one of Innocent III's letters. This letter, sent in 1204, suggests that there is evidence relating to the pope's involvement in the affairs of the local church and the presence of a papal legate. However, papal letters ordering clergy to do this were prevalent in Western Europe at the time. According to this letter to papal legate Peter Capuano, cardinal priest of St Marcello, the pope asked him when "those things among them that had to be corrected, you planted those things that you know to be useful for the glory of the divine name..."³²³ Peter Capuano also sent a letter in the same year to Alan, the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, and to the bishops of Paphos, Famagusta and Limassol, concerning matters which did not relate to the Greeks, but were matters for the local Latin Church.³²⁴ In general the letter provides evidence of low standards of behaviour among the Latin clergy.

³²³ *Acta Innocenti III*, doc. no. 42, pp. 243-44; *Synodicum*, p. 283

³²⁴ *Acta Innocenti III*, doc. no. 42, pp. 243-44; *Synodicum*, pp. 284-86

In addition to Peter Capuano, there are further examples of papal legates who came later to Cyprus, in order to help the pope succeed in his objective concerning the matters of the Greeks and some of the legates played a significant role in the development of the relationship between the two Churches in Cyprus. For example, the role of the papal legate, Pelagius, the bishop of Albano, during the agreements of 1220, was critical. Another important papal legate, who was sent in 1246 by Pope Innocent IV, was the Franciscan, Lawrence of Portugal. Lawrence's mission reflects a new, more conciliatory phase in the papal approaches to the eastern Christians. In 1241, the Mongols invaded Eastern Europe; they had already overrun Russia and they were soon to bring the Seljuk Turks of Anatolia under their suzerainty. In 1243, Innocent IV sent diplomatic missions to the Mongols, led by Dominican and Franciscan friars to elicit information about the Mongols. Lawrence's mission was an attempt to bring about reconciliation between the Latins and the eastern churches – Orthodox, Armenians, Jacobites – in the face of the Mongol threat. Lawrence's mission was part of the pope's response to this and his general policy in the eastern Christian areas. Lawrence came to Cyprus to defend the Greeks "from the injuries and harassment of the Latins and have the [Latins] make satisfaction to the [Greeks] for the damages and injuries already done restraining those who refuse, etc., with ecclesiastical censures, appeal put aside." "It is our intention... to defend them from the incursions of malicious men."³²⁵ Lawrence succeeded in his mission which suggested a more conciliatory approach by the papacy, and was sufficient to justify the claim that Innocent IV was more sensitive to the aspirations of the Greeks than Gregory IX, a policy which has been explained in another part of this chapter.

³²⁵ *Acta Innocenti IV*, doc. 35, pp 78-79; *Synodicum*, p. 301

Another papal legate was Eudes de Châteauroux, the legate in the crusade of St Louis and cardinal bishop of Tusculum. In his letter to Eudes on 21 July 1250, the pope's desire to bring the Greeks of Cyprus back to the Roman Church is apparent. He states that those Greeks, who obeyed the Apostolic See, could have their own customs and functions, with the provision that this was in conjunction with the Catholic faith, without endangering the souls of the faithful. His desire that any Greeks accepting papal supremacy should be welcomed is made obvious. Archbishop Neophytos and the other Greek bishops, who had submitted to Roman obedience had as part of their submission, had sent envoys to the pope with a petition to redress grievances.³²⁶ The third paragraph of the text concerns provisions which deal with the Greek envoys' requests and not what the pope was prepared to concede.

These requests were;

- (1) that the Greeks could have fourteen bishops, thereby overturning the 1222 agreements,
- (2-5) the most important request for the status of the church was that the Greek Church be subject only to pope and not to the local Latin clergy, thereby becoming a united Province,
- (6-7) tithes must not be exacted from the Greeks, a request which only affected certain clearly defined groups. (The Greek peasants on Latin estates did not pay tithes, and the Latin Church took a tenth of the Lord's income, not a tenth of the peasants' produce.)
- (8-10) that the Latin bishops do not have the right to hear judicial appeals but the Greeks should approach either the pope or the papal legate in the East, to

³²⁶ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. 74, pp. 130-32; *Synodicum*, pp. 302-04

whom they should promise obedience and who would, as part of his brief, protect the Greeks,

(11) that the more objectionable aspects of the 1220-1222 provisions be rescinded.

The conclusion concerning the above is that the Greek submission was conditional to these requests to the pope, and Eudes was instructed to consult with local clergy to see what needed to be accomplished. The priority of Eudes's mission to Cyprus seems to have been to get the Latin Church in line with papal decrees and canon law. He was not anti-Greek as such and presumably consulted the local Latin clergy, who had refused to consent to Greek demands.

Letters were sent by the pope to Eudes concerning the Greeks. In the first one, sent in 1254, the pope ordered Eudes to confirm the election of a Greek bishop in accordance with a request made to the pope by the Greeks. Eudes was obliged to ensure that the people showed the proper obedience to the new bishop.³²⁷ This letter shows that the Greek bishops did indeed accept papal superiority. The problem with the election as it is described here is that the candidate was in 'minor orders', i.e. a deacon not a priest, and the pope ruled that this was not canonical. Thus, the papal letter relating to the election of Germanos reveals that the pope and his legate were trying to help the Greeks against the opposition of the Latin clergy in Cyprus.

In a letter sent in 1254, Pope Innocent IV declared that the Greeks who obeyed the Apostolic See could have their own customs and rites, providing that they were in accordance with the Roman Church and did not imperil their souls. The overall tone of

³²⁷ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 103; *Synodicum* p. 306

this letter is that concessions had to be made to the Greeks and even where he insists that the Greeks should 'correct their practices', Innocent IV is careful to avoid polemic and unduly harsh condemnation.³²⁸ It is important to note that this letter remained in the Nicosia cathedral cartulary, despite the fact that it was addressed to the legate and not to the archbishop. Evidently it was a later member of the Latin clergy in Cyprus that decided it should be preserved. It may be assumed that every question raised in the letter arose because the Latin clergy in Cyprus complained that Greek practice was wrong.

There are two other texts from Cyprus that shed considerable light on Latin attitudes to the Greeks in the middle years of the thirteenth century. In 1249³²⁹ the legate, Eudes of Châteauroux, issued his 'Regulations or Institutions'. Most of this document is taken up with decrees for the Latin Church in the island which show that the legate found that standards were poor and reform badly needed. In what is the only reference to the Orthodox, the legate ordered that the Latins should show greater devotion to the local Greek saints: Barnabus, Epiphanius, Hilarion, Nicanor, Tychicos, Jason, Spyridon, Aymon, Alexander, Potamios and Nemesios – an instruction which, if followed, should have promoted better relations between Latins and Greeks. The other text is the 'Regulation by which the Excommunicates are Declared and Denounced, Recited in the Year 1251 in the Great Cemetery of the Nicosia Church',³³⁰ and this will be discussed in detail elsewhere in this dissertation.³³¹

The relationship between the Greek and Latin archbishops

In Cyprus, during the establishment of the Latin Church of Cyprus, after the death of Sophronios, the Greek archbishop of Cyprus, the Greek hierarchy and clergy, together

³²⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 93, pp. 238-44; *Synodicum*, pp. 307-11

³²⁹ *Synodicum*, pp. 160-73

³³⁰ *Synodicum*, pp. 154-57

³³¹ *Synodicum*, p. 161

with the lay leaders and with the permission of the Latin king of Cyprus, Aimery of Lusignan, elected Esaias as their new archbishop (1197 x 1205).³³² It is worth mentioning that Aimery was exercising the function that had formerly belonged to the emperor. Along with Sophronios and Esaias, there were another three Greek archbishops in Cyprus prior to the publication of the *Bulla Cypria*, which abolished the institution of the Greek archbishopric. The Greek archbishops of Cyprus were the following; Ilarion or Simeon, Neophytos, and Germanos, the last Greek archbishop of the island during the Frankish rule.³³³

There is not much documentation tracing the relations between the Latin and Greek archbishops of Cyprus. There is no information regarding Ilarion, bringing his existence into question. There is however, evidence about the relationship between Germanos and the Latin archbishop, Hugh of Fagiano, who was “a zealous reformer rather than a jealous bigot” as, after the decrees of Eudes of Châteauroux, which were a serious indictment of the Latin Church under Eustorge, the next archbishop had to be a reformer. Hugh had good reasons to desire changes because of the laxity and slackness of the Latin Church. His regulations express “concern for the spiritual righteousness and morality of the population and clergy...”³³⁴ and it was his actions that led to the establishment of the *Bulla Cypria*.

There are also sources regarding the Greek archbishop, Neophytos, who was the Greek archbishop during the ‘martyrdom’ of the thirteen monks of Kantara. According to a letter from Neophytos to the Greek emperor, John Vatatzis, it is

³³² *Συνταγμα Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ου}-15^{ου} αιώνας*, pp. 119-21

³³³ V. Laurent, “La succession episcopale des derniers archevêques de Chypre”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 8, 1949, pp. 33-41

³³⁴ *Synodicum*, p. 64

apparent that the event with the monks had caused troubles for Neophytos and relationships within the Greek Church, making the situation between the Greeks and the Latins even worse. In this letter, the Cypriot archbishop complained about the actions of the Greek patriarch. Neophytos protested against the intervention of Germanos in matters concerning the autocephalous of the Greek Church of Cyprus.³³⁵ As a consequence, Germanos sent a letter giving orders and advice to the Greeks.³³⁶ The Greek patriarch advised the Cypriots to comply superficially, in order to be saved from ‘threatened psychological ruin.’ In other words, they had to show patience and stoically endure.³³⁷ Furthermore, Neophytos denied Germanos’s accusation that he was responsible for the martyrdom of the thirteen monks. He in turn accused Germanos of being responsible for the events in question. He was the one who, in 1222-1223, had urged the Greeks to be tolerant and yield towards the Latins, but after the ‘martyrdom’ of 1231, he sent a letter to Gregory IX complaining about the execution of the thirteen monks who he referred to as ‘soldiers of Christ.’ Thus a change in the patriarch’s attitude can be observed.

Germanos’s behaviour was becoming increasingly anti-Latin. In this letter he also accused the Latins of being tyrannical in their illegal rule.³³⁸ Therefore it is possible to conclude that the Greeks were not united regarding their policy towards the Latins. It seems that some Greeks of Cyprus were prepared to cooperate with the Latins, while the Greeks away from the island urged a hard line.

³³⁵ *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος}-15^{ος}*, pp. 129-30; K. Hadjipsaltis, “Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου και το έν Νίκαια Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο Αρχόμενου του ΙΓ’ μχ Αιώνος”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 15, 1951, pp. 157-58

³³⁶ *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος}-15^{ος}*, pp. 121-26

³³⁷ *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος}-15^{ος}*, p. 124

³³⁸ *Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος}-15^{ος}*, pp. 126-29

Neophytos did not accept the patriarch's jurisdiction and in another letter sent to John Vatatzis alleges that the Greek patriarch had been influenced by some Cypriots, against whom Neophytos had imposed canonical punishment. Afterwards in their effort to avenge themselves against Neophytos, these Cypriots reported him to the pope.³³⁹ Neophytos's attitude concerning the event with the monks of Kantara, is also evident some years later, on 9 April 1240, in a letter sent to King Henry I of Cyprus and the Greek higher clergy by Pope Gregory IX, from which we learn that the Greek archbishop refused to obey the Latins and he went into self-imposed exile in Armenia with the valuables of the Church.³⁴⁰

Another relevant issue, in addition to the relationship between the Greek and Latin archbishops, which should be examined, is the relationship between the popes and the archbishops. It is apparent from papal correspondence concerning Cyprus, that successive popes had a very close relationship with the Latin archbishops, regarding matters which dealt not only with the Latins but also with the Greeks. For instance, Pope Gregory IX seems to have been hard-line as he wrote to the Latin archbishop of Cyprus, Eustorge, in 1240, that the Latin archbishop of Nicosia should assign the monasteries of the Greeks fleeing from Cyprus because of heresy to Latins. According to the text, Eustorge had "received command that you make it understood to all bishops subject to you that they should not in any way permit any Greek priest to celebrate Mass in their dioceses unless he has abjured every heresy." The Greek archbishop and bishops read the commands,

"and they tried hard to block your procedure but because they were not able to rely on their vanity and before the day fixed for them, they left the confines of your province in secret along with Greek abbots, monks, and superior priests when the monasteries and churches in which they were living had been stripped

³³⁹ P. Gounaridis, "Η Διήγησις του Μαρτυρίου των μοναχών της Καντάρας και η εκκλησία της Κύπρου", *Πρακτικά του Δεύτερου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου Β' Μεσαιωνικόν Τμήμα*, 1986, p. 323

³⁴⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. nos. 71, 72, 73, 74 pp. 177-84

of all their goods...while said Greek archbishop threatened with a sentence of excommunication the rest of the Greek abbots, monks and priest who remained in that province if they obeyed the Apostolic command,”

in addition, the “Greeks who remain, if they should refuse to yield to the commands of the Apostolic See,”³⁴¹ they would have been expelled from the borders of their province.

In a further letter sent to Eustorge in 1246, this time by Pope Innocent IV, the problem of heresy was addressed, a very significant problem concerning the Greeks. The pope was worried because some Greek monks refused to accept the Church’s commands, and he accused them of shameful behaviour and assisting other Greeks damned with heresy.³⁴²

Moreover, it must be noted that a great majority of the surviving papal letters about Cyprus, are addressed to the papal legates, to the Latin hierarchy or to the secular authority and only very few to the Greeks themselves. There is a genuine problem in knowing what proportion of the pope’s letters were copied into the registers. For example, scholars believe that only a small number were copied for Innocent III’s reign. It is possible, but of course un-provable, that a disproportionately small number of letters addressed to Greeks were enregistered. An example is a letter sent by Pope Innocent IV, to the Greek bishops of Cyprus, and to the papal legate, Eudes of Châteauroux, on 20 December 1251. Innocent addressed the Greek bishops of the island, stating that, “we concede to your fraternity the full and free faculty of freely exercising your right to place in authority over you a worthy person as archbishop and pastor.”³⁴³ Another letter which does not appear in Alexander IV’s register, but in the *Cartulary* and sent some years later, adopted a different tone. Sent by Pope Alexander IV, to the Greek and Latin bishops of Cyprus, a few years before the establishment of the *Bulla Cypria*, on 13 January 1255, the pope ordered the Greeks to obey to the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, “to show

³⁴¹ *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, doc. no. 262, pp. 341-43; *Synodicum*, p. 297-98

³⁴² *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 30, pp. 71-72; *Synodicum*, pp. 300-01

³⁴³ *Acta Innocentii IV*, doc. no. 79-80; *Synodicum*, p. 304

obedience and reverence due to the same archbishop as your metropolitan, to observe and have observed by your subjects his justly applied sentences and to assist him and his church favourably in their needs.”³⁴⁴ Three other remaining letters sent to the Greeks by the pope are: the letter from Pope Innocent IV, to the abbot and monks of the Greek monastery of St. Margaret of Agros, sent in 1243, the letter from Pope Boniface VIII to Leo, the bishop-elect of Solea, in 1301, and the text of the *Bulla*, which was sent to the people of Cyprus.³⁴⁵

It is also necessary to examine the relationship between the pope and the Greek hierarchy. The pope asked obedience from the Greeks when the Latin Church was established. A letter from Celestine III on 13 January 1197, to Alan, the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, stated that all Christians, Latins, as well as Greeks, must “show the required obedience and reverence to you and to take care to comply with your healthy warnings and precepts, putting aside any opposition.”³⁴⁶

Relations after the *Bulla*

The involvement of the pope and his legates

The *Bulla Cypria* reveals the most significant involvement of the pope in the affairs of the Greek Church of Cyprus and is one of the most important sources from which information can be drawn, concerning the relationship between the Greek and the Latin Churches in Cyprus during the Frankish era. It is thus necessary to consider the circumstances in which Pope Alexander IV published the *Bulla*. In 1251, during the papacy of Innocent IV, Germanos was elected as the Greek archbishop of the island,

³⁴⁴ *Cartulary* doc. no. 7, pp. 84-85; *Synodicum*, p. 311

³⁴⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, 78, pp. 273-74, 194-203; *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, ed. F. M. Delorme and A. L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, vol. 11, doc. no. 132, pp. 219-21; *Synodicum*, pp. 299, 311-20, 333-39

³⁴⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 3, pp. 78-80; *Synodicum*, pp. 281-283

and his desire was to have authority over the Greek bishops.³⁴⁷ During the papacy of Alexander IV, Germanos and the Latin archbishop, Hugh of Fagiano, had come into conflict over the status of the Greek archbishop. Germanos insisted that Hugh had no authority over the Greeks, even though he knew that this was untrue as, at the request of the Greeks, this matter had not been accepted by the pope.³⁴⁸ According to the *Bulla*, the Greek archbishop did not want to obey to the Latin archbishop of the island, so the two archbishops of Cyprus excommunicated each other. Germanos then went to Rome and made a complaint to the pope. Alexander published the *Bulla* as a result of the demands of the Greek archbishop, who asked for his protection and for the establishment of an arrangement which would solve the problem. Bearing in mind the conditions under which the *Bulla* was issued, it can be characterized more as the pope's participation, than his involvement or interference. The publication of the *Bulla* was more of a necessity and a result of the actions of the Greek archbishop of the island, than the active intervention of the pope in the affairs of the Greeks. Alexander therefore can be seen to have been coerced into making a decision, resulting in the publication of the *Bulla*.

Pope Alexander's involvement in the domestic affairs of the Greek Church of Cyprus is obvious from the *Bulla's* first provision, which concerns the reduction of the number of Greek bishops, and was part of the agreements of 1222. The important point here is why the *Bulla* should repeat the same matter and when the change took place. It appears that this provision was not implemented after the agreements of 1222, as it is repeated here. According to Schabel, "we have no idea how the change took place, but probably when the Greek bishops of Solea, Arsinoe and Karpasia died,

³⁴⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 195-203: *Synodicum*, p. 311-20

³⁴⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 195-203: *Synodicum*, p. 311-20

they were either replaced after a new election, or other living bishops were transferred to their seats. With Lefkara and Limassol, the situation is more problematic, because these apparently had never been official seats before the Frankish period. At any rate, by 1260 only four Greek seats remained, although in addition to these four the Greeks had been allowed to elect Germanos Peisimandros as archbishop after the death of Neophytos in the early 1250s.”³⁴⁹ Moreover, Schabel correctly adds that it is not clear if all four bishops and Germanos went to Rome but, by 1260, only three bishops were present and the see of Arsinoe was vacant. The publication of the *Bulla Cypria* was witnessed by Germanos and bishops Nilos of Solea, Joachim of Karpasia, and Matthew of Lefkara. Nilos filled the vacant seat of Arsinoe, enabling Germanos to gain the more significant seat of Solea. In 1260 there were four bishops; Germanos of Solea (also archbishop of Cyprus), Nilos of Arsinoe, Matthew of Lefkara, and Joachim of Karpasia.³⁵⁰ There is no evidence regarding the disappearance of other sees. In Schabel’s opinion, after the death of their Greek bishops, they did not elect others and the see disappeared.

The reduction of the Greek sees was specified in the agreements of 1220-1222 and confirmed by the *Bulla*. It is not the only provision which illustrates the involvement of the pope and his attempts to control the Greek Church of Cyprus. Other terms of the agreements of 1220-1222 included the consecration of the Greek bishops, the oath of obedience, the legal cases and the terms, which refer in particular to the Greek archbishop of Cyprus. These prove the efforts of pope to participate in the Greeks’ affairs and his great desire to control them. However it must be emphasized, that in Cyprus, “almost the entire population was Orthodox and there had been a full

³⁴⁹ C. Schabel, “The Greek bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340 and the Synodikon Kyprion”, *Κοπριακές Σπουδές*, 144-145, 2003, p. 218

³⁵⁰ Schabel, “The Greek bishops of Cyprus”, pp. 218-19

Orthodox hierarchy at the time of the Latin conquest,” contrary to the kingdom of Jerusalem where, “the Orthodox were only found in certain areas, and in many parts of the patriarchate there had been no Orthodox bishops at the time of the first crusade.”³⁵¹ Of course with regard to this point, it must be emphasized that it cannot be proved that all fourteen bishoprics had bishops in 1191, perhaps some of them were already moribund. There is no information as to which of the fourteen Greek bishoprics had bishops in the period 1192-1222 or 1222-1260. The conclusion is that in Cyprus, the pope’s efforts cannot be considered unnatural or unreasonable, since this allowed him better control of the Greeks and, subsequently, to assimilate the Cypriots into the Latin tradition. There were Latins who believed in the real unification of the two Churches, where they would be “one heart and one soul” creating a nation that would worship their common Father and say they belonged to Christ. The differences in customs would in no way prevent the unity of faith.

The election of the Greek bishops

In accordance with the *Bulla Cypria*, the pope also decided that after the death of a Greek bishop, another cleric should be elected and the Latin bishop should confirm the election. The new bishop would be responsible for the care of the Greek-rite churches, monasteries, and the clergy throughout the diocese;³⁵² additionally the pope allowed the Greek bishops to be ordained using the Greek-rite, and not the Latin-rite, and the other Greek bishops were to perform the ceremony.³⁵³ In other words, the Greek bishop would be a sort of ‘assistant bishop’ in the diocese.

³⁵¹ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p. 184

³⁵² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 194-203; *Synodicum* p. 315; G. Ioannides, “La Constitutio o Bulla Cypria Alexandri Papae IV del Barberinianus graecus 390”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 2, 2000, p. 361; “Constitutio Cypria Alexandri Papae IV”, in *PG*, vol. 140, col. 1545

³⁵³ *Cartulary* doc. no. 78, pp. 194-203; *Synodicum*, p. 315

Although the election of the Greek bishops in Constantinople and Achaëa is a very important topic, the lack of evidence merely allows us to offer speculation which leads to the assumption that the election took place in areas which were not under Latin rule, as it is well-known that most of the Greeks of Constantinople and Achaëa had abandoned their sees at the time of the Latin conquest.

Concerning the case of Cyprus, the Greek clergy of the diocese, the Latin bishop and the candidate were allowed to take part in the election. The new bishop would be responsible for the care of the Greek-rite churches, monasteries and the clergy throughout the diocese. The pope also allowed the Greek bishops to be ordained using the Greek-rite, and not the Latin rite and so other Greek bishops were to perform the ceremony.³⁵⁴ In other words, the Greek bishop would be a sort of ‘assistant bishop’ in the diocese.

Although the Greeks had the right to select and consecrate their own bishops, the Latin bishop of the diocese had the right to decide which candidate was suitable. He could intervene directly to appoint a Greek bishop, if the Greeks delayed making their choice. The Latin bishops, however, did not have the right to appoint Greek bishops unless special circumstances prevailed such as when those who were supposed to elect someone to the position acted negligently and the electors failed to complete the election within three months. In that case at the time when the archbishop of Nicosia was absent from the island, the Latin bishop should not have the power of appointing to the vacant church anyone except a Greek person who corresponded in merit to the great dignity and burden of the office.³⁵⁵

³⁵⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 194-203; *Synodicum*, p. 315; G. Ioannides, “La Constitutio o Bulla Cypria Alexandri Papae IV del Barberinianus graecus 390”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 2, 2000, p. 361; “Constitutio Cypria Alexandri Papae IV” in *PG*, vol. 140, col. 1545

³⁵⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum*, p. 316

The case of Leo, bishop elect of Solea, which will be examined in detail further on in this chapter, is an example which illustrates the involvement of the Latin bishop in the election of the suitable candidate which took place after the publication of the *Bulla Cypria*. According to a letter sent in 1301 from Pope Boniface VIII to Leo, when the Church of Solea became vacant after the death of Neophytos, there were three candidates. Three elections were conducted: the first of Leo, canonically, the second of Theodore and the third of Joachim. The vicar of the Latin archbishop, Berard, chose Leo causing Theodore and Joachim to appeal to the Apostolic See against the vicar. All the candidates produced documents and arguments and the bishop of Tusculum asked some questions. Leo was charged with inadequate knowledge, he was examined by two monks of the monastery of Cryptaferrat in the literacy and the chant of the Greeks. The process continued and finally Leo became the new bishop of Solea.³⁵⁶

In addition to the information contained in the *Bulla Cypria* about the consecration of the Greek bishop, we can draw upon two Cypriot texts from Palatinus codex 367, first edited by the Cypriot historian, Hadjipsaltis, and the latest new edition by Alexander Beihammer which contains information pertinent to the thirteenth century. It is important to underline that these two texts illustrate that the terms of the *Bulla Cypria* had been implemented and that the Greeks had followed the instructions of the Latins regarding the election of Greek bishops.

The first text describes the election of the Greek bishop of Amathus, Olvianos. After the death of the Greek bishop, Mathew of Amathus, the other Greek bishops of Cyprus and the

³⁵⁶ *Synodicum*, pp. 333 - 39

clergy of the Amathus diocese, in the presence of the Latin bishop of Limassol Berard decided on the election of the new bishop. The new bishop had to have moral integrity and a pure life. According to the text, Berard gave an order to the Greek cleric to choose another bishop. After much consideration, together with the participation of some important nobles of the area and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, hymns the Greek cleric selected Olvianos as the suitable candidate.³⁵⁷

The second text is about the election of bishop Germanos of Amathus. According to the Latin bishop of Limassol Berard and the Greek clergy followed the same process in order to elect Germanos as the new bishop of Amathus.³⁵⁸

Furthermore, in both cases the Greek bishops had to give an oath of obedience to the Latins, which was one of the changes introduced by the *Bulla*. Moreover the Greek bishops who were summoned by the Latin bishop for participation in the election of the Greek bishop were obliged to proceed with and not delay the election thus fulfilling their duties. Matters such as the translation or resignation of the Greek bishops had to be referred to the Holy See, which had the right to make a decision³⁵⁹ as was the case with the Latin bishops in the West.

Returning to the oath of obedience, the text of the *Bulla Cypria* stipulated that the Greek bishops of Cyprus promised faith and obedience to Saint Peter, the Holy Roman Church, and the archbishop of Cyprus, Hugh and his successor. They also promised to protect the Latin archbishop and his successors and they would “assist in

³⁵⁷ A. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, no. 94, pp. 226-27

³⁵⁸ A. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, no. 104, pp. 236-37

³⁵⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum*, p. 137

defending and maintaining the papacy of the Roman Church and the Episcopal primacy of the Nicosia Church and the rules of the Holy fathers against all men...³⁶⁰

The Latin bishops would receive the oath from the Greek bishop of their diocese and if they realised that the election was invalid, he had the right “to proceed to its annulment just as he should proceed by law.”³⁶¹ The Greek priests and deacons who refused to obey the Roman Church would be excommunicated. This would also apply if they refused to accept the Latin Church as the head of all the churches and refuse to show obedience to the Roman Church.³⁶²

In Alexander Beihammer’s book there are two texts that describe the process of the ordination according to the rules of the *Bulla Cypria*. According to the text with the permission of the nobles and the cleric of the two Holy Churches (the Latin and the Greek Church) the consecration of the Greek archbishop of Nicosia took place in the presence of the Latin king of Cyprus, Hugh. According to the text he had all the power “του λύειν και δεσμεύειν και διοικείν και πράττειν άπαντα νόμον και κατά κανόνα άπερ και αυτός ενεργεί και διοικεί και πράττει χωρίς και μόνη την χειροτονία των ιερέων και διακόνων”.³⁶³

Later sources

A later writer, Etienne de Lusignan, who lived in Cyprus during the Venetian period stated that the “bishops were to be elected by a Royal Council, and they had to be accepted by the king, then they had to go to the Latin bishop, to whom they owed

³⁶⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 198-199; *Synodicum*, pp. 315-16

³⁶¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum*, p. 138

³⁶² *Synodicum*, p. 138

³⁶³ A. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, no. 43, pp. 194-95

obedience and if all of them would not find any further obstacle they had to reconfirm it, and they had to install it and this instalment is made in this way.” Etienne de Lusignan describes this procedure in detail in his *Chronography*. He raises a different issue, the question of royal confirmation and the procedure which was new under Venetian rule. As a vicar of Limassol himself, he described how he had witnessed the confirmation of the bishop of Lefkara. He continued his description by stating that after the bishop of Lefkara had been elected, the confirmation of his election went to the king and subsequently the bishop’s office. He took office but when there was no king, the confirmation of his election went to Venice and in order not to make the people suffer during that interval and the bishop was given his office. However, his consecration was officially made only when the confirmation from Venice had arrived. When they wanted to install the bishop in his city, first of all they prepared the documents for the election in scripts and when he was elected according to the law and without any fraud the Latin bishop, or his vicar in absentia, went to the Greek cathedral and entered the main altar and he called there also the clerks in minor orders of this bishopric, who were twenty-nine in number and who could enter there.

Etienne de Lusignan described how the Greeks kept their altar covered or locked and they only entered after the first tonsure. Therefore, when the twenty-nine had entered, the Latin bishop called them secretly one by one and made them swear on the open Holy Gospels, asking them if they knew any fault of their future bishop, and also asked if they believed that the bishop was able to perform his task, and if they recognised him as their bishop and they gave the oath of obedience.³⁶⁴

³⁶⁴ Lusignan’s *Chorography and Brief General History of the Island of Cyprus (A.D 1573)*, ed. P N Wallace – A G Orphanides, vol. 5, Nicosia 2001, p.42

It is very important to mention that Etienne de Lusignan referred to the *Bulla Cypria* many years after it was published and he said that it was functioning. More specifically, he said there were many other laws in the *Bulla Cypria*, which I will now omit in order to be brief, except for these: each year the Greek bishop had to recognise the Latin bishop as his superior. He had to give him some presents as recognition of all the things that he had received from his priests and deacons, and from other churches which gave presents not only to the Latin bishops, but also to the canons and other persons in the hierarchy.³⁶⁵

Conclusions

I have presented the election as it is described by Etienne de Lusignan as it is very important to emphasise two things. Firstly, he had personal experience of the ceremony and the details he supplies are very useful. Secondly, despite the fact that it is not a contemporary source, it is important as it shows us that they followed the terms of the *Bulla Cypria* many years after its publication.

Details about the election of the Greek bishops are also to be found in a letter of the Greek patriarch of Nicaea, Germanos (1222-1240) to the Greek Church of Cyprus. A very significant detail according to this letter is the following; “χείρας χερσίν εμβάλειν ιερατικά τους ημετέρους λατινικαίες. Τούτο γαρ είναι τοις επηρεασταίς εχέγγυον ασφαλές, δουλωτικής εμπραγμασίαν υποκλήσεως”³⁶⁶ It is an important detail as this action is what caused the anger of the Greek patriarch because he believed it was an act of subordination to the Latins.

³⁶⁵ Lusignan’s *Chorography and Brief General History of the Island of Cyprus (A.D 1573)*, ed. P N Wallace – A G Orphanides, vol. 5, Nicosia 2001, p. 43

³⁶⁶ Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος} – 15^{ος}, ed. V. Neranzi-Varmazi, Nicosia 1996, pp. 123-24

A later source from the fourteenth century is also significant, that of a letter of Joseph Bryennios. I will outline some of the important points regarding the matter very briefly. Bryennios lists the terms of the *Bulla Cypria* and accuses the Cypriots of obedience to the Latins. He talks about the oath the Greek bishops gave to them. Regarding the consecration he said that the Latin bishop asked the Greek bishop if he obeyed the Latin Church and that the Greek bishop bent his head on the Latin's knee. Moreover he referred to the consecration of the Greek bishop.³⁶⁷

In conclusion, the significant points regarding the election of the Greek bishops are that the *Bulla* was enforced and the Greek clergy accepted a role for the Latin bishop. However on at least one occasion when there was a disputed election, the Greek clergy turned to the pope for judgement. The sources I have studied all present a similar viewpoint.

The oath of obedience

In a letter sent to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, by Innocent III in 1208, there is a reference to the oath of obedience which the Greeks gave to the Latins. The oath is a much-debated issue by modern historians who propose that the oath was a Latin effort to subordinate the Greek Church, contrary to Runciman, who claims that the pope was trying to help the Greeks, and the only thing which he demanded from the Greek bishops was for them to give the oath.³⁶⁸ The oath of obedience was very common in the medieval West too, as the Latin priests used to give an oath of obedience to the pope.

³⁶⁷ Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινών Πηγών Κυπριακής Ιστορίας 4^{ος} – 15^{ος}, pp. 185-99.

³⁶⁸ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p. 172

In Cyprus, the text of the oath that Greek bishops were obliged to give the Latins is part of the text of the *Bulla Cypria*. According to this oath, the Greek bishops of Cyprus promised faith and obedience to Saint Peter, the Holy Roman Church, and the archbishop of Cyprus, Hugh, and his successor. They also promised to protect the Latin archbishop and his successors, and they would, “assist in defending and maintaining the papacy of the Roman Church and the episcopal primacy of the Nicosia church and the rules of the Holy fathers against all men...” and they were obliged to go to the synods, and to help and respect the legates of the Apostolic See.³⁶⁹ The Latin bishops would receive the oath from the Greek bishops of their dioceses and if they realized that the election was invalid, he had the right ‘to proceed to its annulment just as he should proceed by law.’³⁷⁰ The Greek priests and deacons who refused to obey the Roman Church would be excommunicated. This would also apply if they refused to assert the Latin Church as the head of all the Churches and refuse to show obedience to the Roman Church.³⁷¹ This also occurred in Constantinople. The Greek bishops had to swear an oath of obedience to the Roman Church, Pope Innocent III and his successors. Furthermore, they promised to defend the Roman Church from its enemies, go to the councils and assist the papal legates.³⁷² In addition to the oath that the Greek bishops had to give the Latins, there were other kinds of oaths given by the Greeks to the Latins. Concerning Achaea, there is no evidence of an oath of obedience given by Greek bishops to the Latins. This is to be expected as the Greek bishops, and the Greek high hierarchy, had left after the conquest by the Franks and as there was no Greek hierarchy, there was no oath.

³⁶⁹ *Cartulary* doc. no. 78, pp. 198-99; *Synodicum* pp. 315-16; Hadjipsaltis, “Εκ της Ιστορίας της Κύπρου κατά την Φραγκοκρατία”, p.18

³⁷⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum* p. 316

³⁷¹ *Synodicum*, p. 155

³⁷² *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 109, p. 341

There is also no evidence regarding the ordination of the Greek priests in Achaea. It can only be assumed that they went to other places to be ordained or they were ordained by the Greek bishops who had remained in Greece.

Legal cases

Before examining the presentation of the legal cases in Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople, it is necessary to establish the difference between secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In the Western Church, the ecclesiastical courts would try:

- 1) anything to do with faith (for instance accusations of heresy),
- 2) disputes over wills,
- 3) accusations of perjury,
- 4) disputes over marriage, divorce and accusations of illegitimacy,
- 5) accusations of adultery and homosexuality.

Other matters, for example criminal cases and disputes over property, belonged to the secular court. The clergy of the Orthodox Church continued to exercise jurisdiction over the Orthodox population in spiritual matters in Cyprus under the Latins, but the question arises as to whether Greek secular tribunals operated or whether all secular matters were dealt with in the royal courts. In the Holy Land, Jewish and Muslim courts operated under Latin rule for matters of faith and secular disputes within their respective communities. In Cyprus, for legal cases that belonged to the ecclesiastical tribunals and involved two Greeks, the case had to be tried at the Greek ecclesiastical court, but if the case involved a Greek and a Latin, then it had to go to the local Latin bishop in order to solve the differences and if necessary, to the Latin archbishop of Cyprus.³⁷³ Surviving documents from the Greek codex Palatinus 367 from 1306,

³⁷³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum* p. 316

present a decision made in the ecclesiastical courts of Nicosia and Solea. The decision refers to a marriage of two Greeks, Theodora and Thomas, whose case was judged in a Greek court where the sentence adhered to the Byzantine legal tradition. According to Hadjipsaltis, it was based on the laws of the Greek emperor, Leon VI the Wise. The importance of this document stems from the fact that it reveals the Latins of Cyprus allowing the Greeks to keep their legal traditions.³⁷⁴ Regarding the city and diocese of the Latin bishop, he had legal jurisdiction over the Greeks. The Latin archbishop and his bishops had every right to punish the Greeks of their dioceses canonically for offences or injuries to their churches or their people.

In other words, the Greeks were subject to the jurisdiction of the Latin prelates and did not have the same privilege of liberty as the Latins.³⁷⁵ There is no evidence about legal cases involving the Greeks in Constantinople or in the Crusader states. Hamilton argues that there was no legal equality between the Greeks and the Latins, the only exception being the Greeks who accepted the Latin rite. The Orthodox had their own courts and they judged cases according to their own traditional laws and customs. Only in cases involving Orthodox and Latins, were they obliged to go to the Latin courts.³⁷⁶

The relationship between the Greek and Latin archbishops

The *Bulla* has some terms which refer specifically to the Greek archbishop, Germanos. According to the *Bulla*, Germanos should be the last Greek archbishop and after his death, no other would be ordained as Greek archbishop.³⁷⁷ Moreover, he had jurisdiction only

³⁷⁴ K. Hadjipsaltis, "Εκκλησιαστικά Δικαστήρια επί Φραγκοκρατία", *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 98, 1956, pp. 25-33

³⁷⁵ *Cartulary* doc. no. 78, p. 199; *Synodicum* p. 316

³⁷⁶ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 161-62

³⁷⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 200-01; *Synodicum* p. 318

over the Greek churches in the Nicosia diocese and not over the Greek Churches elsewhere.³⁷⁸ This is a critical point as it meant that the Latins in Cyprus were going to put an end to the existence of a Greek archbishopric, thus changing the structure of the Greek Church in Cyprus. Not having a Greek archbishopric was a Latin move to bring the Greek Church of Cyprus closer to the Roman Church. Without an archbishopric, the Greek Church would find it more difficult to function as a unit, so the Latins would be able to exert greater control over its day to day affairs.

In Cyprus, apart from the previous term of the *Bulla*, the Latins decided to change the see of the Greek archbishop,

“the same Archbishop Germanos does not roam without a fixed see we have...absolved said Nilos, the bishop of the Greeks that is in Solea of the Nicosia diocese ...by transferring him to the episcopal see of the Greeks at Arsinoe of the Paphos diocese, which is now vacant and by giving him leave to go over to that see freely. With the same power we commit ...to said Archbishop Germanos, to be governed with the title and honor of the archiepiscopal rank which always retain. Nevertheless, we want the Greek church of Saint Barnabas of Nicosia to belong to the same see as perpetual benefice of this arrangement, so that Germanos is free to stay either in the said see of Solea or at the church of his pleasure.”³⁷⁹

This term of the *Bulla* has mostly been viewed in a negative light by Greek historians.³⁸⁰ After the death of Germanos, there would no Greek archbishop, simply a Greek bishop would be proposed as a substitute in the see of Solea, whenever it was vacant and he would be subject to the archbishop of Nicosia, as the other Greek bishops were subject to the Latins bishops of their diocese.³⁸¹ Behind the diplomatic phrasing of the *Bulla*, what was happening was that Germanos was, like the other

³⁷⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 194-203; *Synodicum* p.318

³⁷⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, p.201; *Synodicum*, p. 318

³⁸⁰ See P. I. Kirimitsis, “Η ορθόδοξος εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 47, 1983, 3-108; C. P. Kypris “Η Οργάνωση της Ορθοδόξου εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους δύο πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας”, *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Μελετών της Ιεράς Μονής Κόκκου*, 1993, 149-185

³⁸¹ *Cartulary* doc. no. 78, p. 201; *Synodicum* p. 318

three Orthodox bishops, being reduced to the level of an assistant bishop in the Nicosia diocese with responsibility for the Greek-rite churches and abbeys, and as a face-saving device, being permitted to keep the entirely honorific title of “archbishop”. In practice, he was demoted; the title “archbishop” was meaningless.

The division of power between the Greek Church and the Latin Church is an issue of paramount importance concerning the relationship between the Greek and the Latin archbishop. Regarding Cyprus, there is a term in the text of the *Bulla Cypria* which refers to this matter. Due to its great value, it will be presented in its original form,

“...every jurisdiction over the Greeks (except the person of the aforesaid Archbishop Germanos) of the city and diocese of Nicosia that this ordinance has conceded to the other Latin bishops of the aforesaid kingdom over the Greek bishops, clerics, and other of their cities and dioceses. But although until the same Archbishop Germanos resigns or dies we want his person to be exempt from the power of the Latin archbishop, nevertheless the same Archbishop Germanos shall make a profession and oath of obedience to the Latin archbishop in the name of the see of Solea that has been committed to him, ... so that the observance of the present arrangement begins with him. But we do not want the Latin archbishop to have, on the basis of this profession of obedience the faculty of punishment over the person of the same Archbishop Germanos or of enjoying anything on him in any case whatsoever, so that he may enjoy undisturbed the full freedom of exemption that this ordinance has conceded to his person alone. But if there should be an appeal against the aforesaid Germanos, archbishop of the Greeks, it shall be appealed to the Latin archbishop, without disregarding the prerogatives of the Apostolic See.”³⁸²

A useful example, which is not very well known and delineates the power of the Latin archbishop over the Greek bishops and generally over the Greek Church of Cyprus during the Frankish era, is an event which took place between 1282 and 1286, when Ranulph was the Latin archbishop of the Church of Cyprus. According to a letter written by Boniface VIII and sent to Henry of Gibelet, archdeacon of Nicosia, in 1296,

“...Ranulph of good memory, archbishop of Nicosia, had brother Neophytos, bishop of Solea, his suffragan, rashly arrested, not without handling him violently, putting aside the fear of God. On the unlikely pretext that, because of this he was

³⁸² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 78, pp. 194-203; *Synodicum*, p. 319

bound by a greater chain of excommunication, and because he committed many other detestable things and, as was said, he was intending to make off with the ornaments and jewels and other movable goods of the same church [of Nicosia], depart from the kingdom of Cyprus with them in secret, and leave the church thus despoiled, you and the greater part of the chapter of the Nicosia Church, in whose chapter you (Henry of Gibelet) were member, reacted to him not a little excessively. For on the order of the chapter, you and some of the other members, having sent some laymen ahead who would protect you, if necessary, from the household of the said archbishop, proceeded to the Nicosia archiepiscopal residence. Having first made an appeal outside the door of the aforesaid archbishop's chamber, in which the archbishop himself was then staying, you opened the door of the room violently and entered, the archbishop's familiars withdrawing the fear. You confirmed the goods were found there, marking them with many seals and storing them for the fabric of the same church. Finally, the chapter, of which you were a member even then having replaced said archbishop's officials, took over the administration of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the church. On account of these things, said archbishop, overcome by the ordeal, left the archiepiscopal residence and promulgated a sentence of excommunication against you and the aforesaid canons. In the end the chapter made you the vicar in the spiritual affairs pertaining to said archbishop, and for a time you performed the role of vicar in these matters. Afterwards, the said archbishop, not able to exercise his jurisdiction, and being afraid to linger in Cyprus because of these things, crossed over to Acre and ended his days with a natural death.”³⁸³

It is apparent from the above that the Latin archbishop of Nicosia did not hesitate to imprison Neophytos. The reason of his action is not known but Schabel speculates that,

“the decree of a provincial council (it had been assigned to various archbishops from the 1250s to the 1280s) in which the author tells his listeners of the earlier exile of Greeks who refused to accept the validity of unleavened bread in Eucharist. These Greeks had been ‘fleeing and hiding in various places and corrupting several people with their fatal poison.’ Each year the archbishop's predecessors warned them ‘to return to obedience’ or to be excommunicated, as did the author himself, and the council judges them to be heretics.”³⁸⁴

Ranulph was automatically excommunicated for this treatment of Neophytos, and he was already excommunicated when the Latin chapter opposed him violently, to stop him stealing from the church.

³⁸³ C. Schabel, “The Latin bishops of Cyprus, 1255-1313, with a note on bishop Neophytos of Solea”,

Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών, 30, 2004, pp. 82-83

³⁸⁴ Schabel, “The Latin bishops of Cyprus”, p. 84

The authority of the Latin hierarchy over the Greek bishops is also made apparent in a letter sent by Pope Boniface VIII, to Gerard of Langres, the archbishop of Nicosia, in 1295. This letter refers to Berard, the Latin bishop of Limassol, who was a Dominican,³⁸⁵ and so even if he had not been an inquisitor himself, he would have been trained with members of his order who were. Berard had occasion to make a formal visitation to the orthodox cathedral at Lefkara where at that time there was the bishop named Matthew. Matthew refused to obey Berard because he disagreed with the issue regarding the use of leavened and unleavened bread. When Matthew was asked by Bernard about the sacrament of the Body of Christ, he kept silent and when Bernard asked again about issues concerning the Catholic Faith and then demanded an oath from him, Matthew's answer was, "Do not swear" [Matthew 5.34]. Using Christ's words quoted here to avoid swearing an oath that would be tantamount to an admission of heresy seems to have been a device commonly employed in the West by members of various heretical groups when confronted by the inquisition. The result of this disagreement was Matthew's excommunication by Bernard of Limassol, and by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nicholas of Hanapes, declared as heretic and finally, Pope Boniface ordered the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Gerard of Langres, to capture and imprison him.³⁸⁶ It is worth mentioning that Bernard's actions took place during the time of Gerard's predecessor, Archbishop John of Ancona (1288–1295). Significantly, according to Schabel, it is hard to ascertain if the pope actually gave the order to Gerard to arrest and imprison Matthew but, "one can see that Greek defiance remained, although with subtle differences: Matthew did not act as the Kantara monks

³⁸⁵ *Synodicum*, p. 331

³⁸⁶ *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, doc. no. 119, pp. 195-96

had. Questions of jurisdiction between Berard and Archbishop John must have also played a role in aiding Matthew's little rebellion."³⁸⁷

In addition to his demand for obedience, the pope also revealed his concern regarding the Greek hierarchy and its problems. A letter sent by Boniface VIII to Leo, the bishop-elect of Solea, in 1301 conveys this concern. The event which the letter described, pertained to the election of a new bishop in the church of Solea, where a vacancy had arisen after the death of Neophytos. There were three candidates for the position, Leo, Theodore, the dean of the Church of St. Barnabas of Nicosia, and Joachim, the abbot of the monastery of St. George of Mangana in the Nicosia diocese. The Latin archbishop, Gerard of Langres, was no longer in Cyprus and so the three candidates turned to his vicar to confirm the election, and he chose Leo. The other two complained to the Apostolic See about it. At the papal court the pope delegated the hearing to John, bishop of Tusculum. One of the charges made by the other candidates against Leo was 'lack of knowledge' and to establish the truth, or otherwise, he was examined by John Baccamazza and two Greek monks of Grottaferrata, who established that Leo was literate and could sing the services. The legal case in Rome ended with a definitive judgment in favour of Leo.³⁸⁸ A double, or as in this case, a triple election, ought not to have occurred under normal circumstances and although the dispute was evidently bitter, the correct procedure was maintained: bringing the case to the archbishop of Nicosia or his vicar, then appealing to the pope over his judgement, wherein a definitive ruling would then be given. This same procedure would have been strictly adhered to with a disputed election concerning a Latin bishopric in Cyprus. The extent of the description of the

³⁸⁷ *Synodicum*, p.74

³⁸⁸ *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, doc. no. 132, pp. 219-21; *Synodicum*, pp. 333-39

event is detailed and lengthy. According to Coureas, this event illustrates that by the end of thirteenth century, the Orthodox clergy were prepared to resort to Rome to solve disputes between themselves and, despite the impoverishment of the Orthodox Church, its episcopal offices were positions keenly sought after.³⁸⁹

The sentence of Excommunication

Excommunication was one of the serious punishments the Roman Church administered to the Latin flock and to the Greeks who refused to obey. The pope “had the power to excommunicate and even to depose a king who had repeatedly violated canon law and cited situations in which popes had taken actions. Civil authorities however were understandably reluctant to acknowledge that the popes possessed any right to intervene in the affairs of the secular governments and sought instead to devise alternative sanctions to restrain despotic rulers.”³⁹⁰ Strictly speaking, excommunication meant exclusion from the sacraments. Two things theoretically followed: the excommunicate was supposed to be shunned by the rest of society and the excommunicate could not swear oaths on gospels or the relics. Apart from the pope, the Latin hierarchy and the papal legates had the authority to use the sentence of excommunication. “It naturally supposes a very grave offence. The excommunicated person, does not cease to be a Christian, since his baptism can never be effaced, he can be considered as an exile from Christian society and as non-existent.”³⁹¹ Another definition of excommunication is offered by Hamilton, “excommunication debarred a man from being present at church services, but it also sometimes had political consequences for example, the vassals of an excommunicate ruler might renounce their allegiance to him. In such a case he had to seek

³⁸⁹ Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, p. 314

³⁹⁰ J. A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, London and New York 1995, p. 110

³⁹¹ <http://www.newadventoorg/cathn/05678a.htm>, accessed 2006

reconciliation with the church in the sacrament of penance.”³⁹² According to a letter written on 23 December 1250 and preserved in the *Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia*, the papal **legate** had the power to impose sentences of interdict, suspension or excommunication.³⁹³ He said,

“all heretics, under whatever name they name they may be known, should often be denounced as excommunicates *ipso jure*...that heretics are those who believe or preach other than what the Roman Church preaches and observes concerning the sacraments of the Church, and who do not believe that the Roman Church is the head and mistress of all Churches and that the Lord Pope is the successor of Saint Peter...”

The different rite of the Greeks and their refusal to follow the Latin rite was an important reason for excommunication during the Middle Ages. The difference in rite made the Greeks call the Latins heretics. Significantly, the Latins also accused the Greeks as heretics because of their refusal to show obedience to the Latin Church and, for that reason, they did not hesitate to excommunicate them. A characteristic of the Latin archbishop of Cyprus, Ranulph, is found in his Regulation when he accused the Greeks as heretics. He continued that, “Again we denounce as excommunicates all Greek priests; and deacons who have not given nor want to give obedience to the Roman Church and Nicosia Church...”³⁹⁴ Under whatever name they may be know implies that Ranulph was also worried about western heretics. The pope extended a personal privilege to the archbishop, explicitly banning a legate or other papal representative from imposing the various penalties mentioned in the letter. The significance is that the legate usually had the right to impose these penalties even on the archbishop of Nicosia. It might be noted that the see of Nicosia was vacant at the time this letter was written. More importantly, it makes us consider whether this letter applied only to the new archbishop appointed in 1251, or to all the future archbishops. It could well be that the pope needed to offer Hugh

³⁹² Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, p. 118

³⁹³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 20, p. 106

³⁹⁴ *Synodicum*, p. 137

of Fagiano a number of inducements, of which this privilege was one, in order to persuade him to accept the nomination.

Apart from Ranulph, there are also other cases where the Latins punished the Greeks with the sentence of excommunication for dogmatic reasons, such as the usage of the holy sacraments. According to the Regulation of Cardinal Eudes of Châteauroux or Hugh of Fagiano, which Hugh read to the flock in the great cemetery of the church of Nicosia, on 9 April 1251, Palm Sunday, they excommunicated as heretics "...all those who are not afraid to think or teach differently from what the Holy Roman Church preaches and observes concerning the ecclesiastical sacraments." Moreover, the text says that,

"Again, on pain of excommunication we strictly order all Greeks who have received the sacraments of Confirmation and Marriage in the way of the Roman Church and the Church of Nicosia, and also those who are born to the aforesaid people, from now on to convene at least one week, namely on Sunday, in the Great Church of the Latins in Nicosia to hear the divine office, and to confess their sins in the same place at least once a year to a Latin priest, and to receive from the same church all of the ecclesiastical sacraments in the way of the Latins, from now on, in no way receiving them according to the Greeks' ways and rites, except perhaps in case of necessity. And if anyone, God forbid, should go against this, not without cause they shall fear the sentence of excommunication and another punishment also."

Not only was the different usage of the sacraments important, but the lack of obedience to the Roman Church was another given reason for excommunication, "...all Greek priests and deacons who have not given nor want to give obedience to the Roman Church and the Nicosia Church."³⁹⁵

The refusal of a Greek or Latin to follow the papal orders or ecclesiastical agreements was a reason for being excommunicated, a normal occurrence in the Latin Church. In

³⁹⁵ *Synodicum*, p. 155

Cyprus there is an example from the early years of the Frankish rule. A letter sent by Celestine III to the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Alan, on 13 December 1196, proves the above, “we forbid anyone from admitting to the divine office or to church communion those whom you have excommunicated or whom you have placed under interdict without your knowledge or consent or that of your successor and [we forbid] anyone from presuming to go against a sentence you have promulgated, except perhaps in imminent danger...”³⁹⁶ Another letter from the patriarch William of Jerusalem, the papal legate, to bishop Velasco of Famagusta, Lanfranc the treasurer of Nicosia and canon Bertrand, the vicar of Nicosia, sent in 1267, stated that anyone who went against the *Bulla Cypria* should be excommunicated, “Through a sentence of excommunication or other canonical penalty, you should also compel the Greek abbots, monks and priests to the obedience to which, according to the Apostolic arrangement made between the Latin and Greek prelates of said kingdom, they are held, by those same prelates [i.e. the *Bulla Cypria*].”³⁹⁷ Another example is a letter sent by Matthew, archbishop of Caesarea in 1280, in which he talked about public excommunications against those who did not obey Hugh’s regulations.³⁹⁸

According to some other surviving papal letters, like the one sent to the Latin archbishop Alan, and the bishops of Paphos, Famagusta and Limassol in 1204, by the papal legate Peter Capuano, cardinal priest of Saint Marcello, there were also additional possible reasons for excommunication like, “on pain of excommunication we strictly prohibit anyone from daring to conspire against his prelate,”³⁹⁹ or in a letter sent to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople on 13 January 1207 due to the

³⁹⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 8, pp. 85-89; *Synodicum*, p. 280

³⁹⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 106, p. 240; *Synodicum*, p. 329

³⁹⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 29, pp. 115-16

³⁹⁹ *Synodicum*, p. 285

desecration of the churches,⁴⁰⁰ or because of the failure to ask for apostolic permission in order to establish bishops,⁴⁰¹ or because they were against the union of the two churches.⁴⁰² Two very important examples of excommunication took place in Cyprus; the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara, (the monks were excommunicated before the martyrdom) and the pain of excommunication inflicted on the bishop, Matthew, who was suspect of “heretical depravity,” by the bishop of Limassol, shown in a letter from Pope Boniface VIII to the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Gerard of Langres, sent in 1295 discussed above.⁴⁰³

In particular, excommunication or the threat of excommunication was used as a way of forcing people to answer charges in an ecclesiastical court, and it was also used against people who tried to appeal against the decision of an ecclesiastical court at a higher tribunal. The complaints of Hugh of Fagiano against Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan, outlined in the papal letters clearly indicate the same thing was happening in Cyprus: the regent was refusing to co-operate with the Latin Church in pursuing people the church had excommunicated. Incidentally, Schabel’s interpretation in the last two lines can be seen as incorrect.⁴⁰⁴ The Latin text reads “absque curie sue sguardio sive consilio” which is a Latin version of the Old French phrase, common in John of Ibelin and Philip of Novara’s legal treatises “sans esgars ou sans conoissance de court”. In other words the king refused to act against one of his own vassals “without the *esgart* or *conoissance* of his court”.⁴⁰⁵ The point being that the vassals could not be condemned without due

⁴⁰⁰ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 97, p. 325

⁴⁰¹ *Acta Innocentii III*, doc. no. 137, p. 373

⁴⁰² *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, doc. no. 23, pp. 50-55

⁴⁰³ *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI*, doc. no. 120, pp. 196-98;

Synodicum, pp. 332-33

⁴⁰⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 77, pp. 190-94; *Synodicum*, p. 326

⁴⁰⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 77, pp. 192; *Synodicum*, p. 325-28

process of the law in the king's court and so the regent could not act against an excommunicate vassal, who had not been sentenced in his own court.

John of Ibelin was writing in the years 1264-1266, at the same time as this letter, whereas Philip was slightly earlier in the early 1250s. The extent of anti-clerical sentiment among the members of the secular nobility must not be underestimated. The secular authorities were resistant to the demands of the Latin clergy, in particular Hugh of Fagiano. They did not want to pay tithes nor have the Latin clergy harass the Greek population. They did not wish to co-operate over excommunication. One reason for this may be that most of the high positions in the Latin Church did not go to members of local Frankish noble families; almost all the archbishops of Nicosia were incomers from the West and would have been viewed as "outsiders".

There is adequate evidence of the threat of excommunication in favour of the Greeks in letters from the pope, in order to protect the Greeks. In such a letter by Pope Innocent IV to the papal legate, Eudes, sent in 1254, he ordered that,

"...by our authority we firmly command that ...the archbishop of Nicosia and his suffragans are not in any way to disturb nor to harass the Greeks in connection with these matters contrary to this provision and determination of ours, restraining those who refuse by the same authority, appeal put aside. Not withstanding if the Apostolic See has granted to the aforesaid archbishop and his suffragans or anyone else that they cannot put under interdict, suspended, or excommunicated by apostolic letters..."⁴⁰⁶

There was also another function of excommunication. The problem with excommunication was that some churchmen abused their power by imposing excommunication for insufficient cause. In particular, excommunication, or the threat of excommunication, was used as a way of forcing people to answer charges in an

⁴⁰⁶ *Cartulary* doc. no. 93, pp. 238-44; *Synodicum*, p. 311

ecclesiastical court. The churchmen asked for help from the secular authorities in their attempt to make excommunication effective. On some occasions the king refused to become involved, which was particularly common in the medieval West.

A useful example from France which proves the above is a story recounted by Joinville. According to Joinville, King Louis IX refused to agree to bishop Guy of Auxerre's request for help, pointing out that it was not always true that the church was correct in its use of excommunication: it excommunicated the people who did not obey the Church, requesting that King Louis take their property by way of distraining them to make their peace with the church. The king refused to agree this request and the importance of this episode is shown by the fact that Joinville repeated the story at the end of his book.⁴⁰⁷ In other words, what the bishop wanted was for King Louis to take their property thus forcing them to make their peace with the church. The king's refusal to agree to this request was based on the idea that doing so would give the bishops too much power in cases where the facts were disputed.

In Constantinople there are many letters of the Greek Church which refer to excommunication. For example, there is the letter of the Greek patriarch, Theodoros Eirnikos, which was sent to the Greeks of Constantinople, excommunicating them because they had showed obedience to the Roman Church. It is a lengthy letter detailing the dogmatic difference between the Greeks and the Latins, and he makes various efforts to convince the Greeks to keep their faith and resist the pressure of the papal legate who was trying to subordinate them.⁴⁰⁸ There is another letter of similar content by the Greek patriarch, Germanos, who excommunicated all the Greeks who

⁴⁰⁷ Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. J. Monfrin, Paris 1995, pp. 30-33, 334-35

⁴⁰⁸ Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Θεόδωρος Ειρηνικός, Πατριάρχης Οικουμενικός ἐν Νίκαια", pp. 182-92

obeyed the Roman Church⁴⁰⁹ and another from Beccus, which is a letter of anathema. According to the letter sent by Beccus to the pope, he anathematised all those who accepted his lack of piety.⁴¹⁰

Conclusions

A parallel can be observed in the relationship of the Greeks of Constantinople, Achaia and Cyprus, and the Latins. In these three places the Greeks reacted to the establishment of the Latin Church in a very similar way, and although the development of their relationship with the Latins contained many similarities, there were also noticeable differences.

As Angold correctly claims “the pope was prepared to be flexible but the same could not be said of the Latin hierarchy in Greece”⁴¹¹ as it had a different agenda. Furthermore, the Greeks in these three places viewed the pope as ‘a protector of their interests.’⁴¹² The Greeks of Cyprus asked to be subject only to him and not to the Latin hierarchy, whereas in Constantinople they regarded him, “as sufficiently sympathetic to their cause to counterbalance the excesses of the patriarch and the Latin clergy.”⁴¹³ It is worth mentioning that this happened much later when the regime had been in place for almost sixty years.

Other factors which influenced the relations between the Greeks and Latins must be considered, one of them being the different nature of the conquest. As shown in Chapter One, the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus took time, unlike the situation in

⁴⁰⁹ Demetarcopoulos, *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς*, p. 42

⁴¹⁰ V. Laurent-J. Darrouzès, “Dossier Grec de l’union de Lyon (1273-1277)”, *Archives de L’Orient Chrétien* 16, Paris 1976, pp. 480-85

⁴¹¹ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 171

⁴¹² Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 184

⁴¹³ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp.184-85

Constantinople and Achaia. Moreover, the origins of the protagonists were different. In Cyprus, the Latin hierarchy came from Jerusalem, they were Westerners who lived in the Latin East, and were familiar with the Greek population as opposed to those in Constantinople and Achaia. In addition, Constantinople was the seat of one of the most important patriarchates of the Christians. In Constantinople, and in Cyprus in particular, the attitude of the Greeks towards the Latins was more 'hostile' than in the Morea. "The native population of the Peloponnese was quickly reconciled to Frankish rule. The Greeks of Peloponnese were leaderless. The Frankish conquerors filled the vacuum. They offered local Greek society certain advantages."⁴¹⁴ In Cyprus it can be argued that this was so perhaps because more evidence is available, and in Constantinople the reaction of the Greeks was tense, as proved by the agreements and the papal letters, which discuss how the Greeks went against the Latins.

The Latin Church in Cyprus was organised more effectively than in Frankish Greece. In addition, the structure of the Church of Cyprus was different to the Church in Constantinople and the Morea, whereas there was no plan for Greece and the Church of Peloponnese was not structured in the same way. The ecclesiastical history of the Morea was connected with political history and the structure of the Church of Greece changed as new places came under the Latin rule. Moreover, there is no evidence of and few references to lists of the bishoprics in the papal letters. This is exemplified in the papal letters of the fourteenth century which contain references to bishoprics which were not in existence, as lists of the bishoprics changed frequently. Another important difference between Frankish Greece and Cyprus is the extent to which the

⁴¹⁴ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 174

rulers of Cyprus and Greece controlled their Latin clergy and whether they listened to their views. This question will be addressed in the next chapter of this thesis.

Similarities can be found in archaeology which in addition to the historical evidence is very important. Starting from Greece, in Thebes there is the church of Panagia Lontzia which was used as the Cathedral Church of the Latins. In Attica several names of churches reflect the Frankish use of the Church.⁴¹⁵ Generally,

“the Latins turned the Cathedral and other Orthodox Churches and monasteries, into Latin-rite churches by effecting minor changes and accepting the Byzantine painted decoration. The Byzantine population continued to worship in the existing churches and monasteries and constructed new ones. The large number of newly built and painted churches... reveals a policy of religious tolerance by the Frankish rulers.”⁴¹⁶

The situation in Cyprus was similar, there are examples of Greek Churches which became Latin. In addition, the artwork was influenced by the Latin conquest, as western elements appear in Greek art. Moreover, according to A. W. Carr there was cooperation between the Greeks and the Latins in the field of art.

In conclusion, all of the factors outlined above, played a major role in the development of the relationship between the Latins and Greeks and can offer an explanation as to why the experience of the Church in Cyprus, differed from that in Constantinople and the Morea.

⁴¹⁵ S. Kalopissi-Verti, “Relations between the East and West in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes”, in *Archaeology and the Crusades*, ed. P. Edbury- S. Kalopissi-Verti, Athens 2007, pp. 6-7

⁴¹⁶ Kalopissi-Verti, “Relations between the East and West in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes”, p. 15

Chapter 3

The relationship of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus with the Latin secular authority

The involvement of the Latin secular authority in the affairs of the Latin, and the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus was important during the Frankish era. The Latin emperor of Constantinople, the prince of Achaea, and the king of Cyprus with their barons and knights were often swift to interfere in the affairs of the Church or attempt to solve ecclesiastical problems following the request of the church itself. With reference to Constantinople and Achaea, due to the general flight of the majority of the hierarchy of the Greek Church, most of the documents refer to the relationship of the secular authority with the Latin Church, and very few of them pertain to the Greeks.

In Cyprus it appears that the establishment of the Latin Church was achieved in conjunction with the secular authority. As presented in detail in the first chapter of this thesis, the crown and more specifically King Aimery, the brother of Guy of Lusignan, asked Pope Celestine III to establish the Latin Church on the island, despite the presence of the Greek Church. In accordance with Western tradition, Aimery needed the presence of a Latin hierarchy as a prerequisite for Cyprus to be recognized as a kingdom. Consequently, Aimery's chaplains selected the first bishop of the island. It is clear that although the people in Cyprus nominated the first bishops, they secured papal approval before they were consecrated. Alan was Aimery's chancellor and archdeacon of Lydda (since 1187 lost to the Latins). The first archbishop of Nicosia and the first bishop of Paphos were chosen by the Franks in Cyprus, not the pope, before December 1196.

By then, acting on Celestine's instructions, in a letter that has not survived, the archbishop of Nazareth and the bishops of Acre and Bethlehem had consecrated Alan as the new archbishop of Nicosia; his colleague, the archdeacon of Latakia, was now bishop of Paphos. Accordingly, the pope then sent Alan the pallium and confirmed the establishment of the province, comprising of the archbishopric and three suffragan sees in Paphos, Limassol and Famagusta.⁴¹⁷ The situation in Constantinople was similar. In Constantinople after the conquest by the Latins, the crusaders decided to establish a Latin Church and without hesitation, Thomas Morosini was chosen as the patriarch of Constantinople. Innocent's permission was not sought. The same situation arose in Achaea as can be observed from the surviving documents which suggest that the secular authority needed the establishment of a Latin Church and succeeded in accomplishing it. It is apparent that in these three places, the existence of a Latin church was a necessity and after its arrival, one of the main goals of the secular authority was to establish the Latin Church. Another important point, comparing the relationship between the crown and the church of Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea, is the fact that in Constantinople, the secular authority did not pay much attention to the reaction of the Latin Church as illustrated by the election of Morosini. Morosini was consecrated and installed without papal approval so it was not the same as Cyprus. Relations between the crusaders and Innocent III had been difficult ever since the diversion of the crusade to Zara. The pope had excommunicated the Venetians and threatened to excommunicate the other crusaders and expressed his disapproval of the diversions to both Zara and Constantinople.

⁴¹⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 3, pp. 78-80

In Cyprus however, the close relationship between the Church and the crown continued throughout the Frankish era. A significant example which delineates the interference of the secular authority, the king and the nobles, in the affairs of the Church, is the agreements of 1220 and 1222. The terms of the agreements have been detailed in Chapter One, the objective of this third chapter is to analyse and present the reasons which led to the secular authority signing these agreements with the Latin Church.

It is necessary to examine the reasons behind the agreements of 1220 and 1222 and establish the way the secular authority operated, beginning with Cyprus. On the one hand, with the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, the king managed to succeed in his purpose; to be recognized as a kingdom and to satisfy the Latins of the island, who needed to have their own church and hierarchy in order to attend the mass and to exercise their religious duties. On the other hand, the crown had to tolerate the presence of the Greek Church and respect it; otherwise they had to deal with the anger and the reaction of the Greek population of the island. According to Makhairas, not a contemporary source from the 1190s, but a later writer, "...remembering the trouble the Greeks had given to the Templars ...This was done (because the Greeks were many in Cyprus, and) in order to bring down their pride, that they might rebel and do to them as they had done to the Templars."⁴¹⁸

Hugh I's attempts to control church appointments led to conflict with the patriarch of Jerusalem, who was the papal legate, and the pope. There is no evidence of later kings trying to control senior church appointments. The king did not want problems with the Greeks, like rebellions, in order to organize their newly-established kingdom

⁴¹⁸ Makhairas, p. 25

and to achieve a peaceful coexistence with the Greeks. The presence of the two Churches, the Latin and the Greek, placed the crown in a difficult position and forced it to play the role of the peacemaker and the protector of the order, so as to prevent any problems. The king had to be very careful, he could not harm the Greek Church or take action against the Greek population because of a possible violent reaction on the part of the Greeks, and concurrently, he could not ignore the needs and interests of the Latin Church either, as they were Latins and he did not want to be excommunicated or to have other serious problematic issues with the Roman Church. This was due to the fact that they had to deal with the pope in such circumstances and as it has already been illustrated in Chapter Two, the pope frequently became involved in the affairs of the local Latin Churches and exerted great power and influence. The crown did not wish to oppose the pope or the Greeks and, as a result, had to strike a balance between the Latin and the Greek Church. It needs to be noted that the crown had its own interests and therefore had to protect them.

The policy of the Latin emperor of Constantinople and his nobility and the policy of the prince of Achaea towards the Latin Church was similar to Cyprus. The Latin emperor of Constantinople wanted to be officially accepted by the pope and the newly-recognised principality of Achaea needed papal recognition too. As in Cyprus, it was his desire to promote good relations between the Latin and the Greek Churches. In both Constantinople and Achaea, the Greek hierarchy was absent, with the Greek patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea, and in order to keep the Greeks' faith and protect them from being Latinized he regularly sent letters to Constantinople. The same pattern occurred in Achaea, where the majority of the Greek clergy left in the period following

the arrival of the Latins. As a consequence, the Greek Church in these places was not organised to the extent where a revolt against the crown was a possibility.

The departure of the Greek clergy raises a range of questions such as whether there were any priests at all in the local churches. If there were not, there would have been no baptisms, wedding, or funeral services for the ordinary population. If only the senior clergy left, we can not speak of a “majority”. It is not known how long this situation continued. The answer to these questions is that we have little or no evidence. It is possible, and this is only a supposition, that ordinary Greek priests went outside the Latin controlled areas for ordination, then returned to their villages and conducted services as usual and the Latin bishops either ignored them, which was very likely as this seems to have happened in Cyprus in the years before 1222, or were prevented from bothering them by the secular rulers.

The Latins had complete political control of Cyprus from 1192 onwards and so they could afford to allow the Greeks considerable religious autonomy – at least until 1222, when it was only the intervention of the papal legate that changed things; in the Morea and Constantinople, they were largely on the defensive, unable to expand their power and confronted by a situation in which it would appear that the Greek patriarch and the other Orthodox bishops were trying to run the church from outside in the Latin controlled areas.

Regarding Cyprus, the agreements of 1220 and 1222 are only one example of this policy. The agreement of 1220 was very important for the Latin Church as it took place after the insistence of the papal legate and its objective was to clarify relations

between the secular authorities and the Latin Church. The extent of royal contact with the Church is revealed in an episode which took place some ten years earlier, in about 1210. According to Rowe and Edbury,

“The information for this episode is furnished principally by two letters of Pope Innocent III, one to King Hugh I of Cyprus dated 13 January 1213, the other, dated 15 January, to the chapter of Nicosia: Albert, the patriarch of Jerusalem and papal legate in the East, had quashed the election of c.1210 because King Hugh had brought pressure to bear on the chapter and had forced the canons to postulate two candidates that he might choose one; the chapter had then formally elected the royal choice; Hugh’s reaction to Albert’s decision had been to protest that the election had been *secundum antiquam consuetudinem celebrata* and that he had been following the practice of his predecessors; Innocent’s response was to dilate on the evil potential of bad custom sanctified by time: *diuturnitas temporis non minuit peccatum, sed auget*; the king’s action in imposing his procedure on the canons thereby infringing the *libertas ecclesie* was irrational, irreligious and scandalous, all the more so since they had been committed *in terra ...quae funiculus Domini haereditatis existit*. Despite Hugh’s assertion that he was doing what was customary ...the Nicosia election appears to have been an isolated example of dual postulation. It seems that after 1191, rulers, with this one exception, made no attempt to impose it and that in terms of practical politics; Innocent’s rebuke was the last word.”⁴¹⁹

The papal legate, Pelagius, was aware of the situation in Cyprus, the problems between the king and the Church and as a consequence, requested the agreements of 1220-1222.

According to the text of the 1220 agreement came into being, “at the requests and frequent admonitions made to me [Alice] through the letters of the venerable father Lord Pelagius ...and also at the petition and request of my venerable father Lord Eustorge”⁴²⁰ and the other Latin bishops concerning the tithes and revenue of Cyprus. The other Latin bishops were associated with Eustorge in demanding a settlement.

⁴¹⁹ P. W. Edbury and J. G. Rowe, “William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180”, *English Historical Review*, 93, 1978, p. 14

⁴²⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 84, p. 220; *Synodicum*, p. 287

According to the first paragraph of the agreement of 1222, it became a necessity because,

“A disagreement arose concerning tithes, possessions, and other things, between Alice, the illustrious queen of Cyprus (the mother of Henry, the true lord and heir of the kingdom of Cyprus), and the barons and knights and men of the above mentioned Henry, on one side, and thus us, Eustorge, the archbishop of Nicosia, and our suffragans bishops [Martin of Paphos, R of Limassol, and Caesarius of Famausta], and the chapters of our churches, on the other. Finally at the admonition of our venerable father Pelagius, bishop of Albano, legate of the Apostolic See, it was calmed, with the consent of both parties.”⁴²¹

Economic matters were of paramount importance to the queen, the nobility, and the Latin Church too. It was actually the underlying reason for the agreements between the secular authority and the Latin Church. The property of the Greek Church was a great temptation for both parties, the Latin Church of Cyprus and the crown. The 1220 and 1222 agreements thus expose problems raised by the Latin clergy, who accused the Frankish nobility of non-payment of the tithes and secularization of former Greek Church property. The non-payment of tithes was a more serious matter and the question which it raises is regarding whether it occurred in the late 1210s, or, whether it had been a long standing problem. So the bishops' agenda was firstly to get the nobles to pay tithes and secondly to lay claim to former Greek Church property that was in lay hands. The queen's agenda was to reach a compromise over the bishops' demands and put a stop to Greek serfs who tried to escape their servile status through ordination. The legate's agenda was to subordinate the Greek Church to the Latins and the legate would have also wanted to support the local clergy in the demand for tithes.

In a letter sent on 8 March 1222, Pope Honorius III wrote to the queen of Cyprus, the barons, the nobles and the knights, requesting them to ensure that the terms of the

⁴²¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, p. 249

agreements were fully observed, especially those concerning the donation of Greek properties which, after the establishment of the Latin Church, were recognized as its properties. The pope wrote before the 1222 agreement was made, and the point is that after 1222, no more was heard of the Latin Church trying to get the lay lords to surrender Greek Church property. The argument at this time focused on whether the lay lords would pay tithes. According to the letter, "...we request, attentively warn, and, ...to confer or rather restore, some of the possessions that the churches, cathedrals, and monasteries of the Greeks are known to have had in the kingdom of Cyprus, to the churches of the Latins who succeeded them and who were established in place of the Greek pontiffs in these same churches by the Roman Church..."⁴²² It must be emphasized that this letter does not state that the Latin Church took the Greek Church's property, but that the secular authority was responsible not only for this action, but also then giving it to the Latin Church. The issue was that former Greek Church property that was in the hands of Frankish secular lords should have been passed to the Latin Church and it was not necessary to mention the former Greek Church property that was already in the hands of the Latin Church. Moreover, it is implied in this letter that the secular authority only adhered to the terms of the agreements which satisfied its interests, as the term of the agreement of 1220, "...the full tithes from all the revenues of the kingdom of Cyprus and those of my and my son's aforesaid barons, knights, and men, in accordance with the usage and custom of the kingdom of Jerusalem..."⁴²³ and the term of the agreement of 1222,

"However, concerning the possessions and lands or places that the churches and abbeys and monasteries of the Greeks had in Cyprus in the time of the Greeks, ...will not raise any question, or law suit, or controversy in the future against the queen, or against Henry, her son, or their heirs, or against their barons, knights, or men, but rather the queen and her son and his and their

⁴²² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 80, pp. 208-09

⁴²³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 84, pp. 220-22

heirs and men will endure no molestation or controversy from now on, but will possess them quietly and peacefully, except for the cathedrals and other churches of the Latins, all casalia, prestarias, and the collective possessions that they hold at present or which they will be able to acquire in the future with royal consent from the donation of kings or of others, with which, along with the tithes and other things mentioned above, the churches must be content.”⁴²⁴

The nobles would pay tithes; the Latin Church would stop trying to claim former Greek lands and be content with what they already had, and with what the nobles might choose to give them in the future. It was compromise. Other papal letters also ascertain that the agreements did not function effectively, or manage to resolve the problems between the crown and the Church, despite this being the reason for their publication. Economic differences continued to exist for several years. In another letter of Pope Honorius III sent on 23 July 1225, three years after the agreements, Honorius complained to the queen, her son and the nobles, that they had failed to implement the terms of the aforesaid agreements. He urged them to “put aside specious objections and to fully observe the accords.”⁴²⁵

In a letter sent on 16 May 1224, the pope asked the bishops of Tripoli and Valania to ensure a thorough implementation of the agreement.⁴²⁶ In other letters sent in 1228, Gregory IX continued to discuss the same matters.⁴²⁷ On 27 July 1231, years after the agreements, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, Gerold, sent a letter to the nobility of Cyprus and informed them of the instructions of Pope Gregory IX, concerning the agreements of 1220-1222. Gregory urged them to go against those who refused to pay the tithes according to the terms of the provisions of 1220-1222. The most important aspect of this letter is that the last part

⁴²⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 95, p. 251

⁴²⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 97, pp. 254-55

⁴²⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 98, pp. 255-56

⁴²⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 100-04, pp. 256-67

refers to papal appeals to the procurators of the Cypriot Latin bishops, and the king and queen, requesting them to adhere closely to the agreement. The barons, knights and nobles were also told that the pope had written to Queen Alice and King Henry I on this matter. Their replies detailed that neither they, nor the Church, were required to follow its provisions fully and provided many reasons to support their stance. Prior to this, the procurators from the barons, the king and the queen had already sent appeals to the Apostolic See, but had not expressed their complaints. After examining their issues, the pope disregarded them as trivial and once again stated that the provisions of the 1220 and 1222 agreements should be applied and observed. If this was not the case, the patriarch would take action against the nobles and the knights as directed by the pope.⁴²⁸ It seems from the above that the relationship of the Church and the secular authority was tense because of economic reasons. The problem continued to exist for a lengthy period of time as it seems by a letter sent on 29 September 1231 by Gregory,⁴²⁹ and in a letter from Innocent IV to Henry I of Cyprus some years later on 4 August 1243. From it we learn that some nobles had been refusing to pay the tithes and the pope asked the king to compel them. Archbishop Eustorge had excommunicated them and Innocent requested the king to “coerce by the application of secular discipline those whom fear of the divine does not recall from evildoing.”⁴³⁰ This again raises the question of the role of secular rulers in enforcing sentences of excommunication and seems to imply the king had not done so. It is not the first reference to excommunication because of the tithe. A letter sent on 29 September 1231 excommunicated those who refused to pay tithes.⁴³¹

⁴²⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 101, pp. 259-61

⁴²⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 88, pp. 229-30

⁴³⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 88, pp. 229-30

⁴³¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 105, p. 267

Concerning tithes, clearly the bishops complained that since then there had been a substantial backlog of unpaid tithes and the ongoing arbitration would cancel this backlog. As we learn from a document of 4 October 1232 there was still a dispute between the crown and the Latin Church regarding the agreements of 1220 and 1222. According to the document, the masters of Hospital and Temple, the archbishops of Nazareth and Caesarea, and the bishop of Lydda announced their arbitral decision concerning the dispute which had arisen between the King Henry I, and the Latin archbishop, Eustorge, and his suffragans regarding the payment of tithes.⁴³² One element in their arbitration was that Henry should compensate the archbishop for the backlog of unpaid tithe with the grant of the village of Mendias; as a surviving royal charter of 1233 shows, he certainly fulfilled this provision, and it can therefore be assumed that he fulfilled the other requirements too,⁴³³ and it shows that the king implemented at least that part of the arbitration. Innocent IV's letter to Henry I on 4 August 1243⁴³⁴ and the letter sent on 18 January 1255, the papal letter of Alexander to the queen of Cyprus in order to remind her to honour the agreements and her oath to defend the Latin Church of the island,⁴³⁵ made it clear that there were still complaints that nobles were not paying tithes. In addition, there are other papal letters which refer to the problem of tithes between the Latin Church of Cyprus and the Latin secular authority. For instance, in a letter from Gerold sent to the knights and the nobles of the island on 27 July 1231, he refers to Pope Gregory IX's instructions to proceed against those defaulting on the payment of tithes.⁴³⁶ The problem with the tithes continued for several years, as exposed by a letter sent on 26 February 1255, once again referring to the problem with the tithe.⁴³⁷ There was also the

⁴³² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 87, pp. 226-29

⁴³³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 59, p. 163-64

⁴³⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 88, pp. 229-30

⁴³⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 70, p. 177

⁴³⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 101, pp. 261-62

⁴³⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 99, p. 257

content of a letter sent on 14 May 1255⁴³⁸ and in a letter of 30 January 1267⁴³⁹ from Alexander whose problem lay with some nobles who refused to pay tithes to the Latin Church of Cyprus.

The problem with the Greeks was not the most significant problem between the secular authority and the Latin Church. As previously observed, they had problems concerning the former Greek properties and the payment of the tithes but they were not the only issues. According to a letter sent on 13 April 1264, the *bailli* refused to help the Latin archbishop of Cyprus to punish the clergy and the lay person of Nicosia who were engaging in various offences against the teaching of the Roman Church. They were accused of adultery, gambling and sodomy. In addition, according to the Latin archbishop, certain persons had avoided sentences of excommunication and stopped protecting those guilty of moral turpitude and helped the archbishop punish them. In a letter sent by Urban IV to the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, the pope advised him to request the assistance of the *bailli* (the future King Hugh III), in order to deal with those contemptuous of ecclesiastical discipline. Moreover, the pope complained about *bailli's* behaviour. He accused the *bailli* of showing favour and helping the knights who had been excommunicated by the Latin Church. He also mentioned that he could not punish his liegemen without the permission of the high court of the kingdom.⁴⁴⁰

In addition to the information regarding the relationship between the Latin Church and the crown, concerning the former Greek properties and the payment of the tithes and the other problems, the absence of the Greek Church from the papal letters is worth examining. In most of his letters pertaining to the agreements, the pope did not

⁴³⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 96, pp. 252-53

⁴³⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 106, p. 269

⁴⁴⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 76, pp. 186-90

refer extensively to the Greeks. The situation was the same regarding Achaea and Constantinople as a subject of the pope's correspondence, regarding the division of the Greek ecclesiastical property, as referred to in Chapter One. In January 1222 Honorius III wrote to the archbishop of Nicosia and the bishops of Paphos and Limassol.⁴⁴¹ This is an important letter for several reasons. Queen Alice, the regent of Cyprus at that time, had contacted the pope with the request that the Greek bishops in Cyprus should be allowed to remain as they were – evidence that the secular authorities were keen to defend the Orthodox against interference from the Latins. However, the pope refused to agree to this request, and, citing the canon of the Fourth Lateran Council that ruled that there could not be more than one bishop in any one diocese, announced that he was ordering the patriarch of Jerusalem and the archbishops of Tyre and Caesarea to take executive action to abolish the Greek bishoprics and instruct the other orthodox clergy to show obedience to the Latin bishops. So the pope, like his legate Cardinal Pelagius, was taking a strong line in ordering the subjugation of the Orthodox to the Latin hierarchy. The 1222 agreement, which dates to September of that year and so which must have been reached with all concerned well aware of the papal stance on this issue, laid down that the number of Greek bishops should be reduced to four who are to be subject to the four Latin bishops. In other words papal instructions were set aside in favour of a locally achieved compromise. So this is another example of the pope's wishes being set aside by the 1222 agreement. Many Greek historians have argued that although it restricted the independence of the Greek Church, it did try to ascertain who owned previously sequestrated Greek property and it is wrong to suggest that it was biased and anti-Greek, even though it struck at the autonomy of the Greek Church. Some

⁴⁴¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 86, pp.223-25; *Synodicum*, p. 290-91

terms of the agreements were therefore, safeguards for the Greek Church property and for the enforcement of proper elections to high office in the Greek Church.

In Achaea and Constantinople there were similar agreements to those of 1220-1222. In Greece, the agreement of Ravennika and the new pact which took place some years later, and in Constantinople the treaty of 1204, the agreement of 1206 and the treaty of 1222, all concerned the division of ecclesiastical property. The agreement of Ravennika took place in 1210 between the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, the archbishops of Athens, Larissa, Neopatra and the barons, and the Latin nobility. It was necessitated by the need to settle matters between the secular authority and the Church, concerning the Greek ecclesiastical properties, tax exemption, the Cyprus agreements of 1220-1222 dealt mainly with economic differences between the secular authority and the church. The previous agreements show that the role of the church in Greece and Constantinople was important. There was a close relationship between the emperor of Constantinople and the prince of Achaea and cooperation with the Greeks, even though in a papal letter sent on 17 March 1208 the pope did not excuse the crusaders for their behaviour after the Fourth Crusade.⁴⁴² As in Cyprus, the Greeks were not the only difficulty encountered by the Latin secular authority and the Latin Church, as exemplified by the correspondence between the pope and the crown. In a letter the pope sent nuncios asking them to help the Latin emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin. Furthermore, many papal letters in the time of Innocent III sent to Baldwin, Henry and Geoffrey of Villehardouin, consider the division of ecclesiastical properties and other internal matters of the Latin Church.⁴⁴³

⁴⁴² *Acta Innocenti III*, doc. no. 114, pp. 345-48

⁴⁴³ *Acta Innocenti III*, doc. nos. 70, 187, 93, pp. 291-92, 419-20, 320

However, there were also disagreements between the secular authorities and the Church. For instance, according to a papal letter sent 12 September 1207, there was a disagreement between the Latin emperor of Constantinople and the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas Morosini.⁴⁴⁴

In addition to the agreements of 1220 and 1222 in Cyprus, the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara is another significant example revealing the direct and close relationship between the secular authority and the Church, and the dependence of the Church on the crown, especially in Cyprus. The Latin Church of Cyprus needed the assistance of the nobility and the king in order to impose its will and satisfy its aspirations. In this chapter the event of the martyrdom of the thirteen monks will be examined from another perspective to present and analyze the relationship among the Greek Church, the Latin Church, and the secular authority of the island. Following the visit of Andrew to Kantara, the intense disagreement with the Greek monks, regarding the use of leavened and unleavened bread in the sacrament of Holy Communion, the accusation of the Greek monks as heretics and the departure of the Latin archbishop from Cyprus, Andrew went to King Henry I and requested him to punish the monks. According to the main source of the martyrdom, the king along with his nobility announced to Andrew that he, and his nobles, preferred not to be involved in this case, adding that they were not responsible for ecclesiastical matters. Andrew took them to the king in order to decide their punishment. The result was that the thirteen monks were sentenced to death by being tied to a horse and dragged in the streets until they died or being cast into the fire.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁴ *Acta Innocenti III*, doc. no. 103, p. 333

⁴⁴⁵ Papadopoulos, *Μαρτύριον Κυπρίων*, p. 336; *Cartulary*, doc. no. 69, pp. 175-76

Andrew however, did not have the power and the authority as a churchman to execute the Greek monks by himself or through the Latin Church, thus needing to use the secular authority as his instrument for implementing the punishment. The king's answer to the request of Andrew to punish the monks is of great significance. He made it clear that he did not wish to get involved in this issue and claiming that he and his nobility did not want to interfere in the affairs of the Church. Andrew insisted and finally decided about the penalty of the Greek monks. It is worth mentioning however, that the king was very young and it was a period of civil war, so the secular authority was not in very strong position. During this time the role of John of Ibelin, lord of Beirut is significant. It is important to mention that John had already come into conflict with the Latin Church over the marriage of his son Balian. In other words, he chose the sentence and the king complied with him and executed the monks. The crown was merely the expedient as it had the power to punish the monks and this is an example of the crown deviating from its more usual role of protecting the Greeks against the more extreme Latin clergy. Moreover, despite the objection of King Henry and his desire not to participate in this dispute between the Greek and the Latin Church, he finally submitted to the pressure of Andrew and the Latin Church, something which exposes the influence of the Latin Church on the crown. In spite of their fear of the reaction of the Greek Church and the Greek population of Cyprus to their verdict, Henry and his nobility obeyed Andrew, as for them, the reaction of the Latin Church was relevant, if they refused to satisfy its wishes. If they had refrained from appeasing the Latin Church and pleased the Greeks, they would have incurred further problems. The death of the monks was a victory for Andrew and the Latin Church, as the secular authority had yielded its demands. The Greeks however, did not react to the martyrdom of the thirteen monks. It could be argued that perhaps they were afraid or had other reasons and so Henry I avoided being placed in a difficult position and having to deal with their anger. Thus the story of the thirteen monks of Kantara can be viewed as

evidence of the great influence that the Latin Church of Cyprus had on the secular authority and their collaboration in matters concerning the Greeks.

The second source concerning the martyrdom of the thirteen monks of Kantara is a brief reference to the event by a Latin writer in the *Patrologia Graeca*. This source does not refer to the involvement of the king in the martyrdom, it simply provides a very brief summary of the events.⁴⁴⁶ What is of great importance in this text is the characterization of the Greek monks as new martyrs of the devil, a serious accusation against the Greeks. The third primary source which pertains to the martyrdom of the thirteen monks is a papal letter sent by Pope Gregory IX on 5 March 1231, to the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, Eustorge, and refers to the martyrdom. As with the previous source, Gregory's letter did not declare the direct involvement of the secular authority in the punishment of the thirteen monks. It simply states, "you (Eustorge) decided that they should be imprisoned until we see fit, and, diligently warned by you, they do not wish to withdraw from this error without the advice of the patriarch."⁴⁴⁷ Both sources do not place much emphasis on the event and do not give a detailed narration of the events. Their summaries are concise and do not mention the involvement of the crown, possibly because it was not important for them or just the very fact that it was very common during that time to tolerate the interference of the king and his nobility in ecclesiastical matters.

The important role of the crown, regarding the Church, is also made apparent in some of the letters which Pope Gregory IX sent to the king and the nobles of Cyprus, during the same period. The first letter, sent by Gregory to Henry on 9 April 1240, informed him

⁴⁴⁶ *PG*, 140, col. 518

⁴⁴⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 69, pp. 175-76; *Synodicum*, p. 297

that he had ordered Eustorge to give instructions to his suffragans not to ordain the Greek priests, unless they had first obeyed the Latin Church and renounced heresy and in particular, their belief that the Latins were heretics because they used unleavened bread in the sacrament of the Holy Communion. The Greeks who refused to obey would be subject to the ecclesiastical censure.⁴⁴⁸ Gregory also sent a letter to the nobles and barons of Cyprus, concerning the same matter asking them to help the Latin archbishop of the island to deal with heresy.⁴⁴⁹ At the same time the pope sent a third letter to Eustorge urging him to request the help of the secular arm in his campaign against the Greek heretics.⁴⁵⁰ The remarkable thing in these letters is the fact that Gregory IX asked for the help of the crown more than once in order to obtain the assistance of the secular authority. This shows two things. Firstly, how important the help of the crown was for the pope, and then to what extent the pope and the Latin Church of Cyprus relied on the assistance of the king and his nobles in all matters particularly those regarding the Greeks. When they had differences with the Greeks, they sent letters to the king and the nobles asking for their assistance. It seems that the extent to which the Latin Church depended on the crown was considerable, because as the letter from the Latin Church reveals, it relied upon the help of the king and was unable to function and deal with the Greeks, without the support of the secular authority.

The second factor is the change of the attitude of the secular authority towards the Latin Church. From 1220 to 1222 and afterwards, during the time of the martyrdom of the thirteen Greek monks of Kantara, the crown cooperated with the Latin Church, giving its permission and punishing the monks. From the letters that have been discussed it would seem that the attitude of the king and his nobles was more

⁴⁴⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 71, pp. 177-79

⁴⁴⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 72, pp. 179-81

⁴⁵⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 73, pp. 181-83

cooperative in the 1230s. But then the incessant demands of the Church in the time of Hugh of Fagiano prompted an estrangement. The crown was prepared to be more cooperative in the 1230s than in the 1220s, or in the 1250s-1260s. This is shown in the agreement to allow the sentence of the Greek martyrs to go ahead and also willingness to submit to arbitration over tithes. Earlier, in the 1220s, the crown had not wanted to pay tithes and it was clear then that although they agreed to pay tithes, they did not in fact do so for some time after 1222. Although Henry I cooperated well with Eustorge, this was not the case with Hugh of Fagiano. Hugh was clearly the sort of zealous reformer who was bound to come into conflict with the secular rulers who did not want to be stirred up. Also, he was a foreigner and secular authority had started to become an irritation due to the incessant interference of the Church in the affairs of the kingdom. During the period 1220-1222, the crown was very unwilling to cooperate, and the pope sent many letters to the king. The crown was unwilling to continue to accept the involvement of the Latin Church in its affairs and the troubles which it caused to the island. This change in the attitude of the secular authority towards the Latin Church, provides evidence that the king refused to submit to the pressure of the Latin Church, and he declined to help the Latin Church or become involved in its problems with the Greeks or the Latin nobility of Cyprus. In other words, the crown was unwilling to cooperate with the Latin Church over tithes. Later on, during the time of Hugh of Fagiano, quarrels with Henry I and Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan were partly over the refusal of the rulers to give the archbishop the support he thought he was entitled to. There is little evidence regarding kings supporting the Latin hierarchy when they wanted to oppress the Greeks.

The *Bulla Cypria*, the other significant ecclesiastical agreement during the Frankish era concerning Cyprus, is another example of the relationship between the Church and the secular authority and is proof of the king's refusal to assist the Latin Church. The agreement took place at the request of the Greek archbishop of Cyprus to the pope. The crown did not participate in the negotiations for the publication of the *Bulla*, but after three years, Pope Urban IV started sending letters to the nobility of Cyprus concerning the observance of the terms of the *Bulla*. In a letter sent on 3 January 1263,⁴⁵¹ by Urban to the *bailli* and nobles of Cyprus, he replied to the complaints of Hugh of Fagiano and discussed the refusal of the Greek laity and clergy to adhere to the terms of the agreement, and their disobedience and lack of respect towards the Latin Church on the island. According to the letter,

“the *bailli* and nobles were urged to compel the recusant Greeks and Syrians to respect the authority of the Latin archbishop and his Church. They were warned that if they continued to withhold their assistance from him in his effort to discipline morally depraved persons, they themselves might end up having to shed their blood, and the blame would be described to them for having initially showed excessive tolerance. The *bailli* had a special obligation moreover to help the archbishop, for he was alleged to have sworn that he would maintain and defend the rights and honour of the Church.”⁴⁵²

It is noteworthy that the Latin archbishop's dispute with the secular authorities dated back long before 1260, to 1253 if not earlier. This reveals that Hugh had a problem with the Greeks and also had to deal with the refusal of the *bailli* and the Latin nobility to help him. His only remaining ally was the pope. Another point regarding this letter, which makes historians question it, is the fact that although the letter was sent to the king it finally appeared in the *Cartulary* of Nicosia Cathedral. Hugh had the problem of the Greeks, but he also had to contend with abuse in the Latin Church, highlighted in Eudes's conciliar decrees as well as Latin lay people, who would not

⁴⁵¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 11, pp. 95-98

⁴⁵² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 11, p. 95

pay tithes or were guilty of other offences. It could be that some of the Latin Clergy against whose lax behaviour Eudes had inveighed, were well connected with Latin secular society, perhaps including members of noble families or the royal chancery staff. It is unfortunate that we have so little information about the political situation in Cyprus between the death of Henry and the arrival of Hugh of Antioch-Lusignan as regent, following the death of Plaisance in 1261.

In another letter sent on 23 January 1263, Urban IV complained about the rebelliousness of the Greeks of Cyprus. Some Greeks and Syrians opposed the Greeks who had accepted the *Bulla Cypria* and obeyed the Church of Rome. The nobles of the kingdom of Cyprus did not assist the Latin archbishop, and Urban urged them to support their archbishop against the Greeks and Syrians who showed disobedience to the Latin Church. The pope also wrote in his letter to seek the help of the secular arm.⁴⁵³ A year after the previous letter, Urban IV sent another letter to the *bailli* of Cyprus. The Greeks continued to refuse to accept the terms of the *Bulla* and they plotted against the Latins. The *bailli* refused to help the Latin archbishop against the recusant Greek clergy and

“had maintained that the archbishop could not punish lay persons subject to the *bailli*, forcing him to appeal once more to Rome and point out that under the cover of his oath the *bailli* was protecting wrongdoers. As a result the archbishop was unable to bring them to justice, even though this oath was effectively nullified by the oath the *bailli* had given to defend the rights and honour of the church, while the punishment of Latin and Greek wrongdoers pertained to the *bailli*, not the archbishop.”⁴⁵⁴

Urban urged the *bailli* to help the archbishop to protect the rights and honor of the church.⁴⁵⁵ In his letter to the Latin archbishop,⁴⁵⁶ the pope also said that he ordered the *bailli* to assist him, despite the oath he had given, not to harm any of his liegeman without

⁴⁵³ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 75, pp. 184-86

⁴⁵⁴ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 76, p. 187

⁴⁵⁵ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 76, pp. 186-90

⁴⁵⁶ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 77, pp. 190-94

the permission of the high court and he urged the archbishop to ask for the assistance of the secular army and the *bailli*, regardless “of any immunities from ecclesiastical penalties which the latter might enjoy.”⁴⁵⁷ The *bailli*, in another letter sent by Urban IV to Hugh, the Latin archbishop, on 3 January 1263,⁴⁵⁸ explained the reason for his refusal to assist the Latin Church, the *bailli* “was maintaining that it was up to the nobles themselves to mend their ways, the archbishop’s authority to mete out punishments being limited to his own servants and subordinate clergy.”⁴⁵⁹ He added that if they continued to have this attitude, refusing to help, they would finally force “to shed their blood, for which the blame would not unreasonably be placed upon them for having encouraged and protected them in their wickedness.”⁴⁶⁰ He finished his letter urging them once again to stop protecting them and to assist Hugh of Nicosia, in dealing with the refusal of the Greeks and Syrians to abide by the terms of the *Bulla* in Cyprus.

From all Urban’s letters, it is clear that the Latin Church insisted on asking for the help of the secular authority, despite the negative attitude of the *bailli* who continually ignored the papal letters and his requests, and provided the Latin archbishop with no assistance. The pope did not only send letters to them, he also appealed to the Latin archbishop in order to ask them for help, which serves to show how important the assistance of the secular authority was for the Church, and how difficult it was to obtain it, in order to deal with the refusal of the Greeks and the Syrians regarding the acceptance of the agreement. It seems that the *bailli* was not sympathetic to the pope and did not attach much significance to his letters and his effort to convince him to help Hugh of Fagiano. The *bailli*’s disregard, along with that of the nobility, for the

⁴⁵⁷ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 77, pp. 191

⁴⁵⁸ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 79, pp. 205-08

⁴⁵⁹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 79, p. 205

⁴⁶⁰ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 79, p. 205

orders and wishes of Hugh of Fagiano as expressed, exemplifies that it was of little importance to them to show their respect and they did not desire to obey the wishes of Hugh. It is clear that Hugh of Fagiano complained that the secular authorities were not co-operating but there is no evidence for other Latin bishops ever making a similar complaint. So, probably Hugh of Fagiano was much more extreme in his approach than any other thirteenth century archbishop of Nicosia.

It could however be argued that there were other reasons for their refusal to help the Latin Church. Perhaps the secular authority had problems with its subjects and was too busy trying to solve other problems, thus leaving it no time to deal with the issues of the Greek and Latin Church. Moreover, it could be claimed that one reason was the crown's disagreement with the terms of the *Bulla Cypria*. It might be suggested that it declined to assist the Latin Church because it was more important for it to have good relations with the Greek Church rather than with the Latin Church. These possibilities, however, cannot be substantiated by the documentary evidence, and in addition, a careful reading of the papal letters reveals that the secular authority did not refuse to help the Latin Church concerning the functioning of the *Bulla* only, but also in other matters. In general, the secular authority was unwilling to assist the Latin Church and tolerate its interference in the kingdom's affairs.

Another example which shows the relationship between the secular authority and the Latin Church, and how this relationship influenced the Greek Church, is the case of the Greek monasteries under the Roman Church in Cyprus, the Morea, and Constantinople. There are many examples of those kind of monasteries, like St Maria de Blacherna and St Michael de Buccaleonis, and St Maria Evergetis. An example in Cyprus is the case of the monastery of St Margaret of Argos, which was under the Pope Innocent IV's protection. It is interesting

to note that the pope took St Margaret under his protection “so that they are not disturbed by the harassment of depraved men” and “we unite in assent to your just requests as much as we can, and we take under St Peter’s and our protection your persons and the monastery itself to which you are bound in divine service, along with all the goods that it lawfully possesses at present or will be able to obtain in the future in just ways...”⁴⁶¹ According to another letter sent on 25 January 1245, by Pope Innocent IV, to the patriarch of Jerusalem, he claimed that “the monks of the Greek monastery of St Margaret of Agros, in the diocese of Nicosia, had sought his protection against certain persons in the cities and dioceses of Nicosia and Limassol who had often wrought damages against them. Wishing to protect them, the pope ordered the patriarch not to allow the monastery and its grange of St Mary of Stilo near Cape Gata to be unjustly harmed by anyone. Wrong doers should be subject to ecclesiastical penalties without appeal...”⁴⁶² The reference to certain people who damaged the monastery is of relevance here. The question is who are these “certain people”? One possible explanation is that he is referring to the Latin nobility and the Latin secular authority of the island. As it is stated in Chapter One regarding the Greek ecclesiastical properties, in Cyprus, Constantinople, and the Morea, after the conquest the property of the Greek Church changed hands and became part of the property of the nobles. It is possible that someone was planning to take the property of the monastery of St Margaret of Agros, and pope attempted to prevent them by placing it under his protection. There was already litigation over disputed property. The fact that the documents are fifty years after the conquest suggests that it was not a problem that had arisen at that time, when it was likely that outlying monastic properties would have been more vulnerable than the expense of getting a papal privilege.

⁴⁶¹ *Cartulary*, doc. no. 107, pp. 273-74; *Synodicum*, p. 299

⁴⁶² *Cartulary*, doc. no. 108, pp. 275-77

As revealed in the above papal letter, the monastery must have been very wealthy and as it mentioned in the letter, the monastery and the grange of St Mary of Stilo on Cape Gata of Limassol had appurtenances, possessions and other goods. They had also land and animals. It might have been that a Frank had been trying to acquire the property, or a dispute had arisen and the correctness of the procedures was brought into question. If there had been litigation over property someone, possibly a neighbour, the monks clearly believed a papal letter of protection would help. In order to keep the property in the hands of the church, the pope took it under his protection, even though it was a Greek monastery.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this letter. In order to prevent the loss of its property, the monks secured the protection of the pope who thus stepped in to prevent any further erosion of Greek ecclesiastical endowment. The Greek monasteries did not have the power to protect themselves from the Latin nobility and so they had to request help from the Latin Church. When the Greek monastery obeyed and accepted him and the Latin Church by giving their oath, according to the terms of the *Bulla Cypria*, the pope was willing to protect them from the Latin nobles who were ready to take their property.

Conclusions

The aim of this thesis is to answer the question of whether, and in what ways, the experience of the Greeks, under Latin rule in Cyprus, differed from the experiences of the Greeks under Latin rule in Achaëa and Constantinople. What differentiates my work from previous historians is the comparison of these three areas. I present information on the ordination of Greek bishops and the oath of obedience which has not been studied to date and look in detail at the Orthodox Church in Cyprus. Moreover I also compare the situation with South Italy, Sicily and the Latin East. My viewpoint as a Greek PhD student is as objective as possible after studying all the available primary and secondary sources including the latest editions.

Before I started writing my thesis I made a project design which included the questions I aimed to address and answer in each chapter. The introduction is divided into two sections; the first section contains an analytical presentation of the Greek, Latin, French and Italian primary sources. The second section includes a presentation and critical analysis of the recent historiography about the topic presenting the work of most of the historians who have written about Cyprus and the secondary sources I drew upon for the comparison with South Italy and Latin East. However there are a few questions which I have raised in the introduction which remain unanswered fully and require further in-depth research.

Chapter One examines the establishment of the Latin Church in Cyprus, Achaëa and Constantinople in detail and illustrates that there are many similarities in the establishment of the Latin Church in these three places. An important point that can be concluded is that compared to Greece, the rulers of Cyprus were slow to seek papal

permission – five years after the arrival of Guy of Lusignan. The explanation for this delay is not straightforward and the more persuasive theory lends itself to Guy's background. He came to Cyprus together with his nobles from Jerusalem, where the Latins had already established a Latin Church and where they lived with the Greeks and were familiar with the Greek Church. In addition, the conquest of Cyprus, unlike that of the Morea and Constantinople, was not accompanied by any violent events. The local population did not react in an aggressive way when the Latins were trying to establish their church whereas the conquest of Constantinople was very violent and destructive. In Constantinople and Achaea, the Greek hierarchy left and went into exile, contrary to the situation in Cyprus. In Cyprus the Greek bishops were not replaced by the Latins as in Constantinople and Achaea where the high clergy left. In Constantinople and Achaea the pope asked the high clergy three times to return and obey and then threatened them with the sentence of excommunication and hanging. A similar situation in the Morea and Constantinople prevailed in Antioch and Jerusalem. In addition, we learn that the Latins occupied existing church buildings and used them for Latin-rite services. Despite the lack of evidence, we can assume that the Greeks were angered by this, an opinion which can be strengthened by a comparison with the situation in Antioch.

Cyprus was directly answerable to the pope and Celestine III's letters to the Latins clarified his decision regarding the structure of the new church. In Constantinople, Innocent ordered the Latins to reduce the number of bishops in cases where Benedict of St Susanna and Morosini deemed it necessary. In Achaea, the Franks followed the Greek model and Achaea was divided into seven ecclesiastical baronies. They also added some additional sees to the archbishopric of Patras resulting in an additional

archbishopric in Patras and another in Corinth. It is apparent that the structure was changed in the three areas including in Cyprus some years later with the agreements of 1222 when they reduced the number of sees from fourteen to four, as the Greeks were better served by four bishops instead of fourteen. What is unique about the situation in Cyprus is the evidence that suggests that the Latins did in fact follow the correct process in the establishment of a Latin hierarchy and the coronation ceremony. Concerning the question that bothers many historians as to whether or not there was a papal plan, the answer is that there was no such a plan.

In addition, Chapter One examines the agreements which followed the establishment of the Latin Church, most of them being concerned with the division of ecclesiastical property and the payment of the tithes. From these, we can draw useful information regarding the relationship between the Latin secular authority, the Latin Church and the Greek Church. After the establishment, the secular authority and the Latin Church argued about lay ownership of Greek ecclesiastical property. Concerning Achaea, we learn about the agreement of Ravennika in 1210 which settled matters concerning the church property and taxation of the clergy. The prince of Achaea produced a new version in 1223. The Latin landowners used the agreements to try to impose control on the Greek clergy who were themselves *paroikoi* and tied to the landowners' property. In 1222 the Latin Church in Cyprus abandoned its demand for the former Greek property in return for the promise given by the Greek Church to pay tithes. There were problems with the payment of the tithes in Constantinople and in Achaea where the lay lords kept the money paid in tithes that was due to the Church. There was a struggle between the secular authority or the Latin Church as to who would receive the tithes and who would be exempted from the tithes. Thus it appears that the agreements were difficult to put into effect. Furthermore, we cannot be

sure if the agreements which ratified in these three places were part of a deliberate papal policy in the Eastern Mediterranean or if they were more separate arrangements between the pope and the local population. The Latin Church also took some Greek monasteries under its protection, giving them special privileges. Chapter One analyses the agreements of 1220-1222 and explains the importance of the agreements for Cyprus and shows that the agreements did not influence the situation in the Morea and Constantinople. Another important point regarding the comparison between Cyprus, Constantinople and Achaea, concerns the development of the relationship between the Greek Church of the Morea, Cyprus, Constantinople, and the Latin Church, which is discussed in depth in Chapter Two. Chapter One also deals specifically with the reactions of the Greeks after the Fourth Crusade and it presents the reaction of the Greeks of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople, in detail and makes a comparison with South Italy.

Chapter Two is structured around a range of questions which deal with the relations of the Greek Church of Cyprus, the Greek Church of Constantinople and the Morea with the Latin Church. Chapter Two presents the progression of the relationship between the Greeks and the Latins in Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus in chronological order. In addition it provides a detailed, analytical account of the extent to which the pope became involved in the domestic affairs of the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople and the local churches of Cyprus and the Morea. Another significant point is the involvement of the papal legates and their role in the Greek Church and it proves that papal legates like Pelagius played a significant role. Although at times their actions caused problems, in some situations they were of assistance. What is important to observe is the impact of their involvement on the relations between the Latins and Greeks. Furthermore this chapter presents the relationship between the

Greek patriarch of Constantinople, the archbishop of Patras and Cyprus, the Latin patriarch and the archbishops. It must be underlined that the pope was active in matters pertaining to the churches in all the Christian areas, not only in Greek areas.

Another factor which is examined is the issue of whether there was violence between the Greeks and the Latins dwelling in these areas. In particular this chapter focuses on what happened in Cyprus in the monastery of Kantara and the consequences of event on the relationship between the Greeks and the Latins. It was an isolated event so we cannot claim that it altered the relations between the Latins and the Greeks significantly. Despite the anticipated reactions of the Greek Church of Cyprus and the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, in the long term it appeared not to cause major problems. Concerning the critical question as to whether the Latins tried to exert their authority and force the Greeks to change their faith and customs, I came to the conclusion that the general papal policy was an attempt to bring back the “schismatic” Greeks to the “right” faith. Naturally each pope followed his own policy and in this chapter I present their policies towards the Greeks, some of them adopting a stricter approach than others. In addition, Chapter Two contains a presentation of the ecclesiastical differences between the Greek and the Latin Church. It investigates the Greeks’ attitude to papal superiority and to what extent the Greek clergy were subordinated to the Latins. Moreover we learn that the legal cases concerning the Greeks were judged in a Greek court where the sentence adhered to the Byzantine legal tradition, similar to the situation in Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus.

One of essential points of this chapter is the *Bulla Cypria* and the way it functioned. All the terms of the *Bulla* are presented in detail including an examination of how it

influenced the events in Frankish Cyprus. Furthermore the *Bulla Cypria* sheds light on the oath of obedience, a much discussed issue. Finally, the subject of the election of the Greek bishops provides information about a new topic which prior to now has not been studied. The pertinent points regarding the election of the Greek bishops are that the *Bulla* was enforced and the Greek clergy accepted a role for the Latin bishop. The Greeks did however on at least one occasion dispute an election and turned to the pope for judgment.

Chapter Three examines the relationship of the Greek Church of the Morea, Constantinople and Cyprus with the secular authority. The basic topic of the third chapter is the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the kings and the nobles. It proves that the secular authorities became involved in the affairs of the Church and the importance of the role they played. This chapter examines events already discussed earlier but from a different point of view. It describes the relationship between the Latin emperor and the Greek patriarch, the Greek bishops and the clergy. It analyses the attitude of the king and the queen of Cyprus, the rulers of the Morea and the emperor of Constantinople to the problems between the Latins and the Greeks. For instance, the agreements of 1220 and 1222 are an example of the policy of the secular authority towards the church. During the agreements of 1220-1222 it is important to underline the role of the queen, Alice of Cyprus, who tried to protect the Greeks and asked the pope to allow certain Greek bishops to retain their status.

Another example is the hostile relationship between Geoffrey of Villehardouin and the Latin Church of the Morea and how the negativity of this relationship influenced the Greek Church of the Morea. In Constantinople the secular authority did not

devote much attention to the Church which is proved by the election of Morosini. In addition, the documents reveal that certain people were trying to damage the Greek monasteries in Cyprus, a possible explanation being that they were the Latin nobles. *It also showed* the important role of the tithes concerning the relationship between the crown and the church. In general, the crown wanted to maintain a good relationship with the church in order for a peaceful cooperation between the Greek and the Latin Church to exist. That is obvious by the considerable number of papal letters sent to the *bailli* and the nobility of Cyprus. The secular authority sought to avoid problems with the Greeks and Latins in Constantinople, the Morea and Cyprus and the example of Kantara is evidence of the great influence the Latin Church of Cyprus had over the secular authority. In these three places the crown followed a similar policy, albeit under different circumstances.

I feel it necessary to mention my disappointment and frustration at how little information can be obtained pertaining to the day-to-day affairs of the Latin and Greek Churches in the Morea and in Constantinople, after the very early years of Latin rule, and how that contrary to expectation, there was far more material on the far smaller island of Cyprus.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Greek Sources

Androutsou C., *Συμβολική έξ απόψεως Ορθοδόξου*, Athens 1930.

Beihammer A., *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, Nicosia 2007.

Anna Comnene, *Αλεξιάς*, ed. N. K. Konstantopoulos, Athens 1938.

Constantinides, C., and R. Browning, *Dated Greek Manuscripts from Cyprus to the Year 1571*, Nicosia 1993.

“Constitutio Cypria Alexandri Papae IV”, in *PG*, vol 140, col. 15-34

Cotelerius J. B., *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, Paris 1677-1692.

Darrouzes J., “Le Memoire de Constantin Stibes”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 21 536-7, 1540-5, 1544-95, 1963, 61-91.

Demetracopoulos A., *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς ήτοι περί των Ελλήνων των Γραμμάτων κατά Λατίνων και περί των Συγγραμάτων αυτών*, Leipzig 1872.

Dositheos, *Ιστορία περί των εν Ιεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων άλλως καλούμενη Δωδεκάβιβλος*, books 8-9, Thessaloniki 1982.

Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *The Capture of Thessaloniki: a translation with introduction and commentary*, ed. John R. Melville Jones, Canberra 1988.

Georgii Logothetae Acropolitae, *Chronicon Constantinopolitanum: complectens Historiam captae Constantinopoleos and quinquaginta annotum, a Balduino Flandro Augusto ad Balduinum ultimum, eius nepotem, Byzantij imp. Nunc primum Graece and Latine editum nostiq: ...Ex bibliotheca Theodori Donsae*, Βιβλιοθήκη Ιστορικών Μελετών, Athens 1974.

Gill J., “An unpublished letter of Germanus”, *Βυζάντιον* 44, 1974, 138-51.

- Goumaridis P., “Η Διήγησις του Μαρτυρίου των μοναχών της Καντάρας και η εκκλησία της Κύπρου”, *Πρακτικά του Δεύτερου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου Β΄ Μεσαιωνικών Τμήμα*, Nicosia 1986, 315-32.
- Hadjipsaltis K., “Εκ της Ιστορίας της Κύπρου κατά την Φραγκοκρατία”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές* 22, 1958, 13-26.
- Hadjipsaltis K., “Εκκλησιαστικά Δικαστήρια επί Φραγκοκρατία”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 98, 1956, 22-33.
- Hadjipsaltis K., “Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου και το εν Νίκαια Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο Αρχόμενου του ΙΓ΄ μχ Αιώνας”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 15, 1951, 141-68.
- Hadjipsaltis K., “Μητροπόλεις και Επισκοπές της Εκκλησίας της Κύπρου και το Σχετικό Κείμενο τριών Κωδίκων”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 93, 1949, 29-37.
- Heisenberg A., *Analecta. Mitteilungen aus italienischen Handschriften byzant. Chronographen*, Munich 1901.
- Heisenberg A., *Neue Quellen zur Geshichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion*, Munich 1922.
- Ioannides G., “La Constitutio o Bulla Cypria Alexandri Papae IV del Barberinianus graecus 390”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 2, 2000, 335-72.
- Kerameus A. P., “Νικόλαος Μεσαρίτης”, *Βυζαντινά Χρονικά* 1904, 389-391.
- Leontios Makhairas, *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, Entitled Chronicle*, ed. R. M Dawkins, 2 vols, Oxford 1932.
- Michael Cerularii, *PG*, vol. 110.
- Nicetas Choniatae, *Historia, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. II, Series Berolinensis, ed. H. G. Beck, A. Kambylis, R. Keydell, Berlin 1975.
- Papadakis A., and Talbot A. M., “John X Camateros confronts Innocent III: an unpublished correspondence”, *Byzantinoslavica* 33, 1972, 33-41.

Papadopoulos A., and Kerameus, “Θεόδωρος Ειρηνικός, Πατριάρχης Οικουμενικός ἐν Νίκαια”, *Byzantische Zeitschrift*, 10, 1901, 182-92.

Papadopoulos Th., “Μαρτύριον Κυπρίων”, *Τόμος Αναμνηστικός ἐπὶ τῇ 50ετητηίδι του περιοδικού “Ἀπόστολος Βαρνάβας” (1918-1968)*, Nicosia 1975, 320-37.

Papadopoulos Th., *Μελέται και Ὑπομνήματα I*, Nicosia 1984

Spiridakis K., “Ἡ Περιγραφή τῆς Μονῆς Κύκκου ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει Ἀνέκδοτου Χειρογράφου”, *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 93, 1949, 2-29.

Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, Bibliotheca Graecae Medii Aevi, ed. C. Sathas, Venice and Paris 1872-1894, rep. Athens, 1972, vol. 2.

Σύνταγμα Βυζαντινῶν Πηγῶν Κυπριακῆς Ἱστορίας 4^{ος} -15^{ος}, ed. V. Naranzi-Varmazi, Nicosia 1996.

Το Χρονικόν του Μορέως, ed. P. P. Kalonrou, Athens 1940 and 2nd edition, 1985.

Other Sources

Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI, ed. F. M. Delorme and A.L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, V, ii, Rome 1954.

Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X, ed. A. L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, V, i, Rome 1953.

Acta Alexandri IV, ed. T. Haluskynskyj and M. Wojnar, *PCRCICO*, IV, ii, Rome, 1962.

Acta Honorii III et Gregory IX, ed. A.L Tautu, *PCRCICO*, III, I, Rome 1950.

Acta Honorii III, ed. A. L. Tautu, *PCRCICO*, III, i, Rome 1950.

Acta Innocentii III, ed. T. Haluskynskyj, *PCRCICO*, II, Rome 1944.

Acta Innocentii IV, ed. T. Haluskynskyj and M. Wojnar, *PCRCICO*, IV, i, Rome 1962.

Alatius, Leo, *De Ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione, Libri Tres*, Cologne, 1648.

Anselmus of Havelbergensis, ‘Dialogorum libri III’, *PL* 188.

Anselm of Canterbury, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit", trans. J. Hopkins and H. Richardson, in *Complete philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, Minneapolis 2004, 466-514.

Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi, ed. R. de Mas Latrie, 2 vols, Paris 1891-1893.

The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia, eds. Coureas N. and Schabel C., Nicosia 1997.

Etienne de Lusignan, *Chorographia et breve historia universale dell' isola di Cipro*, Bologna 1573. *Description de toute l' isle de Chypre*, Paris 1580.

Florio Bustron, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie, Paris 1886.

Gams, P.B., *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, Resensburg, vol. 1873-1886.

Innocent III Opera. *Patrologiae cursus completus: Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. B. Migne, Paris 1844-1846, vol. 214-17.

Jaffé, P., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum a condita Ecclesia ad annum post Chr.n. 1198*, ed. W. Wattenbach-S. Löwenfeld- F. Kaltenbrunner-P. Eward, 2 vols. Leipzig 1881-1888.

Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. J. Monfrin, Paris 1995.

Le Quien, M., *Oriens christianus*, 3 vols, Paris 1740.

Les registers de Innocent IV, ed. E. Berger. Berger et al, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 4 vols. Paris, 1881-1921.

Les registers de Boniface VIII, ed. G. Digard et al, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 4 vols. Paris, 1884-1939.

Les registers de Honorius IV, ed. M. Prou, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, Paris, 1886-1888.

Les registers de Nicholas IV, ed. E. Langlois, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 2 vols. Paris, 1886-1905.

Les registers de Gregoire IX, ed. L. Auvray, E. Berger et al, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 4 vols. Paris, 1890-1955.

Les registers de Gregoire X et Jean XXI, ed. J. Giraud. *BEFAR*. 2nd series, Paris, 1892-1906.

Les registers d' Urbain IV, ed. J. Giraud. *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 4 vols. Paris, 1892-1929.

Les registers de Clement IV, ed. E. Jordan. *BEFAR*. 2nd series, Paris, 1893-1945.

Les registers d'Alexandre IV. ed. M.M. de la Ronciere et al, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, 3 vols. Paris, 1895-1959.

Les registers de Nicholas III, ed. J. Gay and S. Vitte, *BEFAR*. 2nd series, Paris, 1898-1938.

Mas Latrie L. de, «Documents nouveaux servant de preuves à l'histoire de l' île de Chypre sous le règne des Princes de la Maison de Lusignan», in *Collection de documents inédits*, *Mélanges historiques* IV, Paris 1882, 343-619.

Monumenta Spectantia ad Unionem ecclesiarum Graecae et Romanae, ed. A. Theiner-F. Miklosich, 1872.

Regesta Honorii Papae III, compiled by A. Pressuti, Rome 1888-1895.

Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christo nato 198 ad annum 1304, compiled by A. Potthast, 2 vols. Berlin 1874-1875.

Registri della Cancelleria Angioina, ed. R. Filangieri, 46 vols. Naples 1995-2002.

The Synodicum Nicosiense and other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196-1373, ed. C. Schabel, Nicosia 2001.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Supplement (Appendix II), article 1, <http://www.newadrent.org/summa>, 2003.

Topping P., *Feudal Institutions as Revealed in the Assizes of Romania, the Law code of Frankish Greece*, Philadelphia 1949.

Secondary Works

Angold M., "Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile" *Latins and Greeks in Eastern Mediterranean*, eds. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, and D. Jacoby, London 1989, 63-86.

Angold M., *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni 1081-1261*, Cambridge 1995.

Angold M., *The Fourth Crusade*, London 2003.

“Azyme”, *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, 2653-2654.

Beihammer A. D. and Schabel C., “Two Small Texts on the Wider Context of the Martyrdom of the Thirteen Monks of Kantara in Cyprus, 1231”, *Festschrift for Ioannis Hassiotis*, Grenada, 2007, (forthcoming)

Brundage J. A., *Medieval Canon Law*, London and New York 1995.

Carr A. W., “Court of the Lusignan Kings”, *Cyprus and Crusades*, ed. N. Coureas-J. Riley-Smith, Nicosia 1995, 239-57.

Coureas N., “Conversion on Latin Cyprus: a new faith or a new rite?”, *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών* 24, 1998, 77-86.

Coureas N., “The establishment of the Latin secular Church at Patras under Pope Innocent III: comparisons and contrasts with Cyprus”, *Mesogeios*, 13-14, 2001, 145-63.

Cyprus Society and Culture 1191 – 1374. eds. A. Nicolaou-Konnari and C. Schabel, Boston 2005.

Darrouzès J., “Notes pour servir à l’histoire de Chypre”, *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί* 17, 1953, 81-102; 20, 1956, 31-63; 22, 1958, 221-50 and 23, 1959, 22-56.

Dendias M., “Sur les rapports entre les Grecs et le Francs en Orient après 1204”, *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 13, Athens 1953, 371-379.

Dondaine A., “Contra Graecos Premiers écrits Polémiques des Dominicains d’ Orient”, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21, 1951, 320-446

Duba W., “The afterlife in Medieval Frankish Cyprus”, *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 26, 2000, 167-194.

- Edbury P. W., "Latin dioceses and Peristerona: a Contribution to the Topography of Lusignan Cyprus", *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 8, 1978, 45-51.
- Edbury P. W., and Rowe J. G., "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180", *English Historical Review*, 93, 1978, 1-25.
- Edbury P. W., *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, Aldershot 1996.
- Edbury P., "The Lusignan Regime in Cyprus and the Indigenous Population", *Kingdoms of the Crusades: from Jerusalem to Cyprus*, Aldershot 1999, 20, 1-9.
- Geanakoplos D. J., *Byzantine East and West: Two worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance, Studies in Ecclesiastical and Culture History*, Oxford 1966.
- Geanakoplos D. J., *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West 1258-1282, a study in Byzantine- Latin relations*, Massachusetts 1959.
- Gill J., "Innocent III and the Greeks: Aggressor or Apostle?", *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D. Baker, Edinburgh 1973, 95-108.
- Gill J., *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400*, New Jersey 1979.
- Hamilton B., "The City of Rome and the Eastern Churches in the tenth century", *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)*, 10-26.
- Hamilton B., *Religion in the Medieval West*, London 1986.
- Hamilton B., *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, London 1980.
- Harris J., "Distortion, divine providence and genre in Nicetas Choniates's account of the collapse of Byzantium 1180-1204", *Journal of Medieval History*, 26, 2000, 19-31.
- Herde P., "The Papacy and the Greek Church in Southern Italy between the eleventh and the thirteenth century", *The Society of Norman Italy*, ed. G. A. Loud and A. Metcalfe, Boston 2003, 213-15.
- Hill G., *A History of Cyprus*, 4 vols, Cambridge 1940-1952.
- Hussey J. M., *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 1986.

Jackson P., *The Mongols and the West 1221-1410*, Harlow 2005.

Kalopissi-Verti S., "Relations between the East and West in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes after 1204: Archaeological and Artistic evidence", *Archaeology and the Crusades*, ed. P. Edbury and S. Kalopissi-Verti, Athens, 2007, 1-33.

Kirmitsis P. I., "Η ορθόδοξος εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Φραγκοκρατίας", *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 47, 1983, 3-108.

Kolbaba T. M., "Byzantine Perception of Latin Religious "Errors": Theme and Changes from 850 to 1350", *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, DC 2001, 117-143.

Kordoses M. S., *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204-1262) a Study of the Greek population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish dominion*, Ioannina 1987.

Kyrris C. P., "Η Οργάνωση της Ορθοδόξου εκκλησίας της Κύπρου κατά τους δύο πρώτους αιώνες της Φραγκοκρατίας", *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Μελετών της Ιεράς Μονής Κόκκου*, 1993, 149-185.

Laurent V., "La succession episcopale des derniers archevêques de Chypre", *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 8, 1949, 33-41.

Loud G. A., "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", *Conquerors and Churchmen in Norman Italy*, Aldershot 1999, 215-233.

Loud G. A., *Conquerors and Churchmen in Norman Italy*, Aldershot 1999.

Magoulias H. J., "A study in Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Relations on the island of Cyprus between the years A.D. 1196 and 1360" *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 10, 1964, 75-106.

Meyendorff J., *Byzantine Theology, Historical Trends and doctrinal Themes*, New York 1983, 2nd ed.

Moorman J. R. H., *Church Life in England in the thirteenth century*, Cambridge 1931.

- Nicol D. M., "The Papal Scandal", *Studies in Church History*, 13, 1967, 141-68.
- Nicolaou- Konnari A- Schabel C, eds. *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Boston 2005.
- Nicolaou- Konnari A., "The Encounter of Greeks and Latins in Cyprus in the Late 12th and 13th Centuries" (PhD Dissertation , University of Wales, Cardiff 1999).
- Papadopoulos T., "Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου κατά την περίοδο της Φραγκοκρατίας" in *Ιστορία της Κύπρου Μεσαιωνικών Βασιλείων- Ενετοκρατία*, vol. 1, Nicosia 1995, 554-665.
- Patin W. A., *The English Church in the XIV century*, Cambridge 1959.
- Richard J., "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople, 1207-1277", *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, 1986, 45-62.
- Runciman S., *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. Cambridge 1951-1955.
- Runciman S., *The Eastern Schism: a study of the papacy and the eastern churches during the 11th and 12th centuries*, Oxford 1955.
- Runciman S., *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge 1988.
- Sayers J., *Innocent III, Leader of Europe 1198-1216*, London-New York 1994.
- Schabel C., "The Greek bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340 and the Synodikon Kyprion", *Κυπριακές Σπουδές*, 144-145, 2003, 217-34.
- Schabel C., "The Latin bishops of Cyprus, 1255-1313, with a note on bishop Neophytos of Solea", *Επετηρίς Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 30, 2004, 75-111.
- Setton K., *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571*, 1-4, Philadelphia 1976-1984.
- Spence R., "Gregory IX's attempted expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople: the crusade for the union of the Latin and Greek Churches", *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. Derek Baker, Edinburgh 1973, 163-76.
- Wolff R. L., "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204-1261", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8, 1954, 228-303.

Wolff R. L., “The Organization of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople”, *Traditio* 6, 1948, 33-60.

Zakynthinos D. A., “Ο Αρχιεπίσκοπος Αντέλμος και τα πρώτα έτη της Λατινικής Εκκλησίας Πατρών”, *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 1933, 401-17.

Zaxaropoulos N. G., *Η Εκκλησία στην Ελλάδα κατά την Φραγκοκρατία*, Thessaloniki 1981.

