

Christopher Schabel

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

Cyprus University in Nicosia

schabel@ucy.ac.cy

DOI: 10.35765/pk.2023.4203.20

Aimery de Nabinaud, OFM (†1326), Counsellor
of Henry II, Bishop of Paphos, Papal Diplomat between
Cyprus and Armenia, and Debtor

ABSTRACT

Of the four medieval cities (and dioceses) of Frankish Cyprus – Nicosia, Paphos, Limassol, and Famagusta – Paphos has received the least attention. Continuing work on the *Bullarium Cyprium* project, which involves editing the papal letters referring to the island, provides a window into the ecclesiastical history of the town. This is the second of three articles in this journal that complete Jean Richard's work on the bishops of Paphos in the period of the Avignon papacy (1309–1377). With some notes on Bishop Jacques More (1309–1321), this paper focuses on his successor, Aimery de Nabinaud, OFM, the first member of an illustrious family of ecclesiastics who served Cyprus in the 14th century. First noted in 1310, when he was teaching at the Minorite convent in Famagusta, Aimery was an important advisor to King Henry II (†1324), he was eventually elevated to Bishop of Paphos in 1322. We know most about Aimery's diplomatic activities with the Kingdom of Armenia in Cilicia from 1310 until his death, as well as the difficult financial situation he left to his successor as bishop, Géraud de Veyrines.


KEYWORDS: Armenia, Cyprus, papacy, Crusades, Aimery de Nabinaud, Jacques More

STRESZCZENIE

Aimery de Nabinaud, OFM (†1326), doradca Henryka II, biskup Pafos, papieski dyplomata na Cyprze i w Armenii oraz dłużnik

Spośród czterech średniowiecznych miast (i diecezji) frankijskiego Cypru – Nikozji, Pafos, Limassol i Famagusty – Pafos poświęcono najmniej uwagi. Dalsze badania w ramach projektu *Bullarium Cyprium*, który obejmuje redakcję listów papieskich odnoszących się do wyspy, pozwalają na wgląd w kościelną historię miasta. Jest to drugi z trzech artykułów w tym czasopiśmie, które

Sugerowane cytowanie: Schabel, Ch. (2023). Aimery de Nabinaud, OFM (†1326), Counsellor of Henry II, Bishop of Paphos, Papal Diplomat between Cyprus and Armenia, and Debtor.

©  *Perspektywy Kultury*, pp. 291–316. DOI: 10.35765/pk.2023.4203.20

Submitted: 25.02.2023

Accepted: 30.08.2023

dopełniają opracowanie Jeana Richarda na temat biskupów Pafos w okresie papieżstwa awiniońskiego (1309–1377). Oprócz kilku uwag na temat biskupa Jacques’a More’a (1309–1321), niniejszy artykuł poświęcony jest jego następcy, Aimery’emu de Nabinaud OFM, pierwszemu członkowi znamienitej rodziny kościelnej, która zasłużyła się dla Cypru w XIV w. Aimery, o którym po raz pierwszy wzmiankowano w 1310 r., kiedy nauczał w klasztorze minorytów w Famaguście, był ważnym doradcą króla Henryka II (†1324), a w 1322 r. został mianowany biskupem Pafos. Obecnie posiadamy najpełniejszą wiedzę o dyplomatycznych relacjach Aimery’ego z królestwem Armenii w Cylicji od 1310 r. do chwili jego śmierci, a także o trudnej sytuacji finansowej, w jakiej znalazł się jego następca na stanowisku biskupa, Géraud de Veyrines.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: Armenia, Cypr, papieżstwo, wyprawy krzyżowe, Aimery de Nabinaud, Jacques More

This is the second in a series of three articles on the Latin bishops of Paphos during the Avignon papacy. Continuing the theme of an earlier study in this journal on Géraud de Veyrines (Schabel, 2020), this paper surveys the experiences of his predecessor, Aimery, who, like Géraud, played an important role in Cypriot relations with the Kingdom of Armenia in Cilicia. The great Girolamo Golubovich compiled the first biography of Aimery in 1919 (Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, pp. 225–231), but in the intervening century additional sources have appeared that allow us to augment and correct his account.¹

1 Since the publication of my paper on Aimery’s successor in the fall of 2020 (Schabel, 2020), Jean Richard passed away and I discovered that many of Pope John XXII’s so-called “lettres closes et secrètes,” to use Professor Richard’s French, that is, the letters in Reg. Vat. 109–117, were inadvertently omitted from the *Bullarium Cyprium* III because of a coincidence of accidents. First, in the late seventeenth-century Cardinal Garampi concentrated on the Reg. Aven. series in compiling the *Schedario Garampi*, the early basis for the *Bullarium Cyprium* III, and there are no Reg. Aven. volumes corresponding to Reg. Vat. 109–117, although copies of some letters are in other volumes. Second, Guillaume Mollat’s main project was the *Lettres communes*, a calendar of which he published in 16 volumes, and while Auguste Coulon and Suzanne Clémencet published three volumes of the *Lettres secrètes et curiales relatives à la France*, no one ever accomplished the corresponding project for those letters *intéressant les pays autres que la France*, unlike in the case of Benedict XII. Charles Perrat and Jean Richard did find and summarize scores of unknown letters in Reg. Vat. 109–117, but they overlooked scores more, some of which concern important elements and events in Cypriot foreign relations. Aimery de Nabinaud’s involvement in some of these issues will serve as a pretext to mention some of these sources. As before (Schabel, 2020, p. 81, n. 1), I have transcribed the full text of the letters cited below according to the summaries in *Bullarium Cyprium* III (2012) and where I cite the manuscript the letters are absent from the *Bullarium Cyprium*. Coureas mentions Aimery often (Coureas, 1997, pp. 108, 209; Coureas, 2010, *passim*), but necessarily relying on the summaries of Mollat. I thank Nicos Coureas, Peter Edbury, and Ioannis Harkas for their comments.

Friar Aimery, Lector in the Franciscan Convent of Famagusta

Pace Golubovich, we first hear of the presence “fratris Aymerici de Ordine Minorum, lectoris in Famagusta,” as an observer at the trial of the Templars in Nicosia on 28 May 1310 (Schottmüller, 1887, pp. 208, 348; Gilmour-Bryson, 1998, pp. 139–140 & 363–364). This information was made available over three decades before Golubovich wrote, but he could not have known whence Aimery came because it was not until 1927 that Charles Perrat published the only source that provides this information, a document of 4 August 1310 witnessed by “Haymerico de Nabinalis, lectore Fratrum Minorum Famaguste” (Perrat, 1927, p. 86).

There is a town called Nasbinals about 40 kilometers northeast of Rodez in south-central France, and one called Nabinaud, with variant spellings *Nabinaus*, *Nabineau*, *Nabinaux*, and *Nabinau*, about 35 kilometers west-northwest of Périgueux. The latter town is the seat of the diocese to which his alleged nephews Hélié, Léger, and Itier *de Nabinalis* (sometimes written *de Nabinal* in French and *de Nabinali*, *de Nabinals*, and *de Nabinallis* in Latin), three brothers, have been attached, since they were part of the general trend of clerics coming from the Périgord to take up careers in Cyprus (Rudt de Collenberg, 1979, pp. 249–250; Salles, 2007). Because they were all Franciscans, their diocese is not mentioned in the sources. Nevertheless, on 3 September 1344, at the request of Hélié, who was then cardinal, Pope Clement VI granted the position of rector of a parish church in the diocese of Périgueux to a certain Guillaume *de Nabinalis*, alias Le Grand, described as a cleric and familiar of Hélié and who at the time held a benefice called an *assisia* at the level of acolyte in the church of Nicosia, no doubt from Hélié’s time as archbishop of Nicosia (Reg. Vat. 167, f. 243r-v, no. 409). This suggests that the *de Nabinalis* in question is indeed the town in the diocese of Périgueux.

Rudt de Collenberg asserted that Aimery had a niece (Isabeau de Vots) who married a Cypriot (Jean de Montolif) and five nephews, the aforementioned Hélié, Léger, and Itier, and two laymen named Raymond and Adhémar. Adhémar supposedly had three sons, the layman Guillaume and two clerics named Hélié and Audibert, all associated with Cyprus (Rudt de Collenberg, 1979, p. 250). I have been able to verify only some of this, but the fact that the cleric Guillaume of Nabinaud mentioned above is not called a close relative of Hélié should warn us to be cautious about other cases of people from Nabinaud, even if they are associated with Aimery, the three brothers, and/or Cyprus. For example, when on 18 March 1347, at the request of the same Cardinal Hélié, the sixteen-year-old Audebert *de Nabinalis*, already canon in a church in the diocese of Périgueux with an expectancy elsewhere,

was given another benefice in the West, Pope Clement specified that Audebert was Hélié's *nepos*, i.e., a nephew or other junior relative (Reg. Vat. 177, ff. 133v–134r, no. 62). This is perhaps not the case with Raymond *de Nabinallis*, a young nobleman of the Périgueux diocese, whom in 1337 Pope Benedict XII ordered the bishop of Famagusta to absolve of the sentence of excommunication he had incurred for visiting the Holy Sepulcher without a license (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-27). Nor can we be certain, contrary to assumptions, that Adhémar *de Nabinallis*, who migrated to Cyprus, was a nephew of Aimery and/or brother of Hélié, Léger, and Itier. In 1354 Guillaume *de Nabinallis*, the late Adhémar's son, who wished to follow his father's footsteps and go to Cyprus, is described in a letter of Pope Innocent VI to King Hugh IV as a young nobleman of the diocese of Périgueux (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, u-37). Whether or not these men were closely related to Aimery, the three brothers, or both, their cases do solidify the association of Aimery and the others with the diocese of Périgueux.

Doubly unfortunate for Golubovich, the two documents from 1310 are the only ones that tie Aimery to the Franciscan convent in Famagusta and identify him as a *lector* there. The Franciscan convent in Nicosia was already several decades old when the Famagusta convent is first mentioned in the surviving sources, on 22 October 1296, when a document was drawn up for Philip of Antioch, guardian of the convent (*Notai genovesi*, 1983, no. 11). On 2 July 1300 a man planned his burial there and documents of 24 February 1301 and 23 June 1302 were drawn up in or in front of the convent, the ruins of which survive (*Notai genovesi*, 1982, nos. 12 & 245; *Notai genovesi*, 1987, no. 239; Olympios, 2018, 162a–167b). One assumes that the Famagusta convent was established almost immediately after the fall of Acre, although it could have been older.

When Aimery joined the convent is, of course, impossible to say. Although one could be a *lector* in logic and physics in a convent school, by 1310 the majority of Franciscan convents had a *lector* who had studied theology at a *studium generale* of the order and taught low-level classes (Roest, 2000, pp. 80–97). For example, a certain Martin was *lector* in the Minorite convent in Nicosia in 1299 and Nicolas de Marsilly, *lector* in the Dominican convent of Nicosia in 1310, was later remembered as having been “in scholis conventus” in 1306 (Schabel, 2009, no. 5; Richard, 1962, p. 51, n. 1). In order for Friar Aimery to be a *lector*, he had to have been at least in his mid-20s, putting his date of birth at around 1285 at the latest. It is unlikely, however, that Aimery had just arrived in 1310 direct from his studies, especially given the important role he played in the events of that year, so he was probably a few years older.

If Aimery had studied theology at a *studium generale* of the order, the most likely place would have been the Franciscan *studium* in Toulouse,

where he would have heard lectures by a giant in the order, either Vital du Four (†1327), *lector* between 1297 and 1307, or perhaps Bertrand de La Tour (†1332/33), probably *lector* in 1308–1309. Indeed, Hélié de Nabinaud would be *lector* there in the early 1320s. Alternatively, Aimery could have studied at Montpellier or Narbonne, which had also reached a high level by the early fourteenth century (Piron, 2012).

Aimery was thus a Franciscan from Languedoc, but he would not have felt out of place in Famagusta, populated by merchants from Languedoc and Catalonia, in addition to Italians, Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, Jews, and a few Muslims, besides Franks of Cyprus. The trial of the Templars in Nicosia was itself a great international spectacle, with knights and witnesses from all over Western Christendom. When Aimery is mentioned as an observer on 28 May 1310, during the interrogation of the draper of the Templars, John of Villa, he was with the Dominicans Jordan Angeli and John of Saint-Quentin as well as the Franciscan Raymond of Ligny or Lagney, guardian of the Nicosia convent, all three regulars at the trial (Schottmüller, 1887, pp. 208, 348; Gilmour-Bryson, 1998, pp. 139–140, 363–364, & *passim*). The number of other mendicants appearing in the trial record is impressive: the Carmelite Adam from Nicosia; the Franciscans William of Schoria, vicar of the minister provincial, and Roger the Englishman, vicar of the custody of Cyprus; the Dominican prior of Nicosia Baldwin of *Villa Ganti* in the diocese of Arras; the Dominicans Francis of Rome/Romagna, Guy of Paris, Leon of Berquesia/Berquesta, and the above-mentioned Nicolas de Marsilly, a royal chaplain and counsellor (Richard, 1962, p. 51, n. 1; *passim* in Schottmüller, 1887, and Gilmour-Bryson, 1998).

Regardless of the Dominican Nicolas de Marsilly's connection to the crown, Henry II favored the Franciscans, who in turn supported the king after his brother Amaury, lord of Tyre, staged a coup d'état in early 1306, seizing control of the government until his assassination on 5 June 1310, just a few days after Aimery de Nabinaud's appearance at the Templar trial. King Henry had to agree to the terms of Amaury's government in documents of May 1306 and January 1307, which were witnessed by a number of mendicants, some of whom were mentioned above. In May 1306 it was the Dominicans Bartholomew, prior provincial, and Jean de Saint-Quentin, prior of the Dominican convent in Nicosia; the Franciscans John, minister provincial, and Guy, in charge of the custody, probably the Guy of Bologna who had been guardian of the Nicosia convent in 1299; and the Carmelite Thomas, prior of the Nicosia convent. In January 1307 it was the Dominican Baldwin, prior of the Nicosia convent; the Franciscans Bertrand, guardian of the Nicosia convent, and William (of Schoria), the vicar of the custody of Cyprus; and the Carmelite Prior Thomas (Schabel & Minervini, 2008, pp. 110, 119; Schabel, 2009, no. 5).

The leading mendicants, as international as the Templars, were thus close to the centers of power in Cyprus, just as the bishops and abbots of the most important monasteries. Indeed, when the Templars offered to surrender to Amaury in Nicosia on 27 May 1308, as the lord of Tyre explained to Pope Clement V, it was in the presence of two of the three local bishops (probably Peter of Limassol, administrator of Nicosia, and Bishop Guy or Anthony of Famagusta), Dominicans, Franciscans, Cistercians, and Carmelites, along with other high-ranking members of the clergy (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-47).

When Pope Clement was first informed of the coup, he resolved to send Raymond of Pins, canon of Bordeaux, to Cyprus as his nuncio to resolve this issue, first mentioning this on 6 September 1307 (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-18). The official orders were given on 23 January 1308, when Raymond was addressed as canon of Bazas and papal chaplain, and he was to be joined on his mission by Nicolò Correr, archbishop of Thebes (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-20). The trip was likely planned for the spring of 1308, judging from the concessions the pope gave his nuncios on 1 April, but by 12 July Nicolò had been appointed patriarch of Constantinople (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-32–36; Saint-Guillain, forthcoming). In the meantime, however, the Templar saga had begun, and the pope was faced with two crises focused on Cyprus. Clement decided to send the Franciscan Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne, bishop of Rodez (and future patriarch of Jerusalem), as his legate, addressing him a letter pertaining to Cypriot affairs on 19 May 1309 (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-50), but it was not until 15 September that he announced this to King Henry in the context of crusade plans, granting his legate a number of concessions on the same day (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-51–72). In effect, Patriarch Nicolò of Constantinople was replaced by Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne, and the pope addressed letters on other Cypriot matters jointly to Pierre the legate and Raymond the nuncio on 24 September 1309 (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-73, 75). In the end, neither was able to reach Cyprus before Amaury, who had been forewarned, sent his brother Henry into confined exile with his brother-in-law, King Oshin of Armenia in Cilicia. Raymond arrived at the end of February, but Pierre did not dock in Cyprus until just after Amaury's assassination on 5 June 1310 (Perrat, 1927, pp. 48–55).

Opposition to Henry's return did not dissipate after Amaury's death, and in any case those involved in the coup and Amaury's widow and children began to fear for their lives and property should the king be allowed to return. It is at this juncture that Aimery appears again on the record. The chronicle known as *Amadi* relates that after Pierre arrived in Cyprus, Amaury's widow, Isabel, made some requests and Pierre summoned "all the prelates, Franks, Greeks, and of any other rite, and the chapter of Santa

Sophia,” to discuss Isabel’s requests, and “on the following day, which was Sunday, 28 June 1310, the legate said Mass and *un Frate Minore ditto fra Almerico* preached.” At the end of his sermon, we are told that Aimery urged the congregation to help to secure the king’s return, relating that the legate would forgive their sins on apostolic authority, whereas those who impeded his release or thought evil of the king and did nothing to help even though they could, they and their descendants would be excommunicated down to the fourth generation. The Greek bishop, Leo of Solea, one presumes, then did the same, followed by the prelates of the other nations. Aimery added that Henry II’s return would be a great boon for many reasons, above all for the peace and quiet of the country and for the future crusade, which the legate Pierre had come to support. Among the audience members was the king’s and the late Amaury’s younger brother Aimery, the constable of Cyprus, along with his retinue, who went to the legate after Mass and sought papal absolution (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, pp. 354–355). Following *Amadi*’s account, Florio Bustron, while omitting Aimery’s name and merely mentioning a Friar Minor, but using his logic and imagination, added some details, among them that the Mass was said in the cathedral of Santa Sophia (Florio Bustron, 1886, pp. 214–215).

That same day Raymond returned from a futile trip to Armenia to secure the king’s release, the nuncio’s second attempt, the first voyage having been in April before Amaury’s assassination. On 16 July 1310 Raymond again left for Armenia, this time with the legate Pierre, the Franciscan confessor of the late Amaury, Daniel Lombardi of the Nicosia convent, the Dominicans Jean de Saint-Quentin and Nicolas de Marsilly, and “*fra Almerico del Ordine di Menori et suo compagno*” (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, p. 366; Perrat, 1927, p. 56). They arrived in Laiazzo on 18 July, and this time Raymond succeeded, although only via an agreement in favor of King Oshin of Armenia and Amaury’s widow and children. The agreement was signed on 4 August 1310 “in the Kingdom of Armenia in an open field next to the village called in the vernacular Dahoudam and close to the castle of Gouarra” and witnessed by the four friars, among them “Haymerico de Nabinalis, lectore Fratrum Minorum Famaguste,” as well as James of Rome vicar of the minister of the Franciscans in Armenia, his associate Pierre de *Montholio*, the Franciscan Bonaventure of Tripoli of the Nicosia convent, and the Franciscan Ralph the Norman, who was King Henry II’s confessor, perhaps having replaced Friar Bertot (Perrat, 1927, pp. 76–77 & 86; *Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, pp. 323, 371–374).

On 10 August the friars arrived back in Famagusta along with the Armenian ambassadors to secure consent to the agreement and to bring back Amaury’s widow and children in exchange for the king. Aimery proceeded at once to Nicosia, where, on 12 August, “uno de li Frati Menori,

fra Hemerico,” entered the royal court and informed the assembled knights, burgesses, and people that the king was safe and sound, held at a certain place, and he recounted the events of the voyage. On behalf of King Henry, Aimery thanked those who had remained loyal and faithful knights. Then he read out in public a letter of the king urging the leaders to accept the agreement, which would secure his release. The news that Aimery delivered was met with great rejoicing, we are told, with three days of celebration and feasting (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, pp. 374–375).

King Henry II was soon back in Cyprus, but he considered the agreement to have been extorted from him under duress and refused to abide by its terms. In part for this reason, Aimery de Nabinaud, who had played a prominent public role in both Nicosia Cathedral and the Royal Palace, would be called on again over decade later to deal with peace negotiations between King Henry and King Oshin’s successor, as we shall see. For now it suffices to say that the Franciscan had become, if he was not already, one of the king’s favorites.

Friar Aimery, Royal Counsellor

King Henry eventually employed Aimery in marriage negotiations between Cyprus and Aragon, in which King Jaime II of Aragon would marry the eldest of Henry II’s sisters, Maria of Lusignan, the seventh child of King Hugh III (†1284). Although it is true that Jaime’s nuncios traveled to Cyprus in the course of 1313, it was late in the year and Henry II’s response is dated 2 February 1314 (on our system, although the Cypriot court and Amadi did not begin the year 1314 until 1 March). Henry announced that he was sending the bishop of Limassol John of Laiazza, the knight, royal counsellor, and bailli of the Secrète Hugh Beduin, and his counsellor “venerabilem et religiosum virum et fratrem Heymericum de Ordine Minorum,” giving them together and individually the power to negotiate (Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, nos. 146–147). According to *Amadi*, Henry sent his ambassadors that same month, but there were two Franciscans, the other perhaps without a mandate (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, p. 395). The Aragonese chronicler Zurita writes that the Cyprus and Aragonese embassies arrived in Valencia at the end of April, meeting the king, but only three ambassadors are listed, the third being “Fray Americo de la Orden de los Frailes Menores” (Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, p. 226). Jaime II wrote to King Henry on 6 June 1314 from Valencia announcing the arrival of the three ambassadors, including “venerabilem ac religiosum fratrem Eymericum de Ordine Minorum,” and the progress in the negotiations. Jaime added that they also discussed the marriage of Henry’s sister

Alice, the ninth child of Hugh III (the eighth, Margaret, having married Thoros of Armenia), and Jaime's second son, Alfonso, the future Alfonso IV, but the Cypriot ambassadors claimed that they did not have a mandate from their king for such discussions (Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, no. 155). Jaime sent his ambassador to Cyprus on 21 August regarding the first marriage, but Alfonso married someone else that same year, a missed opportunity for Cyprus.

Nevertheless, another marriage alliance was formed when it was arranged for Isabel d'Íbelin, the daughter of King Henry's uncle, seneschal, and de facto regent, Philippe d'Íbelin, and Jaime's third son, Ferran the infante of Mallorca, who was in the process of trying to make good on his title as Prince of Achaia. In the royal palace in Nicosia on 5 October the "religiosi et honesti viri fratris Hemerici de ordine Minorum" was, along with Bishop John of Limassol, Bishop Robert of Beirut, and James de Cassiatis, a witness to the marriage contract (Mas Latrie, 1873, no. 5). The marriage was celebrated on 7 June 1316, but Ferran was killed in battle near Clarence (Glarentza) four weeks later on 5 July (Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, p. 227), although his posthumous child by Isabel, also Ferran, would later play a role on the Cypriot stage (Edbury, 1991, pp. 144–146).

After Maria of Lusignan had arrived on 22 November 1315 and was settled with King Jaime, he wrote to King Henry on 5 January 1316 from Barcelona, reporting that she wished to retain her confessor, Arnulf, the guardian of the Franciscan convent of Famagusta, whom Henry had sent with other nuncios to the Crown of Aragon. Jaime added that the queen also requested that Henry send "religiosus frater Aimericus de Ordine Minorum" to deal with her penance, perhaps to replace Arnulf (Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, nos. 206–207).

It does not appear that Henry was willing to part with his Franciscan (*pace* Rudt de Collenberg, 1979, pp. 249–250), however, for on 29 May 1316 the ambassador of Jaime II, Francesc des Forn, composed a report from Famagusta that included a description of Aimery's role at the royal court. Francesc had left Barcelona on 10 March and arrived in Famagusta on 20 April, sent there to secure the remainder of Maria's dowry. Francesc proceeded to Nicosia but, Peter Edbury notes, he could not achieve his aims because, he complained, Henry was surrounded by the queen mother, Philippe d'Íbelin, Hugh Beduin, and, especially, "frare Meric, fratre Menor, qui es gran re de son cor e de tot son conseyl, en axi que son avonclo e misser Ugo Badui, e tota els de la cort me deyen via a frare Eymeric" (Mas Latrie, 1852–61 II, pp. 703–707; Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, p. 227; Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, no. 226; Edbury, 1991, p. 138).

While, contrary to some commentators, it does not seem that Aimery was ever the king's confessor, since perhaps it was best not to mix religion

and politics, Aimery did remain Henry's close counsellor. As a result, Jaime addressed a letter dated Barcelona, 22 February 1317, directly to "Religioso viro fratri Aimerico, Ordinis fratrum Minorum." Jaime reminded Aimery of his embassy to the Crown of Aragon and their negotiations. Jaime remarked that he had sent letters and a nuncio to Cyprus, but to no avail. So the king asked Aimery to see to it that Henry II paid what was still owed from his sister's dowry, to ensure that the two kings remained united and not split by dissension (Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, no. 230).

Aimery was not the only mendicant involved in Cypriot diplomacy, of course. As has been described elsewhere, in the ongoing negotiations between King Henry II of Cyprus and King Oshin of Armenia concerning the agreements for Henry's release in 1310, on 16 September 1315 Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne, now patriarch of Jerusalem, appointed Friar Raymond, in charge of the Franciscan convent in Paphos (and perhaps the same Raymond who had been guardian of the Nicosia house in 1310), and Friar Rostaing Alard, the prior of the Dominican convent in Famagusta, along with three other clerics, including Bishop Jacques of Paphos, as his delegates. In the end, only Friar Rostaing and Bishop Jacques were able to carry out the inquest as to whether the agreement was legitimate or signed under duress, which inquest, held in Nicosia, was probably and not surprisingly biased in favor of their king, Henry II. They finalized their report on 17 April 1318 (Schabel & Georgiou, 2016, pp. 106–113), but it did not settle the issue, and it fell in part to Jacques' successor as bishop of Paphos, Aimery de Nabinaud, to continue the negotiations.

Bishop Aimery of Paphos

No doubt because of his service to the crown, Aimery succeeded Jacques More as bishop of Paphos, although there is some disagreement about when this occurred, just as there is confusion about when Jacques himself had succeeded the previous bishop, Peter of Montolif. The full text of a letter dated 8 June 1310 that Pope Clement V addressed to his legate Pierre and his nuncio Raymond (as well as Bishop Baldwin of Famagusta) around the time of their arrival in Cyprus reveals that Bishop Peter had died and Jacques had succeeded him. The pope thought Bishop Peter alive on 19 May 1309, when he addressed another letter to the legate Pierre as well as two canons of Nicosia, one of which was the future Bishop Baldwin, but in the 8 June 1310 letter the pope specifies that his orders in the earlier letter could not be carried out because Bishop Peter's death intervened (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-50, p. 78). Peter of Montolif seems to have died before 6 October 1309, when in a document drawn up in

Malaucène in the diocese of Carpentras not far from Avignon describing an earlier agreement with Bishop Peter, he is described as having then (*tunc*) been bishop of Paphos (Schabel, 2009–10, no. 1). It is also possible that Peter had resigned first because of ill health and then died, but in any case Jacques was probably elected in the latter half of 1309.

On 18 July 1322, Pope John XXII appointed Aimery bishop of Paphos, but Rudt de Collenberg asserted that Aragonese letters demonstrate that Aimery had been elected bishop “bien avant 1320” (Rudt de Collenberg, 1979, pp. 250 & n. 99). Although he gives no page numbers for the sources that he cites, one of which may not exist, Rudt de Collenberg seems to have meant Martínez Ferrando’s note to his edition of a letter of King Jaime II to Henry II dated Valencia, “XII Kalendas Ianuarii, anno Domini MCCCXX,” which Rudt de Collenberg may have understood as 21 December 1319, but which is 21 December 1320. In the note, Martínez Ferrando relates that Jaime II addressed a similar letter to the Queen-mother Isabel and letters of greetings to Princess Helvis, Queen Constance, Hugh of Lusignan the constable (the future Hugh IV), Hugh Beduin, and “fray Aimeric, obispo de Pafos,” but the document itself is not presented and this may indicate Aimery’s future title as bishop (Martínez Ferrando, 1948 II, no 346).

According to Pope John’s letter of appointment, after Bishop Jacques More died, when the pope was informed of the vacancy, he immediately reserved the naming of the successor, but before this reservation was made the chapter of Paphos had elected Aimery bishop. Afterwards, “perhaps” ignorant of the reservation, which must have occurred in the intervening time, Aimery had his election confirmed by Archbishop John of Nicosia, who then consecrated Aimery as well. When Aimery had thus been put in charge of the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church of Paphos, he learned of the papal reservation and went in person to the curia, then in Avignon, and committed the whole business to the pope and cardinals. On account of the usual merits, including Aimery’s education, but also because of his acceptance by the clergy and people of the city and diocese of Paphos, Pope John ratified Aimery’s election, confirmation, consecration, and anything he had otherwise done properly while acting as bishop, as if there had been no reservation (Wadding, 1625–54 III, pp. 137–138; Eubel, 1898, 227b–228a, no. 470; Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, pp. 227–228, from Eubel).

The first thing to note is that Aimery could not have been consecrated before Archbishop John’s first arrival in Nicosia on 6 September 1319 (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, p. 400). More telling, Pope John states that he reserved the appointment *after* he had learned of Bishop Jacques’ death: *Sane, dudum Paphensi ecclesia per obitum bone memorie Iacobi episcopi*

Paphensis solatio destituta pastoris, nos de vacatione huiusmodi ex fide dignis relatibus certiores effecti... As we have seen, on 17 April 1318 Jacques More was still alive and bishop of Paphos, because from Nicosia he and the Dominican Rostaing Alard addressed a letter on that day to Pierre de Pleine-Chassange, then both bishop of Rodez and patriarch of Jerusalem (Schabel & Georgiou, 2016, pp. 106–113). Since, therefore, the pope had addressed letters to an unnamed bishop of Paphos up to 13 April 1318, just four days before Jacques' letter, and John XXII continued to do afterwards on 18 June 1318, 22 May 1320, and 10 August 1321 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-45, pp. 52, 100, 118), it is clear that word of Bishop Jacques' death did not arrive in Avignon until after 10 August 1321, giving us a *terminus post quem* for Jacques' death of about the beginning of the summer of 1321 to allow travel time from Cyprus to Avignon.

Yet the curia did not address letters to the bishop of Paphos every day, so the absence of any letter to the bishop of Paphos in the months following 10 August 1321 does not entail that Jacques had already died or died soon after that date. Granted, the span of time from Jacques' death to Pope John's letter was at least as long as it took for news of Jacques' death to reach Avignon, for news of the papal reservation to travel back to Cyprus, and for Aimery to travel in person to Avignon to present his case at the curia. Nevertheless, Jacques could easily have died in early 1322. Moreover, judging from the fact that on 21 January 1323 Pope John addressed a number of letters to Bishop Aimery of the sort that new prelates often received – the right to grant four marriage dispensations (in addition to one for Hugh Beduin, another of the king's favorites, on 1 February), to make three notaries, to have a plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis* from a confessor of his choice, to draw up a will, to confer a canonry in Paphos, and indulgences to those who donated to the works on or visited on certain days St Peter's Cathedral in Paphos (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-152–157) – it is possible that Aimery received his confirmation soon after his arrival in Avignon and remained there for some time on business.

Bishop Aimery and Peace Negotiations with the Kingdom of Armenia and Others

In any case, Aimery was in Avignon in April 1323, although we do not know whether he had returned to Cyprus after 18 July 1322 and was then sent back to the papal curia or had remained there and was joined by other Cypriot representatives, who had come to discuss Cypriot foreign policy issues. On 9 April 1323 Pope John XXII involved the bishop of the top suffragan diocese of the archbishop of Nicosia in no less than three conflicts.

As previously noted (Schabel, 2020, p. 86; cf. Golubovich, 1906–1927 III, p. 80), already in the first half of the seventeenth century, in his *Annales Minorum*, Luke Wadding highlighted the peace initiatives that Pope John assigned to Bishop Aimery involving King Henry II's poor relations with the Hospitallers, Armenia, and Genoa, three of the four leading Christian powers in the Eastern Mediterranean (Venice being the fourth). In all cases the issues seem to have been demands for satisfaction from Henry II, but the king's problematic dealings with the three powers stretched back to the early part of his reign (Edbury, 1991, pp. 109–113).

Of the three conflicts in which Aimery was involved, the quarrel with the Hospitallers is the most vague. In his letter to Aimery and Pierre de Genouillac, who had succeeded Pierre de Pleine-Chassagne as patriarch of Jerusalem, the pope remarked that he had been informed that there had been numerous failed attempts to pacify the quarrel between King Henry and the Hospitallers by prelates of Cyprus and other discreet men who had been chosen in common by the two parties in order to find an amicable solution (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-168). Perhaps because the king and the military order tried to solve their problem themselves, no earlier papal letter describing the basis of the quarrel has been found. Nevertheless, it is a good bet that the issue was related to the transfer of Templar properties on Cyprus to the Hospitallers and the order's need to export food and money from Cyprus to its new headquarters in Rhodes, the theme of letters of Pope John to King Henry dated 1317 and 1318 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-39; Reg. Vat. 109, ff. 208ra-b, no. 776). Pope John ordered Pierre and Aimery to summon to their presence the two sides or their representatives and resume the talks for a peace treaty, and to inform the pope if they had any doubts so that he could assist. Even in peacetime the Kingdom of Cyprus was infested by the perverse efforts of the enemies of the faith, the pope remarked, meaning the Muslim powers, so dissent within Cyprus itself needed to be removed (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-168).

The conflicts with Genoa and Armenia are easier to understand, both because they had been some of the leading justifications for Amaury's coup in 1306 (Schabel & Minervini, 2008, pp. 92–94, 112–133) and because the sources are clear and abundant. Pope John's letter concerning Armenia was addressed to Patriarch Pierre, Bishop Aimery, and Maurice de Pagnac, preceptor of the Hospitallers in Cyprus and Armenia. The pope describes the problem as originating in the "dangerous discord" between King Henry of Cyprus and King Oshin of Armenia, between whom negotiations for a peace treaty had begun but were not complete when Oshin died (in 1320). Afterwards the addressees or some of them, meaning Pierre and Maurice, worked for peace between Henry and Oshin's first born and

successor, the young Leo IV (of V), and his tutor and regent, Count Oshin of Gorighos (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-166).

Although King Henry had been accused of failing to aid Armenia before 1306, after 1310 the dispute stemmed, on the one hand, from Henry's incarceration and harsh treatment in Armenia and, on the other, his failure to honor the terms agreed to for his release, which terms were extracted under duress, Henry consistently argued (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-92 & 106; Schabel & Georgiou, 2016, pp. 106–108). While the inquiry into the 1310 agreement was being conducted in Nicosia, Pope John alluded to the need for peace with Henry in a letter to King Oshin dated 9 April 1318 (Reg. Vat. 109, ff. 128vb-129rb), and three weeks later on 1 May he wrote to Isabel, Oshin's sister and widow of Amaury of Tyre, urging her to suffer with patience Henry's denial of her and her sons' rights and properties, putting her trust in God (Köhler, 1909, no. 1; *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-97, but dated with Reg. Vat. 109, f. 134rb-va. no. 512). By then Aimery's predecessor Bishop Jacques of Paphos and the Dominican Rostaing Alard had already dispatched to the pope the results of their inquest, dated 17 April 1318, which most likely supported Henry's point of view (Schabel & Georgiou, 2016, pp. 106–113).

Having received the report, on 13 August 1319 Pope John XXII ordered Pierre de Genouillac, then just canon of Nicosia and papal collector of annates in Outremer, and Maurice de Pagnac to find a way to solve the problem and secure peace (Schabel & Georgiou, 2016, 114-116). Eventually none other than the commune of Genoa sent their ambassadors Nicolino Fieschi and Pietro Grullo di Savona (not Pietro Guglielmi, *pace* Mollat and Perrat-Richard) as mediators, with Pope John urging Henry and Oshin to accept their assistance in letters of 21 May 1320 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-98). In the meantime, Pierre and Maurice had made headway, arranging for a truce of a certain duration, but after Oshin's death on 20 July 1320 and the succession of young Leo, the pope worried that King Henry and King Leo would not observe the truce, so he wrote to Pierre de Genouillac on 22 September 1320 to exhort them to obey the truce and enforce it with ecclesiastical penalties (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-103). The situation declined to the point that an Armenian cleric was unable to secure the benefice conferred on him in Famagusta Cathedral, as Pope John wrote on 10 August 1321 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-117).

By April 1323, however, Pope John was more optimistic, having expressed his joy and heaped praise on King Henry the previous month for his sending a fleet to evacuate Armenian refugees to Cyprus during the Mamluk invasion that provoked calls for a new crusade (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-160). In his letter to the new Patriarch Pierre, Aimery,

and Maurice of 9 April 1323, the pope related that he had learned that after Oshin's death the Armenian side had sent representatives with sufficient mandate to Cyprus to continue negotiations for a treaty, it was claimed, and they even reached a settlement, oaths were taken, and other "solemnities" were observed. But the Devil prevailed, "on the occasion of certain articles touching on the restitution of losses" mentioned in the draft of the treaty. The Armenian side prevented the implementation of the peace, the pope heard with displeasure, so he ordered the addressees to work for a solution (*Bullarium Cyprium III* 2012, r-166).

Luke Wadding also stressed that John XXII's nuncio Géraud de Veyrines was told to seek Aimery's advice on managing a 30,000 florin fund for the defense of the Kingdom of Armenia in general and the reconstruction of Laiazzo Castle in particular following the Mamluk invasion (Schabel, 2020, p. 86). Pope John had already arranged for the money to be sent to the Cypriot branch of the Bardi bank, but as soon as he heard, to his joy, that King Henry had evacuated the Armenian refugees, he sprang into action to exploit Henry's apparent softening. On 17 March 1323 he wrote Patriarch Pierre asking him to investigate the proposed transfer of the important fortress of Baberon (Çandır) Castle in Cilicia from the young King Leo to Count Oshin of Gorighos and his wife Queen Joanna, Leo's mother and King Oshin's widow, with the consent of the king's (new) bailli and tutor, Hayton de Negrino. The requested arrangement was that the castle would pass to a legitimate male heir of Count Oshin and Queen Joanna or, failing that, it would revert to the crown after the count's death (Kohler, 1909, no. 4).

Two days later, on 19 March 1323, the pope announced to King Leo, Count Oshin, and the barons and people of Armenia that he was sending Géraud de Veyrines with financial aid (Reg. Vat. 111, ff. 278vb-279rb, no. 1148). On 9 April, while assigning Patriarch Pierre, Bishop Aimery, and Preceptor Maurice to establish a concord between Cyprus and Armenia, the pope instructed the patriarch to investigate King Henry's request to void the oath he had taken to fulfill the agreements of 1310 and to decide according to justice, informing the pope if any doubts arose (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-191).

On 22 April 1323, Pope John wrote letters to King Henry and King Leo acknowledging the earlier arrival of Henry's ambassadors and announcing that he was sending them back after retaining them for a long time in the hopes of receiving more news from Outremer in the meantime (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-193). The same day he wrote another letter to Henry identifying the nuncios that he recently (*nuper*) sent to Avignon as Bishop Aimery of Paphos himself, the knights Thomas of Montolif and Pierre Le Jaune, and the cleric Pierre de Tuderto. The ambassadors and

the letter King Henry sent with them refreshed the pope's memory about the earlier progress of negotiations between King Henry and the late King Oshin with the pope's nuncios mediating, the peace treaty having been begun but not completed at the time of Oshin's death in 1320. He was also reminded that talks resumed with King Leo afterwards with the Armenian nuncios in Cyprus, with oaths taken and other solemnities, but the Armenian side's insistence on details about restitution for losses prevented the implementation of the treaty. The pope informed the kings that he was happy about the progress but disturbed about the impediments. Because the situation of Cyprus and Armenia among the blasphemers of the Cross, meaning the Muslims, was dire even in peacetime, conflict between Christians in the region had to be avoided, so he assigned the business to Pierre, Maurice, and Aimery himself, whose transition from Henry's main nuncio in negotiations with Armenia to the pope's own negotiator in the same affair was thus immediate. The pope urged the kings to work for peace with the patriarch and both or one of his colleagues, avoiding "rather curious subtleties" that often ruin such negotiations, and heeding the advice of the papal representatives. He closed the letter to Henry by telling him that the patriarch would decide about the oath he had taken in 1310 to secure his release (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-194–195).

We have no information about the progress of the talks after Aimery returned to Cyprus, most likely late in the spring of 1323, but once Patriarch Pierre died the pope was forced to choose new agents regarding Baberon (Çandır) Castle and the peace talks, although the issue of Henry's oath partly died with him on 31 March 1324. The deaths of the patriarch and the king are probably the reason that *Blasius Baronis* of Benevento, familiar of the nuncio Géraud de Veyrines, had to wait at the curia around nine months for a response from Pope John XXII. Blasius ran out of money in the meantime and received money from the papal camera, which noted that Blasius finally returned to Cyprus on 3 September 1324 with papal letters for the nuncio, the king of Armenia, and Bishop Aimery (Schäfer, 1911, p. 457).

We know the contents of these letters. Pope John assigned the investigation concerning the castle to Géraud de Veyrines on 9 August 1324 (Reg. Vat. 112, f. 233va-b, no. 987). As discussed elsewhere (Schabel, 2020, p. 88), that same day the pope sent instructions to Géraud to work with Aimery and take his advice about using the 30,000 florins for the restoration of Laiazzo Castle and the defense of Armenia (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-333). Four days later, on 13 August, the pope informed King Leo, prefacing his remarks by saying that he had recently (*nuper*) received the king's ambassadors, Archbishop Basil of Tarsus and the knights Hayton the turcopolier and Master Baldwin. The pope continued that he was only now

sending them back because he had been waiting for news of King Charles of France's crusading plans, which were postponed in part because of the truce of no small duration between Armenia and the Sultan. Despite the truce, the pope explained that he was assigning 30,000 florins for the reconstruction of Laiazzo Castle and other fortifications and other defense initiatives, to be overseen by Master Gérard de Veyrines with Bishop Aimery (Reg. Vat. 112, ff. 234vb-235rb, no. 991).

We can now add that Pope John XXII wrote the new King Hugh IV on 20 September 1325, telling him that the papal nuncio, Gérard de Veyrines, had informed him that 30 or 40 experienced masters were needed for the repair and construction of castles and other fortifications in the Kingdom of Armenia, but that since it was difficult to find such skilled workers in Armenia, it was necessary to bring them over from Cyprus. Because the defense of Armenia was beneficial for the security of Cyprus, the pope reasoned, the improvement of the fortifications of Armenia was also useful for Cyprus, so he asked King Hugh to grant Gérard permission to take the masters (masons and carpenters, one assumes) from Cyprus to Armenia (Reg. Vat. 113, f. 372rb-va, no. 2187). Since the surviving itemized accounts of Gérard concern work carried out in Cyprus, this information sheds light on what was done in Armenia, for which we have just a letter of Archbishop Homodeus of Tarsus that was requested by Gérard (Richard, 1962, pp. 37–38).

Perhaps the efforts of Henry II and Hugh IV to assist Armenia, coupled with the deaths of most of the main actors connected with the agreements of 1310, meant that full peace negotiations between Cyprus and Armenia were no longer necessary. Eventually, Amaury's surviving sons were partially reconciled with King Hugh and partially compensated for their losses in Cyprus (e.g., Kohler, 1909, no. 5; *Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, s-22).

The most serious problem by far was Genoa, with whom Henry had been at odds since 1292. On this issue Pope John's pertinent letter of 9 April 1323 was addressed to Patriarch Pierre and Bishop Aimery, in which the pope expressed his strongest desire for peace. The pope had already worked hard for peace, sending exhortations to both sides on numerous occasions, with some treaties achieved but, because of the Devil, not followed, the pope heard to his displeasure (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-167). On 22 April the pope informed the Genoese of his assigning the patriarch and bishop to the peace mission (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-195). The latest conflict had begun during Henry's captivity in Armenia in early 1310, when an altercation between the Genoese in Famagusta, on the one hand, and the locals and others living in the city, on the other, resulted in deaths, executions, and material losses. Amaury blamed the

Genoese and after Henry's restauration the king refused to satisfy Genoese demands for satisfaction without investigation. The Genoese were said to be preparing a fleet to attack Cyprus when Pope Clement V wrote a lengthy letter to the Genoese on 28 April 1313, describing the background and asking the Genoese to stand down and seek a peaceful solution (*Bullarium Cyprium II*, 2010, q-101). A solution to this phase of the Genoa-Cyprus quarrel was not reached until a pact finalized on 13 January 1331, as Jean Richard discovered (Richard, 2013). Aimery's role in the peace process was brief, and, to add to the new documents Perrat and Richard uncovered in *Bullarium Cyprium III*, I have found a number of unknown sources for the periods before and after Aimery's episcopacy, so the story must be left for another time.

Given his lengthy and loyal service to King Henry, it is hard to see how Aimery could have been impartial, but we shall never know. Slow communications and the frequent death of the main actors hampered later-medieval diplomacy, especially in places as far away as Cyprus, when the papacy had moved in the other direction from Rome to Avignon. Bishop Aimery would not have arrived in Cyprus until May 1323 at the earliest, but King Henry II died just ten months later on 31 March 1324, effectively putting a temporary halt to negotiations at least as long as it took for word to reach Avignon and for news of King Hugh IV's succession to be announced and sent to the pope. Moreover, Pope John's letters of 9 April 1323 specified in the case of Armenia that Patriarch Pierre could act with one or both of his colleagues, but his colleagues were given no mandate to act on their own. On 19 March 1324, eleven days before King Henry's death, the pope appointed the Dominican master of theology Raymond Bequin as the new patriarch of Jerusalem following Pierre's death (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-224). Even if a messenger had been sent immediately from Cyprus and the curia required no real deliberation to choose Raymond, Pierre's death in Cyprus could not have occurred after January 1324. The previous mention of Patriarch Pierre in a papal letter was on 28 May 1323 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-217), leaving open the possibility that Pierre died much earlier, especially given the dangers of travelling by sea from Cyprus to Avignon during winter. In other words, the deaths of Patriarch Pierre and then King Henry left little room for action on the part of Aimery.

Aimery's recorded service to King Henry II lasted from a few days after the Franciscan first appears on record on 28 May 1310 in Nicosia at the Templar trial until the evening before the king died, since Amadi records that on 30 March 1324 King Henry left Nicosia in the morning and went to his nearby *casale* of Strovolos in the company of Archbishop John of Nicosia, Master Baldwin bishop of Famagusta and Tortosa, and

“fra Chamerin vescovo de Bapho, Frate Minore,” yet another spelling of Aimery’s name that makes it rather difficult to trace him. In the late afternoon the king walked in the fields to view the growing crops and then returned to his house, in conversation with his guests and some knights, who remained talking with him until late in the evening, when he gave them leave to return to Nicosia. The king was found dead in his bed the next morning (*Chronique d’Amadi*, 1891, p. 401).

Aimery’s Death and Debts

Although Pope John assigned tasks to Aimery as the unnamed bishop of Paphos until 27 August 1326, important diplomatic business was put on hold until Hugh IV had fully settled into power, by which time Aimery had also died. The first news we have of Aimery’s successor, Géraud de Veyrines, as bishop of Paphos is in a papal letter of 24 February 1327. Given the distance from Cyprus and the difficulties of winter travel, Aimery must have died in the second half of 1326, probably in the autumn (Schabel, 2020, p. 89).

As noted previously (Schabel, 2020), Aimery’s legacy to his successor as bishop of Paphos, Géraud de Veyrines, was a large amount of debt. While in Avignon on royal business, Bishop Aimery explained his situation to Pope John XXII, as we learn from the pope’s letter of 5 May 1323 to Géraud, who was then still archdeacon of Benevento and dealing with the papal financial affairs in Cyprus. The previous bishop, Jacques More, had collected the six-year tithe from the city and diocese of Paphos in support of the crusade that Pope Clement V had imposed at the Council of Vienne in 1312, but “in his lifetime he had consumed and spent the money so completely that *Aymericus*, now bishop, finds nothing at all of the money” (*Bullarium Cyprium* III, 2010, r-212).

The sexennial tithe imposed at the Council of Vienna was a clerical tithe, not a general one. Although we do not have the record of what Jacques, Aimery, or Géraud paid the papal camera for their common services when they became bishop of Paphos, Géraud’s successor Eudes pledged to pay 2000 florins in 1337 and this amount continued to be demanded afterwards. The common services were assessed at one third of the prelate’s annual income, which meant that the bishop of Paphos enjoyed revenues amounting to roughly 6000 florins annually (Hoberg, 1949, 93a). In Cyprus, where the relatively small cathedral staff represented the bulk of the Latin secular clergy, especially in the isolated diocese of Paphos, the chapter and other Latin clergy were paid from the episcopal income, but it is not known whether the common services were calculated

on this sum or the bishop's share. In any case, Aimery implied that Jacques paid nothing of his own salary and exacted from his subordinate clergy in his bishopric 10% of their incomes, which he then spent.

Pope John instructed Géraud to extend the deadline for Aimery's payment, under the circumstances (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-212), but in a later letter written after Aimery's death, dated 22 February 1329, the pope told his nuncios that Bishop Géraud claimed that Aimery was only obliged to pay the sexennial tithe on the church of Paphos and Pope John's own triennial tithe, which came to 36,000 bezants, or 6000 florins, for the nine years (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-391). In his lifetime Bishop Aimery began paying the debt to Archdeacon Géraud and afterwards, before Géraud's promotion to bishop, Géraud continued to seize Aimery's assets in order to pay the apostolic camera. In a letter of 1 June 1327 to his nuncios, Pope John listed the assets that Géraud received from both before and after Aimery's death as follows (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-329):

Sugar from two years of harvests worth more than 20,000 bezants
Rents from villages (*casalia*) worth 10,000 bezants
Chalices and other ornaments of the chapel worth 5500 bezants
Cloths of gold, silk, and camlet worth 2500 bezants
250 marks of silver in silver vessels worth 6500 bezants
Animals of estimated worth of 2500 bezants
Furniture, wine, and other goods found in the *casalia* worth 5000 bezants
Money from tithes that Aimery collected amounting to 26,000 bezants

The problem seems to have been that Bishop Géraud and the pope's nuncios had different interpretations, first, about the rest of the goods and money that Géraud had received, and, second, about whether Aimery had other debts to the camera besides the tithes owed by Jacques and Aimery himself and, if so, how much, something that is never specified. Regarding the first disagreement, as long as Aimery was alive, one could argue that he could use chalices, ornaments, cloth, silver vessels, and so on to pay his debts, but as soon as he died, not only did his episcopal property devolve on the papacy by right of spoils (Williman & Corsano, 2020, pp. 1–52), but the episcopal incomes from rents and the sugar crop also belonged to the apostolic camera. That is to say, Géraud could not employ Aimery's legacy as bishop in order to repay Aimery's episcopal debts. The papal letter appointing Géraud bishop of Paphos does not survive, but if it happened by an election that the pope later confirmed, one can see why, in Géraud's transition from the person assigned to collect the payment on the Paphos debt to the person obliged to pay that debt, the new bishop would have wished to apply Aimery's legacy to the debt. Since, aside from the collected tithe payments, what Géraud received from Aimery before

and after his death amounted to over 52,000 bezants, Géraud must have thought that the total tithe debt had been fully paid. The nuncios who replaced Géraud after he became bishop did not see it that way (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-391).

In addition, it was unclear whether Aimery owed the camera anything else and how much. In his 1327 letter, Pope John instructed his nuncios to investigate Géraud's accounts as concerned the bishopric of Paphos, as normal, but he also told them to use the above items and any other goods of the late bishop Aimery that ended up with Géraud or anyone else "for the full satisfaction of all and every single item in which said Bishop *Aymericus* was obliged to the aforesaid camera as well as the aforesaid money of the tithe." The Latin is slightly vague, but a later clause clarifies that they are to take the money collected from the tithe and enough of the other money to satisfy Aimery's debts and to send it to the apostolic camera, placing the remainder of the goods Aimery had at the time of his death in a safe place and describing them in detail so that the pope could decide what to arrange with them (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-329).

Perhaps Aimery also owed money for his common services, and maybe even for his predecessor's common services, and there may be other debts about which we are unaware, but it seems as if the pope wanted the nuncios to use Aimery's legacy to pay the debts of the church of Paphos and then keep the rest in a safe place. His nuncios may have had other ideas and perhaps convinced the pope that the debt was one thing, the legacy another, and, if so, one can see their point. Unfortunately, the agreement that the nuncios reached with Géraud, dated 15 January 1329, merely states that, starting 1 March, with the first payment in August, Géraud will pay 9000 bezants every six months until all debts that Aimery had toward the apostolic camera when he died are paid in full, especially the six-year tithe, without specifying how much and for what Géraud still owed (Schabel, 2020, p. 99).

If we are confused, so was Géraud. Before the above agreement, Géraud had written to Pope John complaining about the nuncios, who had pursued Géraud with various processes resulting in sentences of excommunication, suspension, and interdict, against which Géraud appealed, but he ended by begging the pope for mercy, as we learn from John's letter to Géraud dated 22 February 1329, before the pope learned of the 15 January agreement. The pope responded by granting him a year's grace to repay and absolving him of his sentences and any irregularity incurred for celebrating the divine offices under such sentences, although if Géraud did not settle up after the year, the sentences would apply automatically (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-388). On the same day, 22 February 1329, Pope John also wrote to his nuncios explaining Bishop Géraud's different point

of view, adding that Géraud paid 1000 florins up front, but leaving the impression that he agreed with the nuncios and that Géraud would have to pay within a year (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-391).

After the 15 January agreement, and probably after the pope had been informed about it, Géraud complained again, and on 4 June 1329 Pope John again addressed his nuncios, explaining that Géraud claimed that the problem lay with the pope's vague statements in his earlier letters that in addition to the six-year and three-year clerical tithes Aimery had various other debts to the camera, which debts were nowhere specified, although the nuncios calculated them into the total debt and were harassing Géraud on this basis. The pope instructed the nuncios to cease harassing Géraud for debts unless it was clear what they were for (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-407).

By 5 August 1329, Pope John definitely knew about the agreement, since he referred to its first article, on Aimery's debt, in his letter to his nuncios on that day. Perhaps in response to Géraud's complaints to the pope, the nuncios had written a response in which they told the pope that Géraud had agreed to pay 18,000 bezants annually in two instalments until the six-year and three-year tithe debt and other debts, which amounted to 60,000 bezants for the entire three-year tithe "that he had once collected" and "*quasi totum*" of the six-year tithe. Now it was the pope's turn to be confused, noting that the nuncios had failed to specify the amount of the debt still owed for the six-year and three-year tithes in the agreement, so he asked for more information (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-424).

Finally, on 22 March 1330, Pope John relented, instructing his nuncios to honor Géraud's request and use Aimery's legacy to satisfy the tithe debt of the church of Paphos, but if that were insufficient, they were to exact the remainder from Géraud, who presumably had already paid 18,000 bezants according to the 15 January 1329 agreement (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-435). There, perhaps, the story of Aimery's financial legacy ends. Unfortunately, the surviving sources do not allow full clarity, but the conflict of interest between Géraud the collector and Géraud the bishop, the fact that Aimery himself inherited tithe debts and allegedly left Géraud an undisclosed amount of other debt, and Géraud's responsibility for many other financial dealings make it impossible to determine exactly what happened when Géraud succeeded Aimery as bishop of Paphos.

The Nabinaud Tradition

Aimery's greatest legacy may lie in his starting a Nabinaud tradition of service in the church of Cyprus, whatever his exact connection with the three brothers and other people from Nabinaud mentioned above was.

The careers of the three brothers we can now chronicle more precisely. Léger de Nabinaud first appears in connection with Cyprus on 6 February 1328 as canon of Paphos, when he was granted permission to receive his incomes for five years while absent for studies at a university, apparently in law, for he is later described as having legal expertise. Since on 1 February 1323 Bishop Aimery had been allowed to grant a vacant canonry in Paphos to a person of his choice, we may surmise that he selected Léger, who thus served in the Latin Church of Cyprus for over four decades from 1323 until his death as bishop of Famagusta on 30 September 1365 (according to his extant tombstone in Famagusta Cathedral). Léger had previously become canon of Nicosia in 1333 and probably soon afterwards dean of Nicosia. The previous dean, Hélié Anselm or Antiaume, received a canonry with expectancy in Nicosia on 14 September 1316, was still canon on 22 January 1324, and is mentioned as dean on 20 January 1327 and 25 October 1330. Judging from gaps in the record of papal letters to the unnamed dean of Nicosia, Hélié Anselm probably become dean around mid-1326 and was replaced by Léger between late 1332 and late 1335. Léger is called dean in local documents dated around 1336, 11 July 1339, and 17 January 1340, when Dean Léger was present at the Nicosia provincial council. In late 1345 Léger was given permission to continue residing in Avignon for three years, again for studies, it seems, and he was at the papal curia when he was promoted to bishop of Famagusta on 14 August 1348 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, r-6, pp. 156, 298, 345, 478, 507; s-9; t-175, 313, 314 [1347!], 326, 360; *Cartulary*, 1997, 279 no. 109 & 281 no. 109a; *Synodicum Nicosiense*, 2001, 158 no. D, 242 no. J.VIIIb, & 258 no. L.14; Kaoulla & Schabel, 2007, p. 198).

Léger had succeeded his late brother Itier, who had recently died in Avignon (after 23 July). We have no way of knowing when Itier, a Franciscan, first arrived in Cyprus, but he is first mentioned on the island as a witness to the above-mentioned document of 11 July 1339, drawn up in the great hall of the archbishop of Nicosia, and, just as Léger, Itier was present at the Nicosia provincial council of 17 January 1340 held in the same place. Itier must have received some higher education, since Pope Clement VI mentioned the Franciscan's learning when he appointed him bishop of Limassol on 3 November 1344. Clement transferred Itier to Famagusta on 26 June 1346, when Itier was probably in Avignon, and on 25 August 1347 Pope Clement explained to King Hugh IV that Itier could not yet return to Cyprus because he had to remain at the papal curia to tend to his brother Hélié, who was seriously ill (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2010, t-119, 190, 280, 322, 326; *Cartulary*, 1997, 281 no. 109a; *Synodicum Nicosiense*, 2001, 258 no. L.14).

This third brother, the Franciscan Hélié, was in some way instrumental in all these promotions and indeed the aforementioned local documents,

since as a Parisian master of theology who had been of assistance to Pope John XXII against the rebel Minorites Hélie was appointed archbishop of Nicosia on 16 November 1332. Soon after his coronation as pope on 19 May 1342, Clement VI promoted Hélie to patriarch of Jerusalem by 28 June 1342 and made him cardinal-priest of San Vitale just three months later on 20 September, in which capacity he died on 13 January 1348 (*Bullarium Cyprium III*, 2012, r-476; t-3, 8, t-21, 313).

In granting Léger a canonry in Paphos, therefore, Aimery de Nabin-aud ensured the continuation of a tradition that lasted at least a half a century, in which all four sees were occupied by people from Nabin-aud at one point or another.

REFERENCES

- Bullarium Cyprium II: Papal Letters Concerning Cyprus 1261–1314* (2010). Ed. C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Bullarium Cyprium III: Lettres papales relatives à Chypre 1316–1378* (2012). Eds. C. Perrat, J. Richard, avec la collaboration de C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia* (1997). Eds. N. Coureas & C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Coureas, N. (1997). *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195–1312*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Coureas, N. (2010). *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1313–1378*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Chronique d'Amadi* (1891). Ed. R. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Edbury, P.W. (1991). *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191–1374*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eubel, K. (1898). *Bullarium Franciscanum. Tomus quintus. Benedicti XI, Clementis V, Ioannis XXII monumenta*. Rome: Typis Vaticanis.
- Florio Bustron (1886). *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*. Ed. R. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Gilmour-Bryson, A. (1998). *The Trial of the Templars in Cyprus. A Complete English Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Golubovich, G. (1906–1927). *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Francese*, 5 vols. Quaracchi: Collegio di s. Bonaventura.
- Hoberg, H. (1949). *Taxae pro communibus servitiis ex libris obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1455 confectis*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Kaoulla, C. & Schabel, C. (2007). The Inquisition against Peter de Castro, Vicar of the Dominican Province of the Holy Land, in Nicosia, Cyprus, 1330. *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 77, 121–198.

- Kohler, C. (1909). Lettres pontificales concernant l'histoire de la Petite Arménie au XIV^e siècle. In: *Florilegium ou recueil de travaux d'érudition dédiés à Monsieur le Marquis Melchior de Vogüé à l'occasion du quatre-vingtième anniversaire de sa naissance*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 303–328.
- Martínez Ferrando, J.E. (1948). *Jaime II de Aragón, su vida familiar*, 2 vols. Barcelona: Escuela de Estudios Medievales.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1852–1861). *Histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Mas Latrie, L. de (1873). *Nouvelles preuves de l'Histoire de Chypre (II)*. *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 34, 47–87.
- Notai genovesi in oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto. 3 luglio 1300 – 3 agosto 1301* (1982). Ed. V. Polonio. Genoa: Istituto di Medievistica.
- Notai genovesi in oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto. 11 ottobre 1296 – 23 giugno 1299* (1983). Ed. M. Balard. Genoa: Istituto di Medievistica.
- Notai genovesi in oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto. Gennaio – agosto 1302* (1987). Ed. R. Pavoni. Genoa: Istituto di Medievistica.
- Olympios, M. (2018). *Building the Sacred in a Crusader Kingdom: Gothic Church Architecture in Lusignan Cyprus, c. 1209-c. 1373*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Perrat, C. (1927). Un diplomate gascon au XIV^e siècle. Raymond de Piis, nonce de Clément V, en Orient. *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École française de Rome*, 44, 35–90.
- Piron, S. (2012). Les *studia* franciscains de Provence et d'Aquitaine (1275–1335). In: K. Emery Jr., W.J. Courtenay, & S.M. Metzger (eds.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts*. Turnhout: Belgium, 303–358.
- Richard, J. (1962). *Chypre sous les Lusignan. Documents chypriotes des archives du Vatican (XIV^e et XV^e siècles)*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Richard, J. (2013). Le 'compromis' de 1330 entre Gênes et Chypre et la guerre de course dans les eaux chypriotes. *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* NS, 53, 17–36.
- Roest, B. (2000). *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1210–1517)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rudt de Collenberg, W.H. (1979). État et origine du haut clergé de Chypre avant le Grand Schisme d'après les Registres des Papes du XIII^e et du XIV^e siècle. *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge, temps modernes*, 91, 197–332.
- Saint-Guillain, G. (forthcoming). Le clergé latin d'Athènes et de Thèbes au temps de Boniface VIII: autour d'une source judiciaire inédite.
- Salles, G. (2007). L'Église de Chypre... colonie périgordine au XIV^e siècle. *Bulletin de la Société Historique et Archéologique du Périgord*, 134, 233–268.

- Schabel, C. (2009). A Neglected Quarrel over a House in Cyprus in 1299: The Nicosia Franciscans vs. the Chapter of Nicosia Cathedral. *Crusades*, 8, 173–190.
- Schabel, C. (2009–2010). Unpublished Documents from the Cypriot Activities of Papal Nuncio Raymond of Pins (†1311). *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 35, 53–64.
- Schabel, C. (2020). Géraud de Veyrines, Bishop of Paphos, and the Defense of the Kingdom of Armenia in the 1320s. *Perspectives on Culture*, 3(30), 81–103.
- Schabel, C. & Georgiou, C. (2016). Neither at Peace Nor at War: the Non-Implementation of the Armenia-Cyprus Agreements of 1310. *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 38, 95–116.
- Schabel, C. & Minervini, L. (2008). The French and Latin Dossier on the Institution of the Government of Amaury of Lusignan, Lord of Tyre, Brother of King Henry II of Cyprus. *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, 34, 75–119.
- Schäfer, K.H. (1911). *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII. nebst den Jahresbilanzen von 1316–1375*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Schottmüller, K. (1887). *Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens mit urkundlichen und kritischen Beiträgen*, 2 vols. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler & Sohn.
- The Synodicum Nicosiense and Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus 1196–1373* (2001). Ed. and trans. C. Schabel. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Wadding, L. (1625–1654). *Annales Ordinis Minorum*, 8 vols. Lyon.
- Williman, D. & Corsano, K. (2020). *The Right of Spoils of the Popes of Avignon, 1316–1345*, revised 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: The Ames Foundation.

Christopher David Schabel – PhD in History, University of Iowa, 1994, works primarily on later-medieval intellectual history and the Latin East. He is Professor of Medieval History in the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Cyprus.