The Franks in the Peloponnese

Author(s): H. F. Tozer

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 4 (1883), pp. 165-236

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/623369>

Accessed: 07/08/2013 09:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE FRANKS IN THE PELOPONNESE.

THE period which succeeded the fourth crusade is perhaps the most intricate period in the history of Greece. The capture of Constantinople which then took place, and the partition of the Eastern Empire between the invading Powers, displaced for a time and permanently enfeebled the Byzantine government, and the various western principalities which arose on its ruins had no real bond of unity, nor strength to impart vitality to them severally. Hence their subsequent history is composed of a succession of struggles and changes, accompanied by shiftings of boundaries which are almost bewildering. According to the treaty of partition which was ratified beforehand by the attacking parties, the empire was to be divided into three parts, one of which should be assigned to the Latin emperor who was to rule at Constantinople, another to Venice, and a third to the remaining powers who took part in the expedition: but in practice this was never carried out, and large portions of the conquered territory fell to the share of adventurers. The position of Emperor of Romania was conferred on Baldwin, Count of Flanders; most of the islands, as might be expected, passed into the hands of Venice; Boniface, Marquis of Monferrat, who had held the office of commander-in-chief of the Crusaders, was established as King of Salonica, with the province of Macedonia; other chieftains occupied various parts of Greece Proper as feudatories of the empire; and Athens itself became the seat of an important principality under a Burgundian nobleman, Otho de la Roche, who received the title of *Μέγας Κύριος*, or Grand-sire, which was subsequently exchanged for that of Duke. It is in imitation of this title that Dante, who was a contemporary

H. S.—VOL. IV.

N

of this dukedom during its flourishing period, speaks of Theseus as 'Duca d'Atene,'¹ while he calls Pisistratus 'Sire' of the same city.² Hence, also Shakespeare, following the Italian writers, introduces Theseus as Duke of Athens, in *Midsummer Night's Dream*. It is noticeable also that though the majority of these new occupants were not French either by descent or by political allegiance, yet the French language was so generally spoken by them that the name Frank, which I have introduced into the heading of this paper, came to be used at that time, as it is at the present day, in those countries as a common title for the inhabitants of Western Europe.

But while these alien Powers were establishing themselves in their newly conquered possessions, the confusion was still further increased by the rise of a number of aspirants to the government of those districts which remained in the hands of the Greeks. At Trebizond a scion of the house of Comnenus founded an empire, which, thanks to its remote position on the coast of the Black Sea, outlived the final overthrow of its parent State. Nicaea in Bithynia, in the immediate vicinity of Constantinople, was occupied by the rightful heirs of the Byzantine throne, and became in their hands the headquarters of a power which at first maintained a hard struggle with the neighbouring empire of Romania, and afterwards watched its rapidly increasing weakness, until the moment should arrive for regaining the lost inheritance. Another principality also was established in Epirus, the despot of which succeeded in driving the Latins from Salonica, and making that place the seat of a Greek empire, so that for a time it seemed as if its rulers, and not those of Nicaea, would be the future masters of Constantinople. And though, before that city was captured, the empire of Thessalonica had been conquered and absorbed by its rival, yet a semi-independent despotat of Epirus continued to exist for more than a hundred years after that time. Again, early in the fourteenth century, another element of disturbance, the Catalan Grand Company, passed like a comet across the Eastern sky, and affected in an important manner the history of the period. The mercenary service of these adventurers, their negotiations with the restored Greek empire, their insubordination and revolts against their leaders, and their military prowess and barbarous crimes, live

¹ *Inf.* xii. 17.

² *Purg.* xv. 97.

for us in the pages of their native chronicler, Ramon Muntaner : but their real importance for history consists in their having destroyed the flower of Frank chivalry, who had mustered from all parts of Greece to oppose them, at the great battle of the Cephissus (A.D. 1310), from which blow the Latin States never recovered. The Catalans themselves settled in the country and became the dominant power there, until towards the end of the fourteenth century, when they in turn were forced to give way to the Florentine family of the Acciaiuoli, who before this time had obtained possession of Corinth and of other domains in Greece. But the disunion and jealousy which pervaded the various States into which the country was divided rendered them incapable of offering any resistance to a powerful enemy ; and at last the advance of the Ottomans swept them all, both Eastern and Western, indiscriminately away.

Most of the States that have now been mentioned are noticed, though in general very briefly, by Gibbon in his history. But there is one of the Frank establishments in Greece, the existence of which would hardly be discovered from his narrative, though it lasted for more than two centuries, and was in some respects the most important of all. This was the principality of Achaia, or of the Morea. The reason of this omission is the very intelligible one that the materials for its history did not exist in Gibbon's time. It is mentioned, indeed, incidentally by contemporary writers, when the events of which they treat come in contact with it ; as, for instance, among the Byzantine historians, by Nicetas and Acropolita during its early period, and by Phranzes during the later, and among Western chroniclers by Villehardouin, the historian of the fourth crusade : but of the vicissitudes which it underwent, and still more of the state of the province at that time, nothing was known before 1825, when M. Buchon published a translation of the Greek metrical chronicle of the conquest of the Morea, the original text of which was afterwards printed by him in 1841. This remarkable document, which is equally valuable from a historical and a philological point of view, relates the history of the principality during the first century of its existence, and at the same time throws great light on its inner life and organisation. The subsequent researches of M. Buchon also cleared up many difficulties relating to this dark period, and the results of his investigations have

been summarised for English readers by Finlay. Since his time a large amount of additional information on the subject has been collected by the indefatigable labours of Prof. Carl Hopf, who has explored for that purpose the archives of the principal cities of North Italy, as well as those of numerous places in the Mediterranean, and has thus succeeded both in correcting many inaccuracies in the chronicle, and in filling up vacant spaces in the history. The material thus brought together is presented in a very readable form in Hertzberg's *History of Greece*. It is the object of the following paper to give, first, a brief sketch of the history of the period; secondly, an account of the Greek chronicle of the Morea; and thirdly, a description of the remains that exist in the country of the period of the Frank occupation, to examine which I made a journey through the Peloponnese in company with Mr. Crowder in September, 1882.¹

I.—*Sketch of the History of the Frank Principality of the Morea.*

Towards the end of the year 1204, the same in which the Latins captured Constantinople, Geoffrey Villehardouin, a French knight of a noble family in Champagne, and nephew of the Marshal of Romania of that name, whose chronicle has already been mentioned, was returning from Palestine, whither he had proceeded as a crusader, independently of the main expedition, on hearing of the successes of the Franks in overthrowing the Eastern Empire. Owing to stress of weather, however, he was forced to take refuge in the harbour of Modon (Methone) at the south-west angle of the Peloponnese, and while he was kept wind-bound at that place, entered into communication with one of the Messenian nobles, John

¹ Buchon's own summary was published under the title *Histoire des Conquêtes et de l'Établissement des Français dans les États de l'ancienne Grèce sous les Ville-Hardoin*, vol. i. 1846, but the work was never completed, owing to the author's premature death. That of Finlay forms chapter vii. of the fourth volume of his *History of*

Greece. Hopf's account will be found in vols. lxxxv. and lxxxvi. of Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*; that of Hertzberg in vol. ii. of his *Geschichte Griechenlands seit dem Absterben des antiken Lebens*. My own sketch of the period is mainly derived from Finlay and Hertzberg.

Cantacuzenus, who was connected by marriage with the imperial family of Angelus, the successors of the Comneni, and conceived in connection with him a scheme for subduing this province of Greece. The circumstances of the country were in many ways favourable to such an undertaking, for the centralising policy of the Byzantine government, which feared nothing so much as revolt, had from time immemorial discouraged all organisation for purposes of self-defence on the part of the provincials, and that government itself had for the moment been destroyed. The prize, moreover, was a tempting one, for this portion of Greece had for several centuries been comparatively undisturbed by attacks from without and by internal struggles, and consequently was carefully cultivated and possessed a considerable amount of accumulated wealth. The alliance of Villehardouin with a native chieftain caused a prepossession among the Greek inhabitants in his favour, and this was afterwards strengthened, when they found that he was disposed to respect their privileges. In this way he with no great difficulty made himself master of the western coast of Messenia, the rich plain of Elis with its capital Andravída, and even the important city of Patras. But early in the following year John Cantacuzenus died, and his son Michael, discovering that the French leader was aiming merely at his own aggrandisement, broke off the alliance with him, and summoned the Greeks to arms in order to expel the invaders. Villehardouin perceived that he would soon be reduced to great straits owing to the smallness of the force at his disposal.

Meanwhile the Peloponnese had been invaded also from another quarter. Boniface, the newly-appointed King of Salonica, had been put in command of the division of the crusaders which was to subdue Greece, and in the year 1205 marched southwards, accompanied by Otho de la Roche, William of Champlitte, and other chieftains. They met with but feeble resistance, and after Otho de la Roche had been established at Athens, they advanced beyond the Isthmus, and one part of the force, under Boniface, laid siege to the fortress of Corinth, into which Leon Sgouros, the Byzantine governor of Nauplia and Argos, who had undertaken the defence of the country, had thrown himself, while another detachment, with whom was Champlitte, encamped before Nauplia. It was at the latter

place that the two destined conquerors of the country met one another. Villehardouin, despairing of being able to subjugate the country himself, and hearing that a part of the allied forces was advancing from the north, abandoned his possessions in Messenia, and marching along the coastland of Achaia appeared before Nauplia. He there proposed to Champlitte, who was a fellow-countryman of his, being also from Champagne, that he should become ruler of the country, and offered himself to serve under him and become his vassal. King Boniface, who was soon recalled to the defence of his own dominions by an attack of the Bulgarians, signified his consent to the undertaking, and confirmed Champlitte beforehand in any conquests he might make; and thus the combined forces of the two comrades, composed of one hundred knights and a considerable number of men-at-arms, proceeded by way of Patras and Andravída to recover Villehardouin's earlier acquisitions, which they easily succeeded in doing. Their further advance, however, was not to be unopposed. The powerful Greek landholders, who were not disposed to part with their possessions without a struggle, raised a force composed of the remains of the Byzantine garrisons, of bands of warlike mountaineers, and of troops sent to their aid by the despot Michael of Epirus, and having assembled in the upper valley of Messenia, the Stenyclerian plain of classical times, gave battle to the Franks at a place called the olive-grove of Kondoura. Here they were signally defeated, and the impression made by this victory was so great that within no long time the invaders had added to their territory the rest of Messenia, the greater part of Arcadia—including the fortresses of Veligosti on the south-western border of that country, and of Nikli, which occupied the site of the ancient Tegea, on the south-east—and even the important town of Lacedaemonia, the mediaeval representative of Sparta. The fortified places, however, were vigorously defended, and the last-named city withstood the besiegers for five days. Champlitte now assumed the title of Prince of Achaia, and rewarded Villehardouin with the fief of Kalamata in the rich land at the head of the Messenian gulf. The towns of Modon and Coron, however, in the westernmost of the three southern peninsulas, were forcibly occupied by the Venetians, to whom they had been assigned by the original act of partition, and in their hands

they remained throughout this period of history, and became important strongholds.

At the expiration of three years and a half, William of Champlitte was recalled to France by the news of his elder brother's death, in consequence of which it was necessary for him to appear in person in order to claim his inheritance. As his own sons were not yet of age, he named his nephew Hugh to be his bailly or vicegerent in the Morea during his absence, and then took ship for Italy. Shortly after his departure, however, Hugh of Champlitte was removed by death, and this event was immediately followed by the news that the same fate had overtaken William himself in Apulia. It was a critical moment in the history of the newly-formed and half-organised State. According to a strict interpretation of feudal rights, William's eldest son became heir to the principality, and it was in the power of his representatives in France to send an agent of theirs as administrator during his minority; and at a later period stories were afloat, though they receive no confirmation from authentic history, of Geoffrey Villehardouin having been nominated bailly, and having succeeded by craft or force in preventing the claimant from presenting himself within the specified time: but the knights who had served under Champlitte, and were now entering into the fruits of their labours, were well aware that at this conjuncture the rule of a feeble hand would involve them in ruin, and Villehardouin himself was not the man to let slip the opportunity of assuming the government of the State which he had done more than any other man to establish. Certain it is that he now put himself forward, and was acknowledged by the other feudatories as their chief, for early in the year 1210 we find him in command of the principality, and bearing the title of Prince of Achaia. His elevation bore immediate fruits. Leon Sgouros, who defended Corinth against the Franks, when they first invaded the Peloponnese under King Boniface, was now dead, and Michael, the despot of Epirus, had taken possession of that place together with Argos and Nauplia, and intrusted the defence of them to his brother Theodore, a brave and skilful commander, who might in time have turned the tide of fortune in favour of the Greeks. Against him Geoffrey immediately advanced, and having persuaded Otho de la Roche, Grand-sire of Athens, to join him in the expedition,

laid siege to Corinth, which place they captured by blockade; after which, by the aid of Venetian galleys, the strongly fortified Nauplia fell into their hands, and finally Argos capitulated in the year 1212. At this period the only parts of the Morea which were not subject to the Western Powers were the port of Monemvasia at the south-eastern angle of the country, and the mountainous districts of Laconia. In reward for his aid in accomplishing these conquests, Otho de la Roche received Argos and Nauplia as a fief, and this privilege was enjoyed by his successors. Corinth also, which became the seat of a Latin archbishopric, in consequence of its outlying position was dissociated from the rest of the principality; and thus, as Modon and Coron were in the hands of the Venetians, both the north-eastern and south-western peninsulas of the Peloponnese find little place in the history of the Frank State.

It was during this early period that the principality was organised on a feudal basis; but whereas in the other States that were founded by the crusaders in the Eastern Empire the arrangement was regulated by the Assize of Romania, which was drawn up on the model of that of Jerusalem, the common code of the Latin States in Palestine and its neighbourhood, here it was determined by the customs of Champagne, to which country both Champlitte and Villehardouin belonged. According to this a number of baronies were established throughout the country, the holders of which had fiefs assigned to them in proportion to the importance of the position which they were required to defend; while they engaged for their part to serve for a specified portion of each year in garrison duty and in the field. The affairs of the principality were to be settled by a parliament, and, as regards the administration of justice, the courts were modelled on the institutions of France, but the Assize of Romania was received as the legal code. The natural conformation of the Peloponnese, with its numerous valleys separated from one another by high mountains, was excellently adapted to the feudal organisation, as it had been in old times to the development of independent communities. On the sea-coast of Achaia two baronies were formed, that of Vostitza within, and that of Patras without, the straits, while corresponding to these, among the mountains further inland, lay the

baronies of Kalávryta and Khalandrítza. The district of Elis was appropriated to the prince as his domain, and its chief city, Andravída, became the capital of the whole principality; and from the time that Villehardouin succeeded to the government, the fief of Kalamata was combined with this as the rightful possession of his family. But the two most important of the baronies, to which respectively twenty-four and twenty-two fiefs were assigned, were those of Akova and Karítēna. These lay on either side of the rugged mountainous region in north-western Arcadia, then called Skorta, which was occupied by a warlike Slavonic tribe, who, together with the Melings on the slopes of Mount Taygetus, were the only remaining representatives of those Slavonian invaders who had settled in the Peloponnese early in the Middle Ages. It was of the first importance to the French to keep open their communications in this direction from their headquarters on the western coast to the interior and the eastern districts, and with this view these two strongholds were built in commanding positions, Akova on the side towards Elis, and Karítēna towards Arcadia, or, as it was then called, Mesarea. In the southern part of that country the barony of Veligosti guarded the approaches to Messenia, and that of Nikli to Laconia; while of the remainder, Geráki at the southern foot of Mount Parnon was pushed forward in the direction of Monemvasia, Gritzéna held the mountain districts of Messenia, and Passavá, the most remote of all, situated at no great distance from the ruins of Gythium, the ancient port of Sparta, commanded the Laconian Gulf, and the chief pass through the range of Taygetus, by which it was possible to communicate with Kalamata. Besides these, a number of ecclesiastical baronies were established, possessing four fiefs apiece, while three others were assigned to the military orders, of whom the Templars received lands in Achaia and Elis, while those of the Knights of St. John and the Teutonic Order lay near the Messenian Gulf. The holders of these were bound to military service equally with the other feudatories, only they were exempt from garrison duty. The Archbishop of Patras was recognised as the Primate of the Principality, and on the decease of the first baron of that place, he entered on his barony in addition to the eight fiefs which had already been assigned to him.

Geoffrey Villehardouin died in 1218, and was succeeded by the eldest of his two sons, Geoffrey II. This prince had been married during his father's lifetime to Agnes of Courtenay, the daughter of the Emperor Peter of Romania, who was on her way, in company with her mother, the Empress Yoland, from Brindisi to Constantinople; and when they touched at the port of Katákolos on the western coast of the Morea, and were hospitably entertained by Geoffrey I., the marriage between his son and the daughter of the imperial house was celebrated before the expedition proceeded on its way. In consequence of this connection, Geoffrey II., when he came to the throne, was recognised by the Latin emperor as Prince of Achaia, which title he was the first of his family legitimately to bear, for his father had never himself employed it. The early part of his reign was occupied in a struggle with the Church, which had already been threatening in the time of his predecessor. The ecclesiastical affairs of the feudal States of the Eastern Empire generally had been settled at a parliament held at Ravénika in the south of Thessaly in 1210, in a manner highly favourable to the pretensions of the Papal See; but this convention Geoffrey I. refused to recognise, and in other ways he showed himself disposed to set limits to the independence of the Church within his dominions. When, however, his successor called upon his barons to furnish their contingents of soldiers with a view to the completion of the conquest of the peninsula, the clergy refused to answer to his summons, declaring that they owed no military service and held their fiefs from the Pope only. To this defiance Geoffrey II. answered by sequestering their possessions throughout the country; and in order to prove his disinterestedness in so doing he employed the revenues derived from these in building the castle of Khlemoutzi in a strong position on the westernmost promontory of the coast of Elis. This fortress, in the construction of which three years were employed, became a place of first-rate importance to the Principality, because it was in the neighbourhood of Andravída, the seat of government, and also commanded the port of Klarentza, which was the nearest point of communication for the Franks in the Morea with the west of Europe. Geoffrey was excommunicated; but by the time that Khlemoutzi was completed the condition of the Latin empire at Constantinople had become so perilous that both parties were persuaded of the

necessity of a reconciliation, and the Pope, Honorius III., agreed to remove the ban, and the bishops to perform their military service on condition of the restoration of their fiefs. The other great event of Geoffrey II.'s reign was his expedition to Constantinople in 1236, to relieve that city from the attack with which it was threatened by the united forces of the Greek emperor of Nicaea and the Bulgarian king. In this he was successful, for the Greeks in vain endeavoured to intercept the squadron on board of which his troops were embarked, and he landed them safely at Constantinople. In return for this service, Baldwin II., the last of the Latin emperors of that city, who was his brother-in-law, bestowed upon him the suzerainty of the Archipelago, and the Pope authorised him in employing a portion of the revenues of the Church in the Principality for the maintenance of a hundred knights at Constantinople for the service of the empire. Thus in many ways during his reign the Morea tended to occupy the position which had hitherto belonged to that city, for this province was rapidly increasing in importance in proportion as the empire itself declined. Geoffrey II. died in 1245, after a reign of twenty-seven years, and as he left no children was succeeded by his younger brother William.

William Villehardouin, the third and greatest prince of his family, was born at Kalamata, and consequently was the first of his line who could call himself a native of Greece, and on that ground could lay claim to the allegiance of his Greek subjects, for his elder brother was born in France. He also spoke Greek, which does not seem to have been the case with the earlier chieftains.¹ As soon as he came to the throne, he proceeded to complete the conquest of the Peloponnese. The fortified city of Monemvasia, to the northward of Cape Malea, was still in the possession of the Greeks, and accordingly this place was the first object of his attack. The steepness of the rocks on which it was built rendered it an impregnable fortress, and as it was situated on an island which was joined by a bridge to the mainland, it was impossible to blockade it except by the help of a maritime force : in consequence of this William applied to the

¹ In the Greek Chronicle it is specially noticed of William, that when parleying with John Palaeologus after

the battle of Pelagonia, he answered him in Greek, *ὁ πρίγκιπας, ὡς φρόνιμος, βωμάϊκα τὸν ἀπεκρίθη* (l. 2805).

Venetians for aid by sea, and by means of their co-operation after three years forced the city to capitulate (A.D. 1248). After this he subdued the wild mountaineers of the Taenarian promontory, and constructed the castle of Grand-Maina on the western coast of their territory;¹ and finally, to keep in check the independent Slavonic tribe of the Melings, who inhabited the rugged slopes of Mount Taygetus, he founded the town and fortress of Mizithrá, or Mistrá, on a projecting spur of that range, on the western side of the valley of Sparta. The strength of the position selected, and the extensive scale of the fortifications, testify to the importance which the conqueror attached to this stronghold; it may be regarded, in fact, as a sort of pendant to Khlemoutzi at the opposite angle of the Peloponnese, so that the two together enabled the French to retain a firm hold on the country; thus reminding us of the advice addressed to Philip, son of Demetrius, with regard to the fortresses on the Acrocorinth and on Ithome, when it was told him that by seizing these he would hold the cow by the horns.² Having thus secured himself at home, William proceeded to join the crusade of St. Louis, whom he met in Cyprus: and though after a time he excused himself from continuing the expedition on the ground of the risk involved in a lengthened absence from his possessions, yet with the shrewdness which characterised all the proceedings of the Villehardouins, he took the opportunity of obtaining from that sovereign, to whom he owed allegiance as a French noble, the right of coining money, which from that time forward was exercised by the Principality, so that its *tournois* circulated in the Morea along with Byzantine and Venetian coins. Finally, becoming elated by the greatness of his position, he endeavoured to extend his power outside the Peloponnese by calling on Guy de la Roche, who had succeeded his uncle Otho as Grand-sire of Athens, to do him personal homage; and when he refused to do more than pay the feudal service which he owed for his fief of Argos and Nauplia, and obtained the support of several of the Powers north of the isthmus, and even that of his son-in-law, Geoffrey of Karfena, who was William's nephew and one of his

¹ Leake (*Peloponnesiaca*, p. 142) would place Grand-Maina at Porto Quaglio on the eastern side of this peninsula, but Buchon (*Livre de la Conquête*, p.

95, note) is more probably right in thinking that it was at Tegani, a promontory towards the Messenian Gulf.

² Strabo, viii. 4, § 8.

barons, the Prince of Achaia marched against him, and defeated the confederate army at the pass of Karydi, between Megara and Thebes. Guy was forced to appear at his opponent's court at Nikli, where a parliament was summoned to decide the question, and this after some debate was referred to St. Louis for his adjudication.

The Frank Principality of the Morea had thus reached the culminating point of its greatness. The barons had established themselves in castles throughout the country; security everywhere prevailed; there was a lively commerce both at home and with foreign nations; and the public revenue, without being burdensome to the people, sufficed not only for the current expenses, but for the construction of strongholds such as Mistra, and costly buildings like the church of St. James at Andravida, which was designed to be a mausoleum of the Villehardouin family. At the prince's court the barons from time to time assembled for the celebration of tournaments, which might have seemed a mediaeval revival of the Olympian games; thither too, as to a school of chivalry, the young nobility of France in crowds resorted, so that the French which was spoken there was said to be equally pure with that of Paris. Nor had the majority of the Greek inhabitants for the moment much cause to lament their change of government. For their laws and judicial establishments, which were in all respects superior to those of the Franks, were allowed to remain, and many of their local privileges were respected; the lands appropriated to the newcomers were mostly either imperial domains, or the property of those who had fled the country; and the citizens of the towns retained their private property, and were little interfered with by the Western chieftains, whose residences were in the country districts. Again, whereas under the Byzantine administration the people at large were severely oppressed by the provincial nobility and great landholders, or archonts, as they were called, the yoke of these had been made to press less heavily by the invaders, who deprived them of a great part of their possessions. Even the Slavonian tribes were permitted to enjoy the concessions which had been made to them by the Byzantine emperors.

Unhappily, all this greatness and prosperity was dashed to the ground by a single blow. In the year 1259 William Villehardouin married a daughter of Michael II., despot of Epirus,

who at that time was organising a confederacy among the Greek and Frank States of western Greece to oppose the Greek empire of Nicaea, the power of which was beginning to assume threatening proportions. Thus, when war broke out, the Principality of Achaia was involved in it, and William led the flower of his troops to the support of his father-in-law. The forces which the Emperor Michael Palaeologus sent to oppose them were commanded by his brother John, an able general, and the two armies met in the plain of Pelagonia, in Upper Macedonia, where the confederates were disastrously defeated. Not only were the noblest chieftains of the Morea slain, but Villehardouin himself was captured, being recognised in the hiding-place in which he had taken refuge by his projecting front teeth, which were his most characteristic feature. He could hardly have fallen into worse hands than those of a prince so cunning, ambitious, and merciless, as Michael VIII. For three years, in the course of which the Greeks regained possession of Constantinople, he was detained a prisoner, in the hope that the whole province of the Morea might be extorted from him as the price of his freedom. At the expiration of that period, in 1262, he was released on condition of ceding to the Byzantine government the fortresses of Monemvasia and Grand-Maina and the newly established city of Mistrá, an arrangement by which the Principality was permanently crippled. It would have been far better for both parties in that country if Villehardouin had acceded to his opponent's original demand. Thenceforward there were two powers in the Peloponnese, Greek and Frank, and the land was constantly devastated by the struggles of the contending parties, and Arcadia in particular suffered ruinously from invading armies. But if the original inhabitants were the greater sufferers, the Franks in the long run were at a disadvantage, for their subjects, who were mainly Greek, were always ready to side with their enemies; and their organisation itself was enfeebled, because, owing to the destruction of so many nobles in the battle of Pelagonia, many fiefs had passed into the hands of females. The contest was renewed shortly after William's return, and at first it appeared as if the Greeks would regain the whole peninsula, for they drove their opponents back to their headquarters in Elis, destroying on their way the famous Benedictine monastery and Gothic church of the Virgin at Isova

in the valley of the Alphei¹us, and even laid siege to the capital, Andravída; but the tide of fortune turned, and the Franks subsequently obtained two important victories, the one at Prinitza, near the Alphei¹us, the other in the pass of Makriplagi, which leads from Arcadia into the upper plain of Messenia. The balance was thus for the moment restored, and a truce was concluded; but from this time onward a new factor appears in the politics of the country, which seriously affected the history of the Principality, and rendered it largely dependent on another power. This was its relation to the house of Anjou.

It was four years after William Villehardouin obtained his freedom, in 1266, that Charles of Anjou won for himself the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily. In the following year, William, feeling his need of the support of a greater Power near at hand to resist the rapidly increasing strength of the Palaeologi, betrothed his daughter and heiress, Isabella—for he had no son—to Philip, the second son of Charles. He was able also to render his new ally material service against the youthful Conradin who now arose as his opponent, for he crossed over into Italy with a band of knights, and contributed in no slight degree to the victory of Tagliacozzo. In return for this aid the King of Naples furnished him with a force of auxiliaries, which enabled him to maintain himself against the Greek emperor. But though the help of a powerful prince had thus been obtained, yet the Principality was now involved in the quarrel between the houses of Anjou and Aragon; and the claims of the former of those two Powers were further strengthened by the cession to Charles by Baldwin II., the last Latin emperor of the East, of his rights as suzerain of the Morea. His Italian campaign was the last great event of William's life, though his death did not occur till ten years later (A.D. 1278). He was buried by the side of his father and brother in the church of St. James at Andravída. With him the male line of the Villehardouins was extinguished, and the first period of the history of the Principality may be said to end. Geoffrey Villehardouin and his two sons, unprincipled and grasping though they were, would have been great men in any age, from the combination of shrewdness and political insight with boldness and vigour in action which

¹ Of the remains of this some account is given in Leake's *Travels in the Morea*, ii. 87, 88.

was conspicuous in their policy. The succeeding period is one of lesser personages and feebler administration, and the forces which influence its history are to a great extent exterior to the country.

For about half a century after William Villehardouin's death the sovereignty of the Principality remained in the hands of his successors in the female line, though this was subject to the nomination of the princes of Anjou as suzerains, and at intervals the government was carried on by the baillies or representatives whom those princes maintained in the country. Philip, the first husband of Isabella Villehardouin, died early; and after this his widow married a Belgian noble, Florenz of Hainault, whom the King of Naples then invested with sovereign power. Florenz appears to have been at once an active and an upright ruler, and the eight years during which he governed the Morea (1289—1297) were a time of prosperity. He perceived that the country required rest, and accordingly concluded a treaty of peace with the Greek emperor, Andronicus II.; by this means he was able to reduce the service of the military bands, and to turn his attention to internal reforms in the province, in which violence and intestine war were generally prevalent. The regret which was felt at his death at the expiration of that period was increased by the administration of his successor, Philip of Savoy Isabella's third husband. This prince devoted himself from the first to amassing money for his private interest, and with this view imposed a tax on the Greek and Slavonian mountaineers of northern Arcadia, who had been secured by charter from such exactions. They rose in rebellion, and having invited the assistance of the Byzantine authorities at Mistrá, succeeded in destroying two of the Frank castles; and though this rising was quelled for the time, yet this part of the population was permanently alienated, and contributed to the subsequent expulsion of their masters. In 1304 Philip of Savoy and Isabella quitted the country, and Philip of Tarentum—who had received the suzerainty of the Morea from his father, Charles II. of Naples—while he himself assumed the title of prince, recognised the claims of Maud, the daughter of Isabella and Florenz, for he appointed her husband, Guy II. of Athens, to be his bailly. But the misfortune which the province had experienced in losing Florenz was repeated in the early death of Guy, whose adminis-

tration was equally beneficial. After an interval, in 1313, the hand of Maud was bestowed on Louis of Burgundy, but he also died (it was said by poison), in 1316, shortly after his arrival in the country. The story of the extinction of this branch of the Villehardouins is a tragical one, and illustrates the unscrupulous ambition of the house of Anjou. Robert, King of Naples, and Philip of Tarentum, being determined that the sovereignty of the Morea should be assured to their family, arranged that Maud should now marry their brother John, Count of Gravina; and when she refused her consent, they celebrated the marriage ceremony in defiance of her opposition, and then immured her in the Castel dell' Uovo at Naples, where she died about the year 1324.

The weakness of the administration during this period, and still more the confusion of claims that followed Maud's death, forced the barons of the Morea, nothing loth, to become virtually independent, and to organise themselves for purposes of self-defence. After this time we hear of one or two sovereigns, such as Robert of Tarentum (A.D. 1346), and his widow, Mary of Bourbon (A.D. 1364), who were acknowledged by the whole Principality; but their power was circumscribed within narrow limits, and the task of government became increasingly difficult. At the same time, and owing to this want of unity, the rival Greek State made gradual, but steady, advances. As early as the reign of William Villehardouin, in the campaign which followed the cession of Monemvasia and Mistra, the Greeks had seized Kalávryta, the seat of one of the earliest baronies, in the northern part of the peninsula, and permanently maintained themselves there: and it is strange to think that, while they thus occupied an outpost in the heart of their enemies' territory, the Franks should at the same time have retained possession of the town of Lacedaemonia, though it was but a few miles distant from Mistra, and cut off by a wide expanse of rugged country from Nikli, the nearest place from which it could obtain succours. But this fortress did not remain long in their hands; and at last, in the year 1320, the Greeks made themselves masters of the powerful strongholds of Karitena and Akova. From that time onwards the territory of the Principality was restricted to Messenia, Elis, and the northern coast of the peninsula. Arcadia was wholly lost to them, and the Frankish inhabitants of that

district went over in numbers to the Greek Church. The destruction of so many of the knights of Achaia shortly before this period by the Catalans at the battle of the Cephissus, in 1311, affords a further explanation of the success of their opponents. From the time of Manuel Cantacuzene (A.D. 1349), the Byzantine province in the Morea was of sufficient importance to be erected into a separate despotat, and became the appanage of the second son of the Emperor of Constantinople.

In the latter part of the fourteenth century the government of the Frankish Morea was practically in the hands of a Power the history of which has been brought to light by the researches of Carl Hopf. This was the Navarrese Company, a band of adventurers resembling the Catalan Grand Company, which was formed in Navarre, in the year 1380, by James de Baux, nephew of Philip II. of Tarentum, who on the death of that prince claimed to have inherited from him the sovereignty of Achaia, and proposed to himself to occupy the country by the help of these mercenaries. In his name they first seized Corfu, and then overran Attica, and captured Athens, which was now in the hands of the Catalans; but being expelled again from those countries, early in 1381 they proceeded to conquer the Morea, and having occupied Vostitza on the Corinthian Gulf, formally took possession of the country in the name of their employer. They then sailed for the west coast, and established themselves at Navarino—which place derives its name from them ('Châteaux Navarres'), and not as has usually been thought, from the Avars (τὸν Ἀβαρίνον)—and after this Kalamata also fell into their hands. Their allegiance to James de Baux soon became nominal, and when the rest of the province had submitted to them, in 1386, the Company proclaimed their captain, Peter de San Superan, vicar of the Principality; he thus became the virtual ruler of the country, and ten years later was recognised by the King of Naples as hereditary prince. As might be expected, a leader of adventurers like Peter de San Superan had few scruples as to the means by which he could maintain himself in power; and before this time we find him visiting the court of Sultan Bajazet, no doubt with the object of obtaining aid from him against the Greeks of the Byzantine province. That aid arrived in an unwelcome form, for in 1397, Bajazet's

general, Evrenos-bey, overran and devastated the Morea, and made both Theodore, the despot of Mistra, and Peter himself, tributary. From this yoke they were delivered by the advance of Timour, resulting in the battle of Angora, and Bajazet's captivity (A.D. 1402).

With the death of Peter de San Superan in 1402, the Navarrese supremacy came to an end, and thus at the beginning of the fifteenth century all unity had ceased among the Frank occupants of the Peloponnese. Argos and Nauplia were sold to Venice in 1388 by the last heir of the house of Brienne of Athens, which had inherited that fief from the De la Roches; Corinth was annexed to the Byzantine despotat in 1404; Patras, with its Latin archbishopric, had passed into the hands of the Pope. The remainder had become for the time the possession of the Genoese family of Zaccaria, which, two hundred years before, had established itself in Chios, Samos, and others of the Aegean islands, and having extended its influence in various directions, at last became the chief power in the Morea, and ruled over the plain of Elis, the ancient barony of Kalandritza in Achaia, and part of Messenia. And along with these changes of governors the Frankish inhabitants of the country had also changed. A roll of the fiefs of the Morea which was drawn up about the year 1391 exists at the present day, from which it appears that not one of the old feudal names of owners of the thirteenth century remained at that time. The end of this feeble state, the shadow of the once lordly Principality, may be described as painless extinction. In 1427 the despot Constantine Palaeologus—the future emperor of Constantinople, who died heroically in the final siege of that city—having conquered the rest of Elis, appeared before the port of Klarentza, which was now in the possession of Carlo Tocco, count of Cephalonia, having been sold to him by a Genoese adventurer, called Oliverio Franco, who had forced Centurione Zaccaria to cede it to him in 1418. The count, distrusting his power of resisting the Greek army, listened to the proposals of Constantine for terminating the war by a matrimonial alliance, and gave him his niece, the beautiful Maddalena Tocco, in marriage, with Klarentza and his other possessions in Greece as her dowry. The despot occupied that place and the neighbouring fortress of Khlemoutzi, which he made his residence, and then proceeded to besiege Patras, of

which he became master in 1429. In his camp before that city he celebrated his marriage with Maddalena, who thenceforward bore the name of Theodora. Meanwhile his brother Thomas had besieged Khalandritza, and pressed Centurione Zaccaria so hard in that place, that he also consented to yield to him his domains there as dowry to his daughter Catherine. This was the last of the Frankish possessions in the Peloponnese; and thus by the marriage of the contending parties the history of the Principality of Achaia reaches an almost melodramatic termination. The Greeks regained the whole of the country, except the portions that belonged to Venice, twenty-four years before their empire was extinguished by the fall of Constantinople. Centurione retained the empty title of prince until his death in 1432, and therefore that is regarded as the date of the formal extinction of the Principality. Its total duration had been two hundred and twenty-seven years.

In order to estimate the effects of the Frank occupation of the Peloponnese on that country, we have only to compare its condition at the commencement of that period with what we find at its conclusion. In the twelfth century, owing to the long interval of rest which that province had previously enjoyed, it was in a singularly flourishing state; a variety of industries existed, especially the manufacture of purple, silk, and linen fabrics; the soil was carefully cultivated; and what may be termed the 'plant' of civilised society—the capital invested by successive generations in roads, bridges, quays, drainage, and similar works—was in excellent preservation. No stronger evidence can be required of the security and good order that prevailed than the fact that a wealthy and populous town like Andravida was not protected by walls. On the other hand, on the eve of the Turkish occupation, we find the country districts depopulated, trade and industry at a standstill, agriculture neglected, and public works and means of communication ruined. Notwithstanding the scanty notices of contemporary society which can be gleaned from the writers of the period, it is possible in some degree to trace the stages of this downward progress. Even in the thirteenth century many families quitted the Peloponnese to settle at Constantinople, and the hardy mountaineers of that country sought service in the fleet of the Greek emperor. The period of anarchy that followed caused

the agricultural population to suffer severely from the exactions of the barons and military adventurers, and their farmhouses were destroyed by the continual forays; so that, from the time when Manuel Cantacuzene became despot in 1349, colonies of rude Albanian peasants, who could endure greater hardships and had fewer needs than more civilised inhabitants, were introduced in great numbers into Arcadia. From the descriptions of the misery and disorganised state of the province given by the author of *Mazaris*, who passed some time at Mistra early in the fifteenth century—whatever allowance must be made for his exaggerations as a satirist—it is clear that the ruin of the country had then been completed.

These disastrous effects, it is fair to say, are not wholly to be attributed to the Frank occupants. The important silk trade, for instance, had already begun to decline, ever since the Norman prince Roger of Sicily, after capturing Corinth in 1147, transferred that trade, for which that city was famous, to Palermo, by carrying with him its most skilled artisans. So too, the piratical expeditions of the Seljouk Turks, who not only bore off plunder, but burnt the houses and destroyed the fruit-trees, and dragged away the inhabitants to be sold for slaves, depopulated the shores of Greece during the latter half of the fourteenth century. The long-continued struggle, also, with the Byzantine empire produced results, which might partly have been avoided, if the invaders had retained their conquest in undisputed possession. But, after all allowance has been made, it is the feudal system itself and the character of those who introduced it, which must be held responsible for the decline of the country. The two peoples thus brought into contact were in every way contrasted. The Greeks were far superior in material civilisation and the arts of life; and their municipal system and legal administration derived from the old Roman code were in advance of anything that had been introduced among western nations. The Franks, on the other hand, had the advantage of higher moral principles, arising from the self-respect and truthfulness inculcated by their family discipline; and these for a time were maintained by the feudal system and the ties of duty it involved. But in the East the beneficial influence of that system was soon lost, because, when it was separated from the associations connected with it, the

grounds of its best obligations were removed, and it soon came to be supported only by the promptings of personal interest. The Villehardouin princes, indeed, who felt the necessity of conciliating their Greek subjects, kept these tendencies in check, and their vigorous administration succeeded in restraining the rapacity of the barons; but after their time the evils arising from the alien administration rapidly developed themselves. The results were not as pernicious as in the states founded by the Crusaders in Palestine, where serfage was forced once more on a people who had emancipated themselves from it; but yet, when the new establishment was fully matured, we find that the Franks were demoralised and the Greeks ruined. This is the reason why no period of Greek history has left so scanty traces in the country as that of the Frankish dominion. A few buildings, a few names of places and families, a few words embedded in the language, remain as memorials of that time; but for any element of civilisation or progress or stability derived from it we look in vain.

II.—*The Chronicle of the Conquest.*

The *Greek Chronicle*, which brought to light the feudal organisation of the Frank Principality, and is the principal authority for the first century of its existence, was first printed from the manuscript in the Paris library in 1841 by M. Buchon in his *Chroniques étrangères relatives aux Expéditions françaises pendant le treizième Siècle*. Its existence had long been known, for Ducange in his *Greek Lexicon* refers to it under the title *De bellis Francorum in Morea*; and the frequency of his quotations from it attests its value for linguistic purposes, so that it appears in some cases to be the earliest, and in some the only, authority for certain mediaeval Greek words. Ducange also intended to publish it, but was prevented by death, and no use was made of it as a historical document until Buchon's time. When it was first published, the editor believed that it was an original work; but this opinion he was led to alter by the discovery in 1845 of a French text in the library at Brussels, entitled *Le Livre de la Conquête de la Princée de la Morée*. The view that this was the earlier of the two, and that

the Greek version was derived from it, is now generally accepted, though it was doubted by so excellent a critic of Byzantine literature as the late Dr. Ellissen, who published extracts from the Greek poem, with a verse translation into German and historical notes, in the second volume of his *Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur*, in 1856. The French chronicle was printed as vol. i. of Buchon's *Recherches historiques sur la Principauté française de Morée*, while the second volume of that work contained another Greek text, taken from a manuscript discovered at Copenhagen. This latter is undoubtedly superior to the text of the Paris manuscript, as it is fuller, and supplies many of its *lacunae*; but it is inferior in respect of orthography and metre: in the following pages, however, the references are made to the Copenhagen text, and the quotations are taken from it, unless the contrary is stated, because in it alone the lines are numbered. The poem, as edited by Buchon from the Copenhagen manuscript, supplemented in parts by the other, contains 9219 lines of 'political' verse, of which 1332 belong to the Prologue, and the remaining 7887 to the Conquest of the Morea.¹ Its title is *Χρονικά τῶν ἐν Ῥωμανίᾳ καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τῷ Μωρέᾳ πολέμων τῶν Φράγκων*; for though the editor has given to the whole work the title *Βιβλίον τῆς κουγκέστας*, by which it is generally known, and to the part that follows the prologue the separate heading *Τὸ πῶς οἱ Φράγκοι ἐκέρδισαν τὸν τόπον τοῦ Μωραίως*, which is a line from the poem itself, yet these convenient appellations are his own invention. The *Livre de la Conquête* carries the history twelve years further down than the Greek chronicle, for it continues to A.D. 1304, while the Greek manuscripts end in 1292.

The date of the composition of the French chronicle can be approximately determined. When referring to the descendants of Baldwin II., the last emperor of Romania, the writer mentions Catharine de Valois, who married Philip of Tarentum; and in doing so speaks of her in the present, and of him in the past tense—'la très excellente dame, qui ores s'appelle empereys et fu feme dou très excellent et noble homme, messire Philippe de

¹ Buchon himself computes the number of lines in the latter part as 7892, but Ellissen has pointed out (Pref. p.

xxx.) that in the verses 570—580, by an oversight, five verses are reckoned as if they were ten.

Tharente,'¹ Now as Philip died at the end of 1332, and Catharine in 1346, the *Livre de la Conquête* must have been written in the interval between those two years. On the other hand, internal evidence goes to prove that the Greek version was made towards the end of the fourteenth century, because a French knight, Erard de Saint-Sauveur, who is there spoken of as no longer alive, is known to have died in 1391 (καλὸς αὐθέντης ἦτον).² It is true that the line in which this occurs is not found in the Copenhagen MS.; but anyhow, whatever may be thought of this passage, the other which bears on the same question, viz. that in which the Catalan Grand Company is spoken of as still in possession of Athens—

ἐπῆραν καὶ τὸν τόπον του, τὸ μεγάλο κυράτον·
καὶ εἶναι αὐθένταις σήμερον εἰς αὐτο ἡ Κουμπανία—³

if it is not a later insertion, can hardly be taken literally—for the Company itself ceased to govern in 1326—but must rather refer to the rule of the house of Aragon, by whom at the request of the Catalans the superintendence of the duchy was undertaken. It remained in their hands until 1394, and this date is not at variance with the one already given. A strong proof that the French chronicle was the original is found in the forms in which the proper names are given in the two. In it the names of the Western chieftains are accurately spelt, while those of places in Greece appear, either in a purely French form, where they were founded by the new occupants, as Beaufort, Belregard; or in that by which they had from the first represented an ancient name, as La Crémonie for Lacedaemonia. In contrast to this, the Greek has a hard struggle to reproduce the Frank names, so that we are constantly met by such strange forms as *μαντάμα Ζαμπέα* *madame Isabelle*, *ρόη Παγοῦν* *roi d'Aragon*, *ντὲ Ἄντουλο* *Dandolo*, who is also sometimes called Ἀρίς *Harry*. But, in reality, the *Livre de la Conquête* has nothing of the air of a translation about it; and

¹ *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 29. A full discussion of this and other points here referred to will be found in Buchon's preface to this work, and in Ellissen's preface to his extracts from the Greek Chronicle, though the point of view of

these writers is often different.

² Paris text, p. 213.

³ Copenh. text, l. 5955. The *μεγάλο κυράτον* is the duchy of the grand-sire, or Μέγας Κύριος.

its simplicity and vigour, which remind us sometimes of Villehardouin's *Chronicle*, are the best evidence that it was not derived from any previous writer. At the same time, that the two versions, notwithstanding many minor points of difference, are one work, and not merely corresponding narratives of the same period, is shown by the remarks, the matter of the speeches, and frequently the mistakes, being the same in both.

The author of the *Livre* was a Frenchman, for he speaks of the French as his countrymen. Probably he was also a knight, for his style is not that of a professional writer, and he shows a natural preference for adventures and feats of arms. Certain peculiarities, too, in the vocabulary he used—which contains Greek and Italian elements, unknown to the French language of that period, though such as might be expected in what was spoken in Greece—suggest that he was a native of the Morea. His papal sympathies are evident throughout, and, in particular, the story of the contest between Charles of Anjou and Manfred is told from a point of view strongly favourable to the court of Rome. The same feature is noticeable in his translator, who, though he spoke Greek as his native tongue, was manifestly a Roman Catholic, and a strong partisan of the French. Possibly he was a Gasmul, as the children of mixed marriages between a Frank father and Greek mother were called, such as we frequently hear of at this period. Hence his judgment of the Greeks is very severe, and he readily echoes, and accentuates more strongly, the diatribes against them in which his author indulges—

καθὼς εὐρίσκεται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ γένος τῶν Ῥωμαίων
εἰς δολιότητα πολλὴν καὶ εἰς ἀπιστιαῖς μεγάλαις.¹

In respect of style the contrast between the two versions is complete, for whereas the French is natural and unaffected, the Greek is stilted and prolix: in fact, it is a reproduction rather than a translation, or even a paraphrase, and both the details of the narrative and the diction are greatly expanded. The following passages, describing how Robert of Champlitte was treacherously left behind at Corfu by the captain of his vessel, may illustrate the relation of the two.

¹ Prol. 592, 593.

‘Et quant Robert vint à Corfo, le patron lui fist entendant que la gallie avoit mestier de calefater en aucuns lieux ou il faisoit besoing; et en tel maniere si fist descendre le noble homme ou tout son hernois, et puis fist semblant de deschargier la gallie; et la nuit, quant Robert estoit au chastel et dormoit à son ayse, le patron fist remettre dedans ce qu’il avoit trait pour decevoir Robert.’¹

In the Greek this occurrence is related thus:

Λοιπόν, ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ λαλῶ, ἐγείνετο τὸ πρᾶγμα
καὶ ὡς τὸ ἤφερεν τὸ κάτεργον εἰς τοῦ Κορφοῦ τὸ κάστρον,
ὁ κόμιτας τὸν ἔκραξε ἐκείνον τὸν ‘Ρουμπέρτον,
καὶ λέγει του· ‘Τὸ κάτεργον ἔσπασεν ἀποκάτω,
καὶ χρῆζομεν νὰ εὐθυασθῇ, νὰ τὸ καλαφατίσω·
λοιπόν, καλέ μου ἀδελφέ, τὰ ροῦχά σου ἂς ἐβγάλουν
ν’ ἀλαφρωθῇ τὸ κάτεργον, νὰ τὸ καλαφατίσω’
καὶ ἐκεῖνος λογιζόμενος εἰς ἀλήθειαν τοῦ τὸ λέγει,
ᾧρισε καὶ ἐξέβαλλεν τὰ ροῦχά του εἰς τὸ κάστρον,
καὶ ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἀπλίκευσεν εἰς τὸ ξενοδοχεῖον.
καὶ ὅταν ἐπέρασε ὁ καιρός, τῆς νύκτας γὰρ τὸ πλεῖον,
καὶ ἐλάλησεν ὁ πετεινός, ἐκείνοι τοῦ κατέρργου
ἔδωκαν τὴν συρίστραν τους, καὶ εὐθὺς πάντα ὑπάγουν.²

The speeches, again, with which the narrative is freely interspersed, are sometimes simple inventions of the Greek chronicler, but more commonly free translations from the French with numerous additions. As might be expected, the graces of style are few. Here and there short similes are introduced: slaughter in the field is compared to mowing grass in a meadow (ὅλους τοὺς ἐκατέκοπτεν ὡς χόρτον εἰς λιβάδι); the enemy is overpowered as the partridge by the hawk (τοὺς ἄλλους ὅλους ἔχομεν, ὡς φάλκονες περδίκι); Monemvasia is kept closely blockaded by William Villehardouin and the Venetians ‘like a nightingale in a cage’ (ὡς ᾽ς τὸ κλοῦβιν τὸ ἀηδόνη); and the comparison of the triangular site of Constantinople to a lateen sail is really effective—

ὡς ἄρμενον τριπρόσωπον (τρίγωνος γὰρ ὑπάρχει),
τὰ δύο μέρη ᾽ς τὴν θάλασσαν, τὸ τρίτον ᾽ς τὴν στερέαν.³

¹ *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 62.

³ Lines 2704, 2679, 1583, Prol. 532.

² *Gr. Chron.* 864—876.

Some of the descriptions of places in Greece are also true to nature; thus the wild mountain district, called in ancient times the Sciritis, through which the road ran from Nikli (Tegea) to Lacedaemonia (Sparta), is well characterised as *δασώδης τόπος, βουνιὰ καὶ στενολάγγαδα*;¹ and the position of Yanina in Albania—with its castle in the lake, joined to the land by a bridge, and capable of ‘defying the world’ as long as provisions could be brought to it in boats—is excellently described in the following lines—

τὸ κάστρον ἔνι ἀφηρόν· ἀπέσω εἰς λίμνην στέκει,
 ἐν ᾧ ἐνι μέγας ὁ Ὁξερὸς, τὸν γύρωθεν τοῦ κάστρου.
 μὲ τὸ γιοφύριον ἐμπαίνουσιν οἱ ἐκεῖσε κατοικοῦντες·
 μὲ τὰ σαντάλια ἐμπάζασιν τοῦ κάστρου τὴν σωταρχίαν.
 τὸν κόσμον ὅλον οὐ ψηφᾷ τὸ κάστρον τῶν Γιαννίνων
 νὰ τὸ βλάψουν μὲ πόλεμον, μόνῃ νὰ ἔχη σωτάρχιον.²

But on the whole it must be confessed that the *Greek Chronicle* is dull reading, though its contents might furnish the material for many romances. Well may Dr. Ellissen exclaim, ‘What would not a Walter Scott make out of it!’

The Prologue commences with the story of Peter the Hermit and the first crusade; and here the sympathies of the writer at once become evident from the way in which he sides with the Crusaders in their dealings with Alexius I. From the taking of Jerusalem by Godfrey of Boulogne it passes to the events of the fourth crusade; and after mentioning the taking of Zara in compliance with the wish of the Venetians, it goes on to relate the circumstances which induced the Crusaders to turn their thoughts towards Constantinople. The siege of that city is then related, and the death of the Greek emperor Murtzuphlos, who was flung to the ground from the top of a high column; and the prophecy relating to that event is introduced, which was believed to date from the time of Leo the Philosopher. The narrative of these events, being given altogether at second-hand, forms a strong contrast to the life-like story in the Chronicle of Villehardouin, who was an eyewitness of them. Then follows the election of an emperor, the partition of the conquered

¹ Line 5351.

² Lines 7454—7459. The name of Ozero, which is here given to the lake of Yanina, is the Slavonic word for

a piece of water, *jezero*, which is found at the present day attached to some lakes in Greece, sometimes in the form Nezero (τὸν Ἐξερὸν).

territory, the death of Baldwin I., and other events of the succeeding period, until it concludes with the retaking of Constantinople by the Greeks, and the flight of the last Latin emperor. In the Chronicle proper, which begins at this point, it is at once stated that what precedes is simply introductory, and the remainder is devoted to the conquest and history of the Morea. In this part, however, owing to the discursive tendency of the writer, various events belonging to general history are introduced, especially such as are connected with southern Italy. Thus the struggle between Manfred and Charles of Anjou is related, and along with it—as an episode to account for the French invasion of Naples—the story of Charles's wife being found in tears by her husband in consequence of the taunts of her sisters, who laughed at her for being only a countess when they were married to kings; whereupon he protested to her that he would soon make her a greater queen than any of them. The chronicler is in error in speaking of her sisters as two in number, whereas in reality they were three. The story itself would appear more authentic, if something very much like it were not already found in Livy.¹

It has already been intimated that the Chronicle is far from being wholly a trustworthy authority in matters of history; and therefore it may be worth while here to mention the principal errors which occur in it. (1) It states that the doge Dandolo was put forward as a candidate for the office of emperor, but himself declined to be nominated, and recommended Baldwin of Flanders. Gibbon went further, and said that the post was offered to him and he declined it. But Finlay has pointed out that this was not the case, for the constitution of the Venetian republic rendered it impossible for the doge to become a feudal sovereign, and, as a matter of fact, the clause in the partition treaty which provided that Dandolo should be dispensed from taking the oath of fealty to the emperor to be elected, implied that he was himself ineligible.² (2) When speaking of the

¹ *Gr. Chron.* 4603 foll.; *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 200. The story is found in Villani (Book vi. chap. 90), who makes the count, Charles of Anjou, to say, 'Contessa, datti pace, che io ti farò tosto maggiore reina di l ro.' He rightly speaks of three sisters who were

queens. The four are mentioned by Dante (*Par.* vi. 133). The story in Livy (vi. 34) relates to Licinius Stolo.

² *Gr. Chron.* Prol. 928 foll.; Gibbon, vii. 321 (Smith's edit.); Finlay, iv. 90, 94.

Greek empire of Nicaea, and of Theodore Lascaris as being its first emperor, it says that Michael Palaeologus put to death his son;¹ in reality it was the son of Theodore Lascaris II., his immediate predecessor, whom Michael deposed and blinded in 1261, nearly forty years after the death of Theodore Lascaris I. (3) It represents Champlitte and not Villehardouin as the original conqueror of the north-western province of the Morea. It describes how he came with a force from France and made himself master, first of Patras, and then of Andravida; after which he drove Leon Sgouros out of the town of Corinth, and forced him to take refuge in the citadel, and then was visited at that place by Boniface and Geoffrey Villehardouin.² We have already seen that the true story is, that Villehardouin originally subdued the western districts and then betook himself to Nauplia, where he met Champlitte, who had previously marched into the Peloponnese in company with the King of Salonica. (4) The Chronicle contains an amusing story, related in much detail, of the manner in which Geoffrey I. became master of the Principality. According to this, when Champlitte returned to France and heard of the death of his relation Hugh, whom he had left as his bailly, he sent a young member of his family, Robert of Champlitte, to take his place. Villehardouin, however, pretended that there was an agreement between William of Champlitte and himself, according to which he was to succeed to the Principality, if his former chief's representative did not present himself within a year and a day; and then by various stratagems he endeavoured to prevent him, first, from arriving in the country, and afterwards from meeting the parliament that was to recognise him, within the specified time. In this he succeeded, and was subsequently acknowledged Prince of Achaia.³ This story may possibly have some foundation in truth, but it receives no confirmation from authentic history. (5) A still more romantic episode relates to the marriage of Agnes of

¹ *Gr. Chron.* Prol. 1225 foll.

² *Gr. Chron.* 75 foll.

³ *Gr. Chron.* 828 foll. This story has been made the subject of a historical novel in modern Greek, 'Ο αὐθέντης τοῦ Μωπέως by Alexander Rhizos Rhangabé, which has been translated into German by Dr. Ellissen, with the

title *Der Fürst von Morea*, and published as Part II. of the second volume of his *Analekten*. The interesting sketch which this romance gives of the chief personages and the life of the period, is not seriously interfered with by the unhistorical character of the event on which it turns.

Courtenay with Geoffrey II. This is said by the Chronicle to have taken place during that prince's reign, and the princess is described as being on her way to Spain, where she was to be married to the King of Aragon, when she put into the port of Katakolo, and was persuaded by Geoffrey to become his wife instead.¹ Agnes, however, in reality was on her way to Constantinople, and was married to Geoffrey II. during his father's lifetime. As Finlay shrewdly perceived, the legendary version of the story dates from a later period, when there was a rivalry between the French of Achaia and the Catalans. (6) But the most important of all the errors into which the chronicler has fallen, and which misled even Finlay, relates to the time at which Corinth, Nauplia, and Argos were conquered by the Franks. According to him this acquisition took place in the reign of William Villehardouin; but in reality these fortresses were taken and annexed to the Frank Principality by his father, Geoffrey I., shortly after Champlitte left the country.²

Before we proceed to notice the linguistic peculiarities of the *Greek Chronicle*, it may be well to mention the derivations which have been given of the name Morea, which first comes into general use at this period. The earliest, and at the same time the most fanciful, is that from the mulberry tree (*μωρέα*), the leaf of which the country resembles in form, just as Strabo in ancient times compared it to the leaf of the plane-tree.³ Next came the Slavonic derivation from *more*, 'the sea,' as if it was called the 'sea-land' or 'coast-land.' This dates from the period when Fallmerayer endeavoured to maintain the purely Slavonic origin of the modern Greeks; and according to him the name was applied to the shore-land of the western coast by the Slavonian colonists of that district.⁴ The objection to it is that it does not make its appearance in common use until the Slavonic element in the Peloponnese had been for the most part absorbed by the Greeks; in addition to which, Kopitar maintains that Morea cannot be formed from this root according to the principles of derivation of Slavonic words. Carl Hopf believed that Morea was a metathesis for Romea, or 'the land of the *Ρωμαῖοι*,' and was first used by the Frankish occupants.

¹ *Gr. Chron.* 1144 foll.

² *Ibid.* 1436 foll.

³ Strabo, viii. 2, § 1, p. 335.

⁴ Fallmerayer, *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea*, i. 243, 244.

His arguments in favour of this are: that the name does not occur before the Frank period; that in contemporary documents the words Morea and Romania are used interchangeably; and that an Italian writer of the fifteenth century calls the Roumanians (Wallachs) Morias, in which form the same metathesis appears.¹ Finally, M. Sathas has lately endeavoured to trace the name to an ancient source, viz. to the town that was called by Xenophon Margana, by Strabo Margalae, and by Stephanus Margaeae. This name he thinks is found at the present day in the fishery of Muria (Μουρρηά) near the town of Pyrgos, on the west coast of Elis; and he shows unquestionably that the name Morea existed in Elis before the thirteenth century, and was used in connection with places in the neighbourhood of Pyrgos, though the passages which he cites do not seem to prove, as he thinks they do, that it was the name of a town. According to him this town, which supplies the link to connect the ancient Μαργαῖαι with the modern Μουρρηά, at one period of the Middle Ages gave its name to the neighbouring district, and this was subsequently extended to the whole of the peninsula.²

The point on which this last view mainly turns is in itself open to question, viz. the assumption that the name Morea, as used by the Franks, was in the first instance restricted to the north-west corner of the country. It is clear from several passages, both in the French and Greek Chronicles, that during the Frank occupation Morea was used as equivalent to Elis, as well as in its ordinary acceptation as the name for the Peloponnese—ὅλης τῆς Πελοπόννησος, τὸν λέγουσι Μωραῖαν³—or at all events for that part of it which was included within the Principality. Thus we hear of persons going from the Morea to Akova in Arcadia, and to Kalamata in Messenia—‘parti de la Morée et vint à Mathe-Griphon,’ and ‘si parti de la Morée et vint demorer en la chastellanie de Calamate.’⁴ From these passages Buchon concluded that the name was originally used in the narrower sense, for the part first conquered by the invaders, and was afterwards extended to the whole of their

¹ *Geschichte Griechenlands*, pp. 265—267.

vol i. Pref. pp. xxx—xxxviii.

³ *Gr. Chron.* 3067.

² Sathas, *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*;

⁴ *Livre de la Conquête*, pp. 466, 386. *Cp. Gr. Chron.* 4376, 5394.

possessions.¹ Hopf, however, has shown by documentary evidence that as early as 1278 both Laconia and the town of Nauplia in Argolis were included in Morea; and he pertinently remarks that the chronicles were composed from the point of view of the fourteenth century, at which time the possessions which remained to the Franks were divided into the three provinces of Morea (Elis), Skorta (Arcadia), and Kalamata (Messenia). His conclusion then is, that Morea was from the first the name for the Frankish territory generally, and that it was restricted at a later period to that portion which contained the head-quarters.² This is quite possible, though the arguments here adduced do not necessarily overthrow the opposite view, and the fact that the name Morea previously existed in Elis is strongly in its favour. We can hardly consider the question of the origin of the name to be finally determined, but the derivation proposed by M. Sathas is certainly the most probable that has yet been advanced, and has much to recommend it.

Another point which is worthy of notice in this connection is the marked absence of ancient names and of references to classical times both in the French and Greek chronicles. Strange as it may appear, these gallant chieftains of the West seem to have been wholly unaware that the country which they conquered had ever been famous in history. To them the sacred soil of Greece was nothing more than park or glebe-land, and the remains of Hellenic fortresses and buildings they regarded in much the same way as we regard British camps and Druidical circles. In speaking of the citadel of the town of Arkadia (Cyparissia) in Messenia, the *Livre de la Conquête* describes it as the work of the Giants: 'le donjon avoit une bone tour dessus, de l'ovre des Jaïans,' which passage is rendered in the *Greek Chronicle* by εἶχαν καὶ πύργον δυνατὸν ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων—one of the comparatively few places in which that name occurs.³ Nor were the great mass of their subjects qualified to enlighten them, for with the exception of a few learned men they had lost their ancient traditions. The names of the fortified towns on the coast remained, as Corinth, Nauplia, and Patras, but the great majority of the cities of the interior

¹ *Recherches Historiques*, i. Pref. p. xxviii.

³ *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 44; *Gr. Chron.* l. 442.

² *Griechische Geschichte*, p. 266.

had been destroyed or deserted ; and though at the present day the ancient names are found attached to some of their sites, yet these also had mostly perished. The same thing is true in a still greater degree of the mountains and rivers. One classical river-name alone—that of the Alpheius—is preserved in the *Greek Chronicle*, though in the *Livre de la Conquête* it is always called Le Charbon.¹ This is the more interesting because of the subsequent history of the name. Alpheius has been changed into Rufia, and has been transferred from the river to which it rightfully belonged to its chief tributary, the Ladon, after its junction with which it is applied to the united stream. In the upper part of its course the Alpheius is now called the river of Karitena.

From a philological point of view the *Greek Chronicle* is well worthy of careful study, because it is a unique specimen of the Greek which was in use in the Morea during the fourteenth century. In it we find, but slightly modified for poetical purposes, the language which was spoken by the inhabitants of this province, when they were subject to the government of the French, and were constantly brought into contact in private life with persons of that nationality ; and which, latterly at all events, was employed to some extent by those chieftains themselves and their followers. During the period subsequent to the fourth crusade the Greek popular literature elsewhere was much influenced by the contemporary French romances both in respect of the stories that were borrowed, and the mode in which they were treated ; but the language itself remained comparatively unaffected by the West, while in this poem a more definite impression derived from that source is traceable. M. Buchon, no doubt, has greatly over-estimated the changes arising from that cause, and the glossary of French words adopted into Greek, which is appended to vol. ii. of his *Recherches historiques*, contains a large number of terms previously existing in mediæval Greek, and derived from the official Latin of Constantinople ; but still the addition thus made to the language is worthy of notice. Besides this, the length of the composition and the variety of subjects of which it treats cause its vocabulary to be extensive and to contain many rare words. From it we may learn the etymology of some words in the later language,

¹ *Gr. Chron.* 3344 ; *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 176.

because we see them here in their original forms; and at the same time we are warned against assuming that words in modern Greek were introduced at a late date from Turkish or other sources, by finding them already in use at this time. In it also we are able to observe the stage of transition which the language had then reached; for while it teaches us how early certain corruptions and dialectic forms were introduced, and how thoroughly modern its character is, like that of all the compositions in the vulgar tongue from the twelfth century onward, it reminds us also that some familiar usages, which are now all but universal, had not then come into existence.

The introduction of numerous French proper names into a Greek narrative naturally gave rise to considerable difficulty. It is not easy at first sight to recognise Ancelin de Toucy in Ἀνσελῆς ντὲ Τοῦθ, or Galeran d'Ivry in Γαλερὰς ντὲ Βρῆς, or Mont Escové—the name of the fort erected by the Franks on the hill behind the Acrocorinth at the time when they besieged that citadel, which has now been corrupted by the Greeks into Pente Skouphia or 'the five caps'—in Μοὺν-ντὲ-Σκούβε. We can sympathise with Buchon when he tells us that until he became acquainted with the *Livre de la Conquête*, which provided him with a key for the interpretation of these names, he failed to discover Jean Chauderon in Τζάν ντὲ Ντζαδρούν, especially as the surname is sometimes written Τζιάν ντὲ Ποῦν.¹ Nor is Φρεμενούριοι a very intelligible representation of 'Frères Mineurs,' *i.e.* the Franciscans. In these and similar instances there is real difficulty, arising partly from the peculiar pronunciation of the names in the country, and partly from awkwardness in spelling. But in the majority of cases it will be found that the strangeness is only apparent, being caused by the elaborate devices which have been resorted to in order to represent the sounds of a different language. Thus Κοντεφρουὲ ντὲ Μπουλιοῦ, strange though it looks, would have been phonetically, in the mouth of a Greek of the fourteenth century, a fairly close approximation to Godefroi de Bouillon. The reason of the strangeness is the absence from mediaeval and modern Greek of letters corresponding to the sounds *b* and *d*; to the English *sh*, *ch*, and *j*; and the French *j*, soft *g*, and others; in consequence of this, certain artificial combinations of letters have

¹ *Livre de la Conquête*, p. 153, note.

been invented with a view to transliteration. This method is so far from being clumsy, that it is a singularly honest attempt to reproduce foreign names with accuracy, and is vastly superior to the rude adaptations with which most languages have been content. It is curious in some instances to notice the great variety of forms which the same name may take. Thus Baldwin, *Baudouin*, appears as Βαλδουῖς, Βαλδούβις, Βαλδουβίνος, Μπαλδουῖς, and Μπαντουῆς. Sometimes also different forms of a name are adopted, according as one or the other suits the metre; thus Geoffroi is indifferently either Ντζεφρὲς or Ντζεφρόες.

The military terms which the writer uses are a curious mixture of Eastern and Western words, and of these the Eastern are composed partly of words of Greek origin, but more commonly of Latin words naturalised in Byzantine Greek.¹ The general name for an army is *φουσάτον*, Lat. *fossatum*; a division of the army is *ἀλάγιον*, or more properly, *ἀλλάγιον*, a word which seems to be derived from 'changing guard,' and so is used for 'guard,' 'corps;' and among the various bodies of soldiers we hear of *κουρσατόροι*, 'skirmishers,' Lat. *cursatores*; *σκουταράτοι*, 'heavy-armed,' from Lat. *scutum*; *καβαλλάροι*, 'cavalry,' from Lat. *caballus*; and *ρογατόροι*, 'mercenaries' (which does not seem to be used before this period), from *ρόγα*, Lat. *roga*, that is *id quod erogatur*, and so 'donative,' and 'military pay.' The term for 'soldiers' quarters,' *κατοῦνα*, is also of quite late occurrence, and seems to be derived directly from the French *cantonnement*. 'Arms' are *ἄρματα*, or more accurately though less commonly, *ἄρματα*, Lat. *arma*; and among the weapons and instruments used occur *σπαθί*, 'sword,' Lat. *spatha*, Gr. *σπάθη*: *κοντάρι*, 'spear,' Gr. *κόντος*: *πελατίκι* or *ἀπελατίκι*, 'club,' 'mace,' which is probably a corruption of *ἰππηλατίκιον*, having been originally a stick to be used on horseback; *τζάγγρα* or *τζύγγρα*, 'crossbow,' a word of unknown

¹ Ducange's *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Græcilitatis* is still the great source of information on mediæval Greek words, and even where it does not give their etymologies, it provides the means of investigating them in the numerous passages which are quoted in their historical order. Additional in-

formation may be obtained from Sophocles' *Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek*; from Buchon's indices; from Koray's Ἀτακτα; and from the glossaries appended to the collections of mediæval and modern Greek poems, which have been published during the last twenty years.

origin, but probably from the West, for Anna Comnena speaks of the weapon as being strange to the Greeks; *βούκινον*, 'trumpet,' Lat. *buccina*; *δοξάρι*, 'bow,' from Gr. *τόξον*; *σαγιτολάσι*, 'flight of arrows,' which seems to be found only in this poem, from *σαγίτα*, Lat. *sagitta*, and *ἐλαύνω*; *κουκουρόν*, 'quiver,' Lat. *cucurum*, which seems to be derived from an early form of the German *Köcher*. In one passage where this last word occurs (*Gr. Chron.* 3817) the Paris text (p. 117) for *κουκουρά* reads *καρκάσια*, a word of late introduction for 'quiver,' another form of which is *ταρκάσιον*. *Καρκάσιον* seems to be connected with Fr. *carquois*, and similar words in other Romance languages; *ταρκάσιον*, and the late Latin *tarcasia* or *turcasia*, with Turkish *tirkesh*, 'quiver:' but what relation these bear to one another it is difficult to decide. The terms used in describing sieges are chiefly derived from Western sources. The fortified place itself is *κάστρον*, Lat. *castrum*, but its occupants form the *γαρνιζούν*, Fr. *garnison*; a siege is *σέντζιον*, Fr. *siège*, from which is derived a verb *ἀσεντζεύω*, Fr. *assiéger*, and among the engines and implements of attack are mentioned the catapult, *τριμπουτζέτα*, Fr. *trebuchet*; the 'sow,' *σκρόφα*, Lat. *scrofa*, a kind of *testudo* or mantlet for protecting those who undermined the walls, which is described by William of Tyre as being wattling, within which 'libere delitescerent, qui ad suffodiendum aggerem introduce-rentur';¹ and scaling-ladders, *σκάλα*, Lat. *scala*. The provisions for a siege are given as bread, wine, water, and biscuit; *ψωμίν*, *κρασίν*, *νερόν*, *παξιμάδι*: the last of these words, which is regularly used in modern Greek, and is the Turkish *peksemet*, seems to be of Persian origin, and is found in the form *παξαμάς* even as early as in the *Tactica* of the emperor Leo (A.D. 886). Several of the terms that have now been mentioned will be found in the following passage which describes the siege of Corinth:—

τὰ τριμπουτζέτα ἐσύρνασιν γύρωθεν εἰς τοὺς τοίχους·
καὶ ἡ τζάγκραις οὐκ ἀφίνασιν ἀνθρωπον νὰ προκύψη
ἔξω ἐκ τὰ δόντια τοῦ τειχείου νὰ ἰδοῦν τὸ πῶς τοξεύει·
ταῖς σκάλαις, ὅπου εἶχασιν, ἔστησαν εἰς τοὺς τοίχους,
καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέσω ἐσέβησαν, ἐπιάσασιν τὴν χῶραν.²

¹ Book xviii. chap. 19.

² *Gr. Chron.* 149—153.

To these words we may add the names for 'horse,' 'ship,' and 'boat.' Those for 'horse' are ἄλογον: φάρας, φάριον, a word of Arabic origin; παρίππια, 'government hacks,' inferior horses, such as were provided for mercenaries; thus we read (3403):—

τὰ ἄλογα ὅπου ἔχουσι ὅλα παρίππια εἶναι,
ἐνὸς φαρίου μας ἢ φορὰ νὰ ῥίξῃ δεκαπέντε.

And again (5251):—

τὰ λέγουσι παρίππια, νὰ δώσουν τῶν ῥογατόρων.

μουλάριον is also used for a 'mule.' For 'ship' we find κάτεργον, 'galley,' which seems to be first used by Anna Comnena; καράβιον, the previous form of which, κάραβος, 'a small vessel,' is found early; κόκα (Prol. 537), about which I can discover nothing,¹ and the collective πλευτικά, 'fleet.' 'Boat' is expressed by βάρκα, Lat. *barca*; ταρίς, ταρίτα, 'long boat,' which first appears in Nicetas (A.D. 1200); and σανταλίον, which looks as if it were derived from Arab. and Turk. *sandal*, but it is more probable that both of them came from σάνδαλος, 'boat,' which occurs in Theophanes (A.D. 817).

The following words are connected with chivalry and the feudal system. General terms: λίζιος, Fr. *lige*; φίε, Fr. *fief*; μπάϊλος, 'bailly,' Fr. *baile*; παρλαμᾶ, Fr. *parlement*; ὁμάτζιον, Fr. *homage*; ῥεβεστιζω, 'to invest,' Fr. *revêtir*; χειρόρτιν (5432, 6391), 'glove,' used in investiture. Titles: μπαρούς, Fr. *baron*; κόντος, Fr. *comte*; μαρκέσης, perhaps Ital. *marchese*, for it is found in Constantine Porphyrogenitus; κοντόσταυλος, Fr. *connétable*, but the Greek word previously existed as the title of an officer of the Byzantine court; it survives as the name of a Greek family, and also of a village near the site of the ancient Cleonae; φλαμπουριάρος, 'banneret,' from φλάμπουρον, 'banner,' Lat. *flammula*; σεργέντος, Fr. *sergent*. Names relating to military orders: Τέμπλον, the Templars Ὅσπητάλι,

¹ While this is passing through the press, I have received from M. Sathas the following quotation from Fabio Mutinelli's *Lessico Veneto*, 1851, p. 107. "Cocca, legno di guerra (però anche da traffico), aito, rotondo, e perciò molto concavo, laonde *caucos* significando in

greco, concavo, corrottamente gli venne il nome di *cocca*. Navigano questi legni per mezzo di vele soltanto, aveano una ciurma dai settecento ai mille uomini, volendosi che le *cocche* siano state i primi navigli sopra i quali si sian poste artiglierie."

the Knights of St. John; Ἀλεμάνοι, the Teutonic Order; κομμεντούρης, 'commander of an order,' Fr. *commandeur*.

Some additional words of French origin may also be mentioned besides those which have already occurred. A certain number of these retain their original form, while the majority are modified so as to suit the Greek language. To the former class belong κομμεσιούν, *commission*; κουμόν, *commune*, while Κουμούν is the 'Republic of Venice'; παρτούν, *pardon*, the name for the jubilee of A.D. 1300, which is mentioned in connection with the marriage of Isabella Villehardouin with Philip of Savoy (7247); ἀβοῦερ, *avoué*, 'attorney' (6064). Of those adapted to Greek forms we may notice: nouns, τζάμπρα, *chambre*; κουγκέστα, *conquête*; ντουάριν, *douaire*; βουργίσιοι, *bourgeois*; ἀβουκάτος, *avocat*; κουρβερούρι, *couverture*; καπερόνι, *chaperon*, 'hood'; πασάτζιο, *passage*; this is used, like the contemporary Latin *passagium*, for 'pilgrimage' and 'crusade,' but the Greek word probably comes from the French, as it is first found in this poem; προβελέγκια, *privileges*; ῥητζίστρο, *registre*; the form and accent show that it is from the French, though ῥέγιστρον, Lat. *regesta*, is found in Constant. Porphyry; διαφέστορας, *défenseur*, though διαφένσωρ, Lat. *defensor*, is found earlier in Greek; ἀκουμέρκουτος, from *commerce*, 'exempt from customs duties'; verbs: ἀμαντεύω, *amender*; ῥοβολεύω, *révolter*; πρεσαντίζω, *présenter*, 'introduce'; παραοφρίζω, *offrir*. We also meet with expressions in the Greek which have been translated directly from the French; thus ζητεῖν ἀπολογίαν is regularly used for *prendre congé* in bidding adieu to a person, and ἀπολογίαν τὸν δίδει (3813) means 'gives him his discharge,' *congé*; and when it is said by Michael Palaeologus, after he had put William Villehardouin in prison, that he wanted to get money for him, but not to eat him, this is expressed in the *Livre de la Conquête* by 'il ne le mengera mie au sel' (p. 152), in the *Greek Chronicle* by οὐδὲν χρήζει τὸν πρίγκιπα μὲ τὸ ἄλας νὰ τὸν φάγῃ (3155).

The Latin words which are found in mediaeval Greek are mostly official terms, that is, expressions derived from the court, the camp, and the law-courts.¹ Several of these have been noticed in speaking of the military terms, and a few others

¹ For the history of the introduction of these words into familiar use, see Mr. Freeman's remarks in vol. iii. of this *Journal*, pp. 372 foil.

among those which occur in this poem may now be mentioned. Such are — *μαντάτον*, *mandatum*, 'message'; *βοῦλλα*, *bullā*, 'seal'; *ὀφφίκιον*, *officium*, 'office'; *βέργα*, *virga*, 'wand of office'; *τέρμενον*, *terminus*, 'limit,' 'fixed period,' which is regularly used in the phrase *τὸ τέρμενον τοῦ χρόνου*: *φамελία*, *familia*; *φάλκων*, *falco*; *καπίστριον*, *capistrum*; *ὀψίδα*, *obses*; *γῆστέρνα*, *cisterna*; *ταβέρνα*, *taberna*, 'shop, tavern'; *ἀπλκεύω*, *applico*; this word is found in Theophanes as a military term, *applicare castra*, 'to encamp,' and afterwards is used for 'take lodgings, put up at a place'; e.g. (873) *καὶ ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἀπλκευσεν εἰς τὸ ξενοδοχεῖον*; from this again is formed a substantive *ἀπλήκη*, 'lodging'; *μουρτεύω*, 'rebel against'; this word, and the substantive *μοῦρτος*, are taken by Ducange to mean 'murder,' and to be derived from the late Latin *murdrum*; but it is more probable that they are other forms of *μοῦλτος*, Latin *tumultus*, 'riot, rebellion,' which is found in Theophanes, and *μουλτεύω*, 'to rebel,' which occurs in his *Continuator*; and the passages cited by Ducange will equally well bear this meaning; *πελεγρίνος*, *peregrinus*, 'pilgrim, Crusader'; the earlier form *περεργρίνος* occurs in the sense of *ξένος* in the sixth century, and is used by Anna Comnena with the meaning of 'pilgrim.'

It may be worth while also to mention some of the less common mediaeval Greek words which are found in the Chronicle. *Κιβόρην*, 'a grave' (1416) is first used with this meaning about this period; it appears to be the same as *κιβώριον*, the '*baldacchino* of an altar,' which is found in this sense as early as Theophanes, and sometimes is written *κιβούριον*: this is the original of the corresponding word in mediaeval Latin, *ciborium*. Possibly the later meaning may be derived from the idea of a sepulchre being a covering, 'vaulted over.' It is noticeable that one of the editors of Ducange's *Latin Glossary*, without reference to the Greek word, remarks—'In pluribus Arverniae locis *Cibory* lingua patria locus est concameratus, in quo reponuntur ossa defunctorum.' *ξυλοκονταρίζω*, 'to tilt or joust' at a tournament (1081), is otherwise unknown, but *ξυλοκόντιον* is used by Nicetas in the sense of a stick for use as a whip on horseback; *χαμοτζούκη* (1080) is another *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, and we might suppose it to be foreign, were it not expressly stated to be a Greek name, *καὶ χαμοτζούκην ἐποίηκεν, τὸ λέγονν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι*: the sense required is 'festival' or

'tournament'; *πιττάκι*, 'message, letter,' according to Leake (*Peloponnesiaca*, p. 158) is for *ἐπιταγή*, but *πιττάκιον* is used even by Polybius in the sense of 'writing-tablet'; *σωταρχία* or *σωτάρχιον*, 'provisions' (7457, 7459, and elsewhere), in all probability is rightly explained by Sophocles as a corruption of *σιταρχία*; *τὸ ἐπὶ κλην*, 'surname' (586, and *passim*) is a peculiar form of *ἐπὶ κλησις*: *δρόγγος* is thought by Leake (*ubi supra*) to be a Peloponnesian form of *λόγγος*, 'a wood, wilderness, or mountainous pass,' and Buchon translates it by *defile*; it is used of the mountain region of Scorta, *εἰς τῶν Σκορτῶν τὸν δρόγγον* (591), and also of the fastnesses of the Melings (1666); *καλαφατίζω*, 'to caulk' (868) is best known through the name of the emperor Michael the Caulker (*ὁ Καλαφάτης*) in the eleventh century, and is not derived from the French *calfater* and similar words in the Romance languages, but from the Arabic *kalafa*, 'to caulk,' from which they also are derived; *σεντούκιον*, 'box, chest' (6449), comes from *σάνδυξ*, 'chest,' which is found in Hesychius; but it is doubtful whether it is derived from it directly, or through the Persian form *sanduk*, which is also the word for 'box' in Turkish; *ἀναπετάριν* (4714) is used of some object, with which the Countess of Anjou wiped the tears from her eyes; *τὰ ὀμμάτιά της ἐσφόγγιζεν μετὰ τὸ ἀναπετάριν*: Buchon gives its meaning as 'mouchoir, ou plûtôt volant de robe, aile'; as it must be derived from *ἀναπετάννυμι*, 'to spread out, unfold,' perhaps 'veil' gives a still better signification; *ἀφηρόν* or *ἀφιρόν* (7454), used of the castle of Yanina, is taken by Buchon as equivalent to *ἀφίερον*, in the sense of 'devoted, resolute, strong'; *τὸ κρότος* in one or two passages (4072, 4077) signifies 'flight, rout,' but it is otherwise unknown.

The feature that impresses the reader most forcibly in the language in which this poem was composed, is its modern character. It is to all intents and purposes modern Greek, and it is surprising to find how many words and expressions which are familiar at the present day had then already obtained currency. Thus 'the moon' is not *σελήνη* but *φεγγάρι*, 'to wound' is *λαβώνω*, 'to kill' is *σκοτόνω*, 'the early morning' is *ταχύτζι*, 'the body' is *κορμί*, 'girls' are *κοπέλια*, 'to look out for' is *κυττάζω*: *ψοφείν*, though rare, is used for 'to die,' of animals; *σημὰ* for 'together with,' *ιδικός* (*ειδικός*) for 'own,'

φορά for 'a time,' as *τρεις φοραῖς*, 'three times.' Similar instances might be multiplied to any extent, and the same thing is true of forms of expression, as *ἂν ἔχης ὀρεξιν νά* for 'if you desire to.' In some cases we can see the modern usage growing up. Thus *διὰ λόγου μου, του κ.τ.λ.*, here signifies 'for myself, himself,' &c.; *ὅσου διὰ λόγου μου* is 'for my part'; in l. 63, *ὁ καθεὶς διὰ λόγου του* apparently means 'each on his own account,' and in l. 1837, *κάστρον ἐποίησεν ὁ λόγου του*, the phrase is a title of respect (see also l. 48). Now in modern Greek *τοῦ λόγου σας* is the polite form of address for 'you, your honour.' Sometimes, too, the derivation of an obscure modern word is revealed. Thus the popular *στερνότερος*, 'last,' appears here as *ὑστερνότερος*, and is thus shown to be a comparative from *ὑστερος*: and *ὀγλήγορα*, 'quickly,' is here *ἐγρήγορα*, which is the neuter plural of an adjective *ἐγρήγορος*, 'quick,' connected with the classical *ἐγρήγορα*, and with *γρηγορεῖν*.

But the modern character of the mediaeval popular language, which has thus been traced in the vocabulary, is even more observable in the forms of words, some of the peculiarities of which, as they occur in this poem, are now subjoined. Abbreviations: as *γιαλὸ* for *αἰγιαλός*, *ἄς* for *ἄφες*, *θές* for *θέλεις*: prefixes: as *ἐτοῦτο* for *τοῦτο*, *ἐτότε* for *τότε*, *ἐτέτοις* for *τέτοις* (= *τοιούτος*), and especially before two initial consonants, as *ἐγνώριμοι*, *ἐπταισμάτων*: affixes: as *τίποτες* for *τίποτε*, *τόνε* for *τόν*, *πάνε* for *πάν* (= *ὑπάγουσι*); metathesis: as *ἐβγαίνω* for *ἐκβαίνω*, *ἐβγάλω* for *ἐκβάλλω*: shifting of accent: as *αὐτος* occasionally for *αὐτός*: especially on to the last syllable: as *κεινὸς* for *ἐκεῖνος*, *αὐθεντεῖδ*, *στρατεῖδ*, *Ῥωμαίων*, *Μωρεῶς*, *βασιλεῶς*: various letter-changes, *e.g.* the substitution of *ο* for other vowels, as *ὄμορφος* for *εὐμορφος*, *ὀλπίζω* for *ἐλπίζω*, *ὀμπρὸς* for *ἐμπρὸς*, *γοφύριν* for *γέφυρα*, where the form is approaching the dialectic *διοφύρι*; of *ψ* for *υς*, as *ἐκαψαν* for *ἐκαυσαν*, *ἐπλεψαν* for *ἐπλευσαν*, *σώρεψιν* for *σώρευσιν*; of *μμ* for *υμ*, as *ψέμματα* for *ψεύματα*; of *ρ* for *λ*, as *κόρφος* for *κόλπος*; of *δ* for *τ*, as *δοξάταις* for *τοξόται*, *δοξείω*, *δοξόβολον*, 'bowshot'; and other instructive changes, such as *ἀριθμισμός* from *ἀριθμός*, and *ἐκατξε* for *ἐκάθισε*.

On the nouns we may further observe, that the nominative and accusative plural of stems in *a* often end in *αις*, as *προνοίαις*, *μητροπολίταις*: the genitives plural of the same are

sometimes paroxytone, as ἐκκλησίων: some genitives are irregular in form, as τῆς νύκτας, τῆς Πελοπόννησος: the dative is very rare, except with proper names and in phrases, such as ἐν τούτῳ: and sometimes the accusative is used for it, as τὸν ἐλάλησεν, sometimes the genitive, as ἄλογα νὰ τοῦ φέρῃ, εἰπέ του τὰ μαντάτα: the accusative is sometimes found for the genitive, as τὰ δικά τους, 'their own'; the enclitic του, της, του (abbreviated from αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.) occurs *passim* for 'his,' &c.; ὁ ὁποῖος and ὁποῦ are the regular relatives, but there is also a peculiar use of the article in this sense, resembling the Homeric usage. On the verbs we may remark that in the formation of the present ν is commonly inserted in 'contract' verbs, as σηκώνω, φορτώνω, and in some others, as στέλνω for στέλλω: γ also is sometimes introduced between vowels, as πεζειύγω: the aorist passive has the perfect termination in κα, as ἐδόθηκε for ἐδόθη: in the third plural certain forms are found interchangeably, as ὑπάγωσι, ὑπάγουν, ὑπᾶσι: ἐβάλασι, ἔβαλαν: the infinitive is rare, though it is occasionally found, as φυλάττειν, κερδίσειν: the compound analytical infinitive occurs, as νὰ ἔχῃς καταλάβει, ἡθέλασι φονεύσει, and still more analytic expressions are seen in τοῦ νὰ δεχθοῦν, 'that they should receive,' τὸ πῶς ἡθελαν πράξει, 'as to how they should act'; the participle active is used indeclinably, as λέγοντα ἐτούτην τὴν βουλὴν ἔσωσεν καὶ ὁ δεσπότης, and καὶ ἦτον ἀποθάνοντα ἡ πρώτη τοῦ γυναιῖκα. As to the other parts of speech—the forms ἀπαί, ὑπαί, for ἀπό, ὑπό are noticeable; many analytical forms of prepositions are found, as ἀπέσω εἰς, ἀπάνω εἰς for ἐντός, ὑπέρ: both μὲ and μετὰ are used with the accusative in the sense of 'with,' μετὰ also with the genitive; παροῦ (παρ' οὗ) stands for 'than,' where παρὰ would now be employed, and ἐνομοῦ for 'together'; the negatives are μὴ, μήν, and οὐ, οὐδέν, which last has the same signification as οὐ but the abbreviated δὲν is not found; there are numerous uses of indefinite particles with a negative following, as πούποτε οὐκ εὑρίσκεται, 'nowhere,' τίποτε οὐκ, 'nothing'; πολλάκις μὴ signifies 'to see whether,' reminding us of the Attic use of μὴ πολλάκις: ὥς ἂν is used for 'like,' but not the abbreviated σάν: γὰρ constantly occurs with a meaning corresponding to our 'aye,' as a continuative or expegetic particle.

III.—*Topographical Notices.*

The following descriptions of the position and present state of some of the most interesting places connected with the history of the Frank Principality are the result of a journey through the Peloponnese, made with the object of investigating the remains of that period. The ordinary routes through the peninsula, which are followed by tourists naturally anxious to visit the classical antiquities, lead to but few of those sites, and therefore it is almost necessary to undertake a special journey in order to explore them. No doubt the mediaeval fortifications of Patras, Corinth, Argos, and Nauplia, which are frequently visited, are among the finest in the country; but these, as we have seen, are but little associated with the history of the Principality, Patras and Corinth having followed for the most part an independent policy of their own, while Argos and Nauplia were attached as a fief to the dukedom of Athens, and remained in the hands of the family of Brienne even after their expulsion by the Catalans from their possessions in northern Greece. The same thing is true of the maritime fortresses of Modon and Coron in the south-west corner of the Peloponnese, for they were almost from the first in the hands of Venice. Hence the parts of the country which deserve especial attention in connection with this period are the north-western, the central, and the southern districts—or, to adopt the ancient names, Elis, Arcadia, and Laconia, together with the eastern portion of Messenia. The course of my own tour was from Corinth by way of Argos, Nikli (Tegea), and Mistra, to Monemvasia on the extreme south-east coast; thence by Passava in Maina and Kalamata through the pass of Makriplagi to Karitena and Akova in north-western Arcadia; and finally through Elis, visiting Khlemoutzi, Klarentza, and Andravida, to Patras. In what I have now to say, however, I prefer to invert this order, and to commence with the western portion, which formed the headquarters of the Principality. Some of the places to be noticed have been visited by Leake, others by Ernst Curtius; Buchon, also, who was indefatigable in every branch of his subject, made a journey in 1840 and 1841 in quest of these Frankish antiquities, an account of which is given in his

interesting volume, entitled *La Grèce continentale et la Morée*. But the majority of the sites are so little known, and the subject has attracted so little attention, that a succinct account of them, which is the result of personal inspection, may not be without value.

As might be expected, the remains are for the most part the ruins of castles, which were the residences of the barons, and were built, as far as the nature of the ground allowed, on the same principles as the feudal fortresses of the West. The steep heights on which the ancient Greeks were wont to construct an acropolis, were equally serviceable for the strongholds of the Middle Ages, and some of the latter are found to rest on foundations of Hellenic walls. To judge from the places that remain, two considerations seem to have influenced the barons in the choice of a site; first, that they might secure their communications with their countrymen; secondly, that there might be sufficient productive land in the neighbourhood to provide them with an adequate revenue. In consequence of this, the principal fortresses were not constructed in very remote places. In the wild district of Skorta, for instance, though we hear of one or two small castles as existing in the heart of the mountains,¹ yet the great baronial residences of Akova and Karitena, by which the Slavonic tribes of that region were to be kept in check, were placed on the edge of the lower country. In some instances, however, the Franks did not occupy new positions, but settled in those which had been already fortified by their Byzantine predecessors; and one of these, the castle of Nikli, was situated on level ground. That of Klarentza, also, with which our description will commence, though a new foundation of the Franks, was distinguished rather by the convenience than the strength of its site.

¹ The sites of the forts of Arakloven and Great Arakhova, which are mentioned in the Chronicle, have not been determined. Buchon visited a place called Arakhova, not far from Dimitzana, but found no castle there (*La Grèce*, p. 492). In Isambert's Guide-book (*L'Orient: Grèce et Turquie d'Europe*, p. 330), which is quite the

best handbook for travellers in Greece, though it strangely ignores the period of French occupation, mention is made of a Frank castle at Dimitzana. The rocks which surmount that town may easily be mistaken for walls, and in one or two places there are fragments of Cyclopean walls among them; but there certainly is no castle.

KLARENTZA, KHEMOUTZI, AND ANDRAVIDA.

On the coast of Elis, where its level plains reach the sea, there stand two solitary promontories which, to judge from their appearance, were once islands, and have been joined to the mainland in some prehistoric period by the advance of the shoreline. Both are composed of low, flattened ridges, the direction of which is from north to south. The smaller and southernmost of these, which lies not far from the mouth of the Alpheius, was in ancient times called Ichthys, and in the Middle Ages bore the name of Katakolo, which is still attached to it, while the castle which defended the little port on the inner side of it was named by the Greeks Pontiko-castro or 'Rats-castle,' and by the French Beauvoir. Far more conspicuous than this is the other promontory, the classical name of which was Chelonatas, derived apparently from its resemblance to the back of a tortoise; this abuts upon the sea like a massive breakwater, and forms the extreme point of the Peloponnese on that side. In the *Greek Chronicle* it is called Khlemoutzi or Khloumoutzi, in the *Livre de la Conquête* Clairmont, and Buchon believes that the former name is a corruption of the latter;¹ this however is improbable, because in the Greek narrative it bears the name of Khlemoutzi from the first, and Col. Leake would derive it from the word *χλεμός, χλομός, χελμός*, which is often attached to hills of regular form in the Morea, and is familiar to the traveller as the modern appellation of Mount Aroanias (Khelmos), the highest point in the chain between Cyllene and Erymanthus in Arcadia, which is one of the most striking summits in Greece.² At the northern extremity of this promontory lies an extensive area of level ground, surrounded on three sides by the sea, the greater part of which is occupied by the castle which the French built there shortly after their arrival, and called by the name of Clarence (Gr. *Κλαρέντζα*). It is a rectangular inclosure, extending about a thousand feet from east to west, and perhaps two-thirds of that length in the opposite direction; of the outer wall little now remains except the foundations, but in the middle of the southern side two

¹ Buchon, *Recherches Historiques*,
i. Pref. p. xli.

² Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, ii.
171.

piers of a gateway are to be seen : here also the wall has been defended by a moat, for in this part the ground without is higher than that within. At the western end of this inclosure, where the cliffs overhang the sea at a height of fifty feet, is a sort of keep or stronghold, a hundred feet square ; and just within the opposite wall is a building of no great size, with the remains of a Byzantine church of later date.

The modern village of Klarentza is situated on a small bight to the east of this headland, which is fairly sheltered from all winds except the north. This little port was formerly regarded as the site of Cyllene, the arsenal of the Eleians, but now that place is thought to have been situated farther north along the coast in the direction of the promontory of Araxes.¹ At the time of the Frankish invasion it bore the name of Haghios Zacharias—

—τὸν ἅγιον Ζαχαρίαν,
ἐκεῖ ὅπου εἶναι σήμερον ἡ χώρα τῆς Κλαρέντζας—²

and thenceforward it became the chief point of communication between the settlers in the Principality and their compatriots in western Europe. It is strange to think that this place, which now is principally serviceable for the export of currants, should in those days have been crowded with vessels, whether engaged in the commerce of the country, which extended to Naples, Brindisi, Alexandria, and Cyprus,³ or filled with the young nobility of France, who came hither to seek their fortunes. The size of the inclosure which has just been described is a sufficient proof that it was designed to be, not merely a place of defence, but a resort for visitors, traders, and adventurers. There, too, was a great establishment of the Franciscans (Φρεμενούριοι), with a church dedicated to St. Francis,⁴ but the Gothic remains which Buchon speaks of no longer exist. We learn from Phranzes⁵ that the walls of Klarentza were pulled down by the despot Constantine, and this would account for the ruinous condition in which we now find them. Whether the name of Clarence, which has from time to time been borne by royal

¹ Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, ii. p. 102.

514, 515.

² *Gr. Chron.* 889, 890.

⁴ *Gr. Chron.* 6178, 7279.

³ Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, ii. p. 118 ; Buchon, *La Grèce*,

⁵ Phranzes, p. 156, edit. Bonn.

dukes in England, is derived from this place has been much disputed. On the one hand it has been maintained, that by the marriage of Isabella Villehardouin with Florenz of Hainault, the title of 'duke of Clarence' passed to their heirs, and thus was introduced into England by Philippa of Hainault, queen of our Edward III., and conferred on their son Lionel.¹ On the other hand it is argued that this title did not come from abroad but was derived from the district of Clare in Suffolk, and was given by Edward III. to Lionel, when the latter succeeded to the estates of Gilbert, earl of Clare and Gloucester;² and this view has generally been adopted, by modern historians. The two opinions, however, are not irreconcilable, for it is possible that the foreign title, derived through Hainault from the Morea, may have been combined with and adapted to the earldom of Clare on the occasion of Lionel succeeding to it; and Dr. Ellissen, no mean authority, has pronounced unhesitatingly in favour of this explanation, though unfortunately he has not given his reasons or authorities.³ It is in favour of this view (1) that Clare is not the same as Clarence, and some account is required of the change in the name; and (2) that the title of 'duke of Clarence,' independently of that of 'prince of Achaia,' was unquestionably in use before this period in the Morea. At the same time it may be doubted whether the transmission of the title has been sufficiently made out.

Four miles due south from Klarentza, on the highest and central point of the ridge, which is between six and seven hundred feet above the sea, is the castle of Khlemoutzi—the same which was built by Geoffrey II. out of the confiscated revenues of the ecclesiastics. It forms a conspicuous object for many miles round both by land and sea, and no one who sees it can doubt that the money expended upon it was well laid out, for it is the finest and most massively built of all the fortresses which the French erected. Geoffrey himself remarked after it was finished, that however often they might be expelled from the Morea, they would be able to regain it by means of Khlemoutzi—

πολλάκις ἂν ἐχάσαμεν τὸν τόπον τοῦ Μωραΐως,
ἀπὸ τὸ κάστρον Χλουμουτζιοῦ τὸν θέλομεν κερδίσει.⁴

¹ Buchon, *La Grèce*, p. 514.

³ Ellissen, *Analekten*, ii. 299.

² Leake, *Peloponnesiaca*, p. 212.

⁴ *Gr. Chron.* 1385, 1386.

The entrance is near the north-east angle, where there is a regular feudal gateway with a portcullis; this leads into a very extensive inclosure, the walls of which are surmounted by battlements, with loopholes pierced in them and a passage round inside for the defenders to fight from, though there are few towers. In various parts of this area are ruined buildings, which must have served for dwelling-houses. On the south side, and occupying the highest ground, is the inner castle, which is entered by another massive gateway, and forms an irregular hexagon, 210 feet in length by 80 feet in its widest part. All round this, vast chambers, built in two storeys, remain, with windows in most instances facing the interior court, though some also look outward. The upper chambers had lofty barrel vaults composed of massive blocks of stone, and chimneys and fireplaces backed with bricks, where the signs of burning still remain; perhaps the finest hall is that on the southern side, and this we may well believe was often the scene of grand entertainments and gay festivities. A chamber on the opposite side of the court would seem to have been a chapel from an apse at its eastern end, but if this is the church that Leake saw at the beginning of this century, the paintings which he speaks of have disappeared. There are extensive cisterns, which must have been of great importance, for notwithstanding the limestone of which these hills are composed, there is no spring in the neighbourhood. At one point a staircase leads to an upper level, which was surmounted apparently by other buildings; but these have been destroyed, probably at the time when the place was captured by Ibrahim Pasha. The material used throughout was masses of stone embedded in mortar, and mixed with brick in places.

The name of Castel Tornese by which this place is known among Italians and sailors recalls the fact, that it was here that the *tournois* were coined, for which William Villehardouin obtained a special privilege from St. Louis. These pieces usually bore upon them the title 'Clarentia,' derived from the name of the neighbouring town. Here also the despot Constantine, the future emperor of Constantinople, resided with his bride Theodora, whom he had married in the camp, after Klarentza had been ceded to him as her dowry. It must have been a delightful abode, especially in contrast with the

heat of Andravida, for it is cool in summer owing to the sea breezes, and the numerous flowering aloes in the village close by, which still bears the name of Khlemoutzi, are a proof of the mildness of the climate in winter. The view it commands is extensive in every direction, and enabled its occupants to watch the approach of friends and foes both by land and sea. On the one side are spread most of the Ionian islands—Zante directly opposite, with its town full in view, the lofty Mount Elato in Cephalonia, Ithaca and the distant Santa Maura, and the islets off the mouth of the Achelous with the heights of Acarnania behind. To the east extends the wide plain in which Andravida lies, and beyond it a conspicuous broken ridge called Santaméri (the ancient Scollis), which received its name from the fortress built there in 1311 by Nicolas de Saint-Omer; while the fine summits of Erymanthus rise behind and dominate the whole view.

Andravida, once the capital of the Principality, though now an inconsiderable village, is situated about six miles off in the midst of vineyards in the dusty, clayey plain. The high temperature of this district is shown by the palms which grow here, though they are of rare occurrence even in the south of the Peloponnese. A trace of the Frank head-quarters having existed in this neighbourhood is to be found in the greater prevalence of names derived from French and Italian—Gastuni, at the present day the chief place of the district, which is called in the *Livre de la Conquête* ‘le fié de la petite Gastoigne,’ and probably derived its name from a French chieftain Gaston; Rhoviata, to the southward of that place, and Rhiolo, further to the north. The position of Andravida, unwallled and undefended as it was at the time of the Frank invasion, is well described in the Chronicle—

καὶ εἶπαν καὶ συβούλευσάν τοὺς τὸ πῶς ἔν' ἡ Ἀνδραβίδα
ἡ χώρα ἡ λαμπρότερη εἰς τὸν κάμπον τοῦ Μωραίως·
ὡς χώρα γὰρ ἀπολυτὴ κείτεται εἰς τὸν κάμπον·
οὔτε πύργους, οὔτε τειχεᾶ ἔχει κανόλως εἰς αὐτήν.¹

One building remains there, which dates from the French occupation; it is the east end of the church of St. Sophia,

¹ *Gr. Chron.* 94—97.

which was the meeting-place of the great parliament of 1275 ; as the Chronicle again says—

ἔκατξαν ὅλοι ἐνομοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν Σοφίαν,
ὁποῦ ἤμμενεν ὁ πρίγκιπας, ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδαν.¹

It was a Gothic structure, in the Early Pointed style, massively built of stone, and two bays of the chancel still exist, with pointed arches and a groined roof. At the east end is a pointed window, and there are two round-headed windows at the sides. The aisles which flank this are one bay shorter, and have round-headed windows. The side walls are thick, and the windows in them deeply splayed. On the outside several buttresses remain. Of the rest of the church there is not a trace, though the area which it covered forms an open space in the middle of the village; and this is the more remarkable, because the part which has been preserved is almost perfect.

When Buchon visited Andravida in 1841, he discovered traces of two other churches belonging to this period, viz. those of St. Stephen and St. James. The latter of these has an especial interest, because it was built by William Villehardouin as a mausoleum for his family, and given by him to the Templars. The Chronicle tells us how Geoffrey II. on his deathbed enjoined his brother to carry out the design which he had himself entertained of erecting a church to contain their father's remains ;² and later on, after this had been accomplished, how William also gave orders that he should be buried by their side—

ᾧρισεν καὶ ἐπαρήγγειλεν, μεθότου ἀποθάνη,
μὴ προῦ περάσῃ ὁ καιρὸς, ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ χρόνος,
τὰ ὁστέα του μοναχὰ νὰ βάλουσιν εἰς σεντοῦκι,
'ς τὸν ἅγιον Ἰάκωβον Μωραῖως, ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδαν,
'ς τὴν ἐκκλησιὰν ὁποῦ ἔπηκε, καὶ ἔδωκε 'ς τὸ Τέμπλον,
εἰς τὸ κηβούριον τὸ ἔπηκεν, ὁποῦ ἦτον ὁ πατὴρ του
εἰς τὴν δεξιάν του τὴν μερέαν νὰ ἔνι ὁ ἀδελφός του,
καὶ ἐκεῖνος νὰ ἔνι ἀριστερά, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ του μέσα.³

Only fragments of walls remained in Buchon's time, and after a lapse of forty years we doubted before reaching the spot whether

¹ *Ibid.* 6079, 6080.

² *Ibid.* 6447—6454.

³ *Gr. Chron.* 1408 foll.

any traces of these buildings would still exist; but still I was anxious to discover whether the site could be verified, because, though the sepulchres may have been rifled in the course of ages, yet on the other hand it is quite possible that they are still in their original condition, especially as after the expulsion of the Franks their existence would be soon forgotten. As soon therefore as we arrived at Andravida, I inquired of the inhabitants whether they knew of any remains of ancient churches, and an old man at once replied that he was acquainted with three—mentioning by name those that Buchon saw—and could show us their sites, the memory of which had been handed down by tradition on the spot. As it was clear from this that his information was genuine, we followed him between a quarter and half a mile along a road leading northward, until we reached a point, where in a vineyard on the left hand close to the roadside were a few squared stones, which belonged to St. Stephen's church; and in the next field beyond were some slight foundations of that of St. James. The buildings had been destroyed, he said, many years before; indeed it could hardly be otherwise in such a land of clay and dust, where a hewn stone would be an object of some value. I give these details in order that the trace of this interesting site may not be lost; and I venture to suggest to the members of the *École française* at Athens, that it is their duty or rather their privilege to explore the burial-place of these their famous countrymen.

AKOVA, KARITENA, NIKLI, AND MOUKHLI.

The central basin of Arcadia—or Mesarea, 'the Midland,' as it was called by the Greeks at this time—which was composed of the level plains of Mantinea and Tegea to the east, and the wide open valley of Megalopolis to the west, is a thoroughly Alpine region. We obtain some idea of its elevation from the fact that the bed of the Alpheius at the foot of the hill of Karitena, which is the lowest point in this whole area, is 1100 feet above the sea. As the headquarters of the Principality were in Elis, and its outlying possessions in Laconia and Messenia, it was necessary to command the approaches to those districts; and when the Frank dominion shrank within narrower limits,

Q 2

these wild uplands became a barrier to resist the progress of the Byzantine forces. The southern passes were secured by the two fortresses of Nikli and Veligosti, the latter of which must have stood at no great distance from the site of Megalopolis, and was thus interposed between the head-waters of the Eurotas and the pass of Makriplagi leading into the Stenyclerian plain.¹ Towards the east, the mountain road which leads to Argos was defended by the strong post of Moukhli, of which, strange to say, though it must have existed during the whole of this period, we hear nothing until it was besieged by Mahomet II. But most important of all were the castles of Karitena and Akova, which served to overawe the independent Slavonian tribe that occupied the wild mountains of the north-west. In this district, which formerly contained the cities of Gortys, Theisoa, and Thelpusa, the country-towns of Stemnitza, Dimitzana, and Langadia now are situated, which notwithstanding their elevated position are among the most flourishing places in the Morea, as may be seen from the careful way in which the bridges and other means of communication are kept up. The traveller in passing from one to another of these on his way from the upper to the lower valley of the Alpheius, has to journey for two days along rugged mountain paths usually at a height of 3000 feet above the sea; and the same line of communication must have been followed during the Middle Ages.

The castle of Akova is one of the least known places in Greece. The neighbouring district is inclosed in a wide bend of the Ladon, which here flows from the north to join the Alpheius. We descended to it in a northerly direction in three hours from Langadia, having obtained a local guide at that place, by paths so steep as hardly to be passable for baggage horses, but commanding beautiful views over the distant sea. The ruins at the present day have no name, but they are identified as being those of Akova by that name existing in the neighbourhood, attached—not, as has generally been stated, and as appears on Kiepert's map, to the surrounding region—but to two villages a little further to the west, called Vervitza and Vizitzi. These are now called Akovais, and the fact of the name representing two places

¹ M. Buchon believed that he discovered the name and site of Veligosti, but all its buildings have disappeared. *La Grèce*, p. 481.

would account for the plural form. Another name derived from the Franks is that of Vretebougā, a mountain near Vizitzi, which Buchon is probably right in explaining as derived from the Templars (Φρὲ Τέμπλου).¹

The castle occupies a height much lower than those from which we had descended, in the midst of sloping hills, on which lie the scattered houses that form the upper and lower village of Galatas. Though at a considerable elevation above the sea, it is no eagle's nest, for it can easily be reached from the valley of the Ladon. The hill on which it stands gradually detaches itself from the ground behind, forming a neck or ridge, the sides of which become steeper as they advance southwards. The length of the fortress was 500 feet, the breadth at the northern end perhaps 180, but it narrows greatly as it rises towards the south. It is the largest of these buildings after Khlemoutzi, but little of it is preserved. The principal remains are towards the north, where are parts of three towers belonging to the wall that crossed the ridge: one of these is tolerably complete for a storey and a half; the second is split in two, so as to stand in two upright masses; while the third, which must have been near the central entrance, has only a single face to show, though that is perfect. The foundations of this crosswall remain throughout and also those of numerous buildings within; at the southern end, where the rocks fall away very steeply towards the ravine below, there was a large keep. The whole is composed of the hard light-grey limestone, of which so many of the buildings in Greece were constructed; but here also, as at Khlemoutzi, tiling is occasionally introduced.

This castle was known to the French as 'Mate-Griphon,' or 'Stop-Greek,' a name which sufficiently explains the object for which it was built.² The most interesting episodes connected with it relate to two noble ladies called Margaret—viz. Margaret de Neuilly, to whom it had descended by lawful inheritance, but who was meanly defrauded of it by William Villehardouin; and Margaret Villehardouin, William's daughter, whose misfortunes

¹ *La Grèce*, p. 493; he spells it Vre-tembougā.

² 'Griphon' was a common name for the Greeks among the French of this period. *Mater* is 'to subdue,' at chess

'to check-mate,' whence the English expression. Hertzberg is in error when he translates Mate-Griphon by 'schlag die Griechen todt' (vol. ii. p. 78).

seemed to be a retribution for the unjust dealing of her father. The former of these ladies was daughter of John de Neuilly, baron of Passava, and was sent as a child to Constantinople at the time of William's release from captivity by Michael Palaeologus, as one of the hostages for his faithful execution of the treaty then ratified. On her return she found her father dead, and Passava, her rightful inheritance, ceded along with Monemvasia and Mistra to the Greeks; but she was still heiress of the barony of Akova, in succession to her maternal uncle, Walter de Rosières, who also had lately died. The device by which Villehardouin possessed himself of the birthright of his friend's daughter resembles in many points the less authentic story of Geoffrey I. and Robert de Champlitte, and illustrates the knavish practices which could be enacted under the cloak of the feudal system. When Margaret presented herself to claim her possessions, the investiture of the barony of Passava, which was now an empty name, was readily granted to her because her father had died within the year; but as more than a year and a day had elapsed since her uncle's death, and no claim had been made to his inheritance, this was declared to have been forfeited; and when it was represented that the demand for investiture had been rendered impossible by the compulsory absence of the heir as William's own hostage,¹ he replied that the law in such a case admitted of no exception. The property thus nefariously obtained was conferred on William's younger daughter, Margaret, who thenceforward was known as the lady of Akova or Mate-Griphon.

The retribution was long delayed, but came at last. Half a century later, Margaret, who was harassed and even threatened with the loss of her barony by the hostility of her stepson, Count John of Cephalonia, one of the most violent characters of the time, in order to counteract his opposition negotiated a marriage between her daughter Elizabeth, a beautiful girl of fourteen, and the infant Don Fernand of Majorca, who was famous for the part he had taken in the Catalan expedition. To him she ceded her rights to Akova and to the Principality; for it was pretended that William Villehardouin had declared

¹ This particular point, though it is mentioned by the Chronicle, does not appear reconcilable with the rest of the chronology; but anyhow Margaret was unavoidably absent. See Hertzberg, ii. 173.

by will that the survivor of his daughters was to inherit his dominions, and the eldest, Isabella, had recently died. The marriage took place at Messina in Sicily, where Don Fernand was then residing; but when Margaret returned to the Morea, she was seized by a number of barons with Count John at their head, deprived of her possessions, and cast into prison, where she died in 1315. Three months later her daughter Elizabeth died in childbirth, whereupon Fernand invaded the Morea with a strong force of Spanish infantry in order to make good his claims. For a moment it appeared as if the house of Aragon would triumph over that of Anjou, for after landing near Klarentza he made himself master of that place and Khlemoutzi, together with the rest of Elis, and the leading barons did homage to him. But the tide of fortune soon turned. The energy with which Fernand commenced his administration roused the opposition of the feudal chieftains, and caused them to welcome Louis of Burgundy and his wife Maud, the representative of the elder female branch of the Villehardouins, when they landed at Patras in 1316. Fernand sallied forth from Klarentza and engaged the Burgundian forces, which were far superior to those at his disposal; but he was defeated, and when he refused to fly with the rest of his soldiers, he was taken prisoner and beheaded.¹

On the further side of the mountains of Skorta, at the point where the Alpheius, having flowed through the plain of Megalopolis, enters the narrow defile by which it penetrates to the lower country, stands the town of Karitena. It occupies the site of the ancient Brenthe, and the position is certainly one of the finest in Greece. The hill on which it stands rises in steep slopes to a height of 600 feet above the river, which washes its base on three sides, and the rocks that form its summit are precipitous in every direction. The town occupies the declivities towards the north, where a neck of land joins it to the neighbouring heights, while the castle is planted on the summit, and covers its whole area. The entrance is in the middle of the eastern face, where there is a strong feudal tower, with a guardroom on the right hand. Over the gateway outside is a square recess, where an escutcheon once stood, and high over

¹ Finlay, vol. iv. pp. 207, 208, 218, 219; Hertzberg, vol. ii. pp. 172, 173, 251—253.

this project three machicolations for annoying an attacking party. The walls in most parts rise to a considerable height, and inside there runs a passage for the defenders to fight from ; but as no battlements remain, it is probable that none ever existed. The interior is about 360 feet in length from north to south, and 120 feet wide in the middle ; but the entire area is much less than this would seem to imply, because it narrows towards the extremities. At the northern end, where the walls form an acute angle, there were chambers with massive arches, but the buildings towards the south, from their greater handsomeness, were evidently the baron's own residence. Here a wall was built across from side to side, and a door and three windows, the latter of which still show traces of trefoil arches, looked out into the court. In one half of this space were cross walls, forming separate apartments ; but the remainder was occupied by a single chamber, which may have been a hall of audience, or perhaps a banqueting room. The walls here remain to the height of the first storey, and there are vaults below. Close by are the extensive cisterns, in which we found water even at the end of a long dry summer. In the middle of the court the native rock crops out. The masonry, though composed merely of goodsized stones, irregularly imbedded in mortar and mixed with brick, is very strong.

For a panoramic view this castle occupies a most commanding position. The lofty heights of Skorta, which are offshoots from Mount Maenalus, rise to the north, and the eye penetrates into their inmost recesses through the long valley that leads up to the fastness of Dimitzana. To the west, close at hand, stand the summits of Mount Lycaeus ; and between these two ranges may be seen the narrow and winding gorge through which the Alpheius flows away, and portions of the lowlands of Elis beyond. In the opposite direction a great part of the plain of Megalopolis lies outspread, and beyond the mountains that bound it appear the heights of Parnon, which interpose between the Eurotas valley and the sea, and, far finer still, the splendid summits of Taygetus, snow-capped for the greater part of the year, which from this point are especially impressive because they rise far away, behind and above the nearer parts of the range. This extensive outlook is an additional element in the strategic importance of the place, besides the strength of its

position and its nearness to the mountains ; and this, no doubt, at the time of the conquest was present to the mind of Geoffrey Villehardouin and Hugh de Bruyères, its first baron, when they selected it for one of their strongest posts.

In the town of Karitena there is one building which may date from the Frankish period. Beneath the eastern cliffs of the castle-rock there stands an old church of the Virgin, small in dimensions, and covered inside with frescoes, now partially defaced. According to the local tradition, the first stone of it was laid by St. Athanasius. It is, however, a Byzantine church of an ordinary type ; but close by, and detached from it, is a little campanile of rough construction in an entirely different style of architecture. It is built in four storeys, the two lowest of which have no windows, while the third has one on each of the four sides, and the fourth two on each side, divided by a pillar. The arches throughout are round, and it is surmounted by a pyramidal cap. This is evidently more Romanesque than Byzantine ; and as it differs from the apparently Venetian campaniles which are found on the west coast of the Morea, it may possibly be of Frankish origin.

The most prominent personage in the history of this place is the second baron, Geoffrey de Bruyères, the nephew of William Villehardouin, and son-in-law of Guy de la Roche, Grand-sire of Athens. He was the flower of the Frankish chivalry—the Lancelot or Rinaldo of the Morea. His adventurous career was chequered by many romantic episodes. In the war between his uncle and his father-in-law he espoused the cause of the latter ; and after his defeat at the battle of Karydi in Megaris, was brought before his uncle with a halter round his neck (*μὲ τὸ καπίστρι εἰς τὸν λαιμόν*, as the *Greek Chronicle* (2024) has it), as being a felon according to the feudal law for having violated his allegiance to his superior. He was pardoned and reinstated in his barony ; and subsequently, when the despot of Epirus made war on Michael Palaeologus, and was supported by the forces of the Principality, he was made prisoner at the battle of Pelagonia, and shared the captivity of Villehardouin. At the end of three years, when that prince agreed to surrender the fortresses of Mistra, Monemvasia, and Great Maina to the Greek emperor, Geoffrey of Karitena was sent as envoy to persuade the barons of the Morea to assent to these hard terms. After this, on

pretence of making a pilgrimage, he escaped to Apulia with the wife of a brave knight, Jean de Carabas, who was reputed to be the most beautiful lady in the Peloponnese; and was only persuaded to return and restore her by the earnest representations of Manfred, who at that time was king of Naples. This perfidious conduct nearly cost him his castle, for during his absence Karitena was besieged by the rebellious Slavonians of Skorta, whose rising was with difficulty suppressed. Being once more pardoned, he became the most vigorous leader of the Frankish forces in their struggle with the Greeks, and accompanied William Villehardouin when he conducted a force to Italy to the aid of Charles of Anjou against Conradin. He died in 1269, and if we may trust the enthusiastic eulogy of the *Greek Chronicle*, was widely lamented on account of his chivalrous defence of the oppressed, and his generosity to the poor.¹

The fortress of Nikli, which guarded the south-eastern frontier of Arcadia, was an old Byzantine stronghold. Though built on level ground it occupies an important position, as it commands the entrance to the difficult pass which leads from the Mantineian plain to Sparta; and for this reason the same site was chosen in ancient times for the city of Tegea. At the time of its capture by the French we hear of its lofty walls, which for three days resisted the attacking force; and it was only surrendered when preparations had been made for a regular siege, and a proclamation was issued that no quarter would be given if it was stormed.² The area inclosed is between 400 and 500 feet square, and the line of walls is traceable throughout, some portions which remain being fifteen or twenty feet high; these are composed of stone and brick roughly mixed, and embedded in mortar. Its modern name is Palaeo-Episcopi, from a handsome Byzantine church, now ruined, which stands in the centre of the inclosure. This building rests on Hellenic foundations, and is mainly built of layers of brick, though on the outer face there are numerous blocks of stone and marble, some of which are decorated with classical or Byzantine ornament. Its dimensions are about seventy-five feet in length by forty-five feet in breadth. At the west end is a narthex reaching from side to side, and on either side of the body of the church are passages—they can hardly be called aisles—which terminate in apses.

¹ *Gr. Chron.* 5879—5892.

² *Ibid.* 699—720.

The central cupola, to judge from its span, must have been fine; four other cupolas remain at the four angles, and at the east end there is a window. As the parliament which was convoked at Andravida met in the church of St. Sophia, it is not improbable that the two important sessions which took place at Nikli were held in this building. The former of these was summoned on the occasion when Guy de la Roche of Athens, after being defeated at the battle of Karydi, agreed to appear before the assembled barons of the Morea, that they might adjudge the question of suzerainty which was in dispute between him and William Villehardouin (A.D. 1258). The second, held in 1262, had to debate the terms of William's restoration to liberty. At this his wife, the Princess Anna, and, as we have just seen, Geoffrey of Karitena, were present, but the hard conditions were not agreed to without a prolonged debate.

The approach to Nikli from the side of Argos was protected by the town of Moukhli, which stood on a conical height near the head of the pass leading into the Arcadian plain. The summit of this is 2600 feet above the sea, and 600 feet above the point where it begins to spring from the mountains at its back. It overlooks on one side the plain of Tegea, on the other the rich valley of Akhlado-Kampos (Hysiae), beyond which is seen the entrance of the Argolic gulf, with the islands of Hydra and Spetzia. The ascent is very steep, and halfway up the first line of fortifications is reached, the second at two-thirds of the height, while at the summit is a keep strengthened by towers which follow the ridge. From the way in which the masses of masonry have been dislocated, this would seem to have been blown up by gunpowder. Foundations of ruined buildings are found over a wide area within the walls, but from the traces that remain the city must at one time have extended for some distance outside the fortifications. The largest fragment now standing in this scene of destruction is the western portal of a church with a round-arched doorway, just within the first line of walls; and the apse of the same may be seen, with traces of frescoes. In case of a siege the want of water must have been the greatest difficulty; and, as a matter of fact, it was the destruction of the aqueducts by which the city was supplied which forced it to surrender to Mahomet II. in 1458. The

importance of the place, despite its being almost ignored in history, is shown by its having been an episcopal see; and even as late as Leake's time the Greek bishop at Tripolitza was called bishop of Moukhli.¹

KALAMATA, PASSAVA, MISTRA, AND MONEMVASIA.

The possessions of the Franks in Laconia remained in their hands during but a brief, though brilliant period; but those in Messenia, while they were among their earliest conquests, were not lost to them until the eve of the extinction of the Principality. Chief among these was the fief of Kalamata, which was bestowed on Geoffrey Villehardouin by William of Champlitte as his independent possession, to be transmitted by inheritance to his family. The town of that name, which is still one of the most flourishing places in Greece, is situated on gently sloping ground on the banks of the river Daphnon, the ancient Nedon, at the foot of the mountains, about a mile from the head of the Messenian gulf. Immediately behind, the rock on which the castle stands rises to a height of about 200 feet above it, and recalls somewhat the acropolis of Athens by the level area on its summit, its solitary position, its site relatively to the town, and the prospect over the sea which it commands. The direction in which it runs is from north-east to south-west; and on its south-eastern side is a lower plateau, which at a later period was inclosed by walls and included in the fortress by the Venetians: their fortifications, though broken, still remain with several towers, and through the most massive of these was the entrance, over which on the outside stands a mutilated lion of St. Mark. The Frankish castle above, which is approached through a similar tower, does not differ greatly in size from that of Karitena, being about 350 feet in length by 100 feet in breadth, a space which appears somewhat limited for the abode of the Villehardouins. In shape it forms nearly a rectangle, but the walls follow the irregularities of the cliffs, which on the northern side descend precipitously towards the wide shingly bed of the Daphnon, while in the opposite direction, above the Venetian inclosure, the hillside, though steep in itself, is further

¹ Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, i. 114.

strengthened by a strong facing of stones, many of which are large squared blocks. Of the original walls little remains above the level of the area on the summit, but at the north-eastern end where the ground is highest, there is a sort of keep or broken tower, composed, as usual, of stones embedded in mortar. Inside, there are cisterns in various places. The view comprises the whole of the Messenian gulf as far as the promontory of Akritas; the wide olive-covered plain reaching to the foot of Mount Ithome, whose broad summit is conspicuous among the mountains of Messenia; and the heights behind and eastward of Kalamata, which are outliers of Taygetus, and through which at one point a difficult pass leads to Sparta. In the town below, the only trace of Frankish antiquities which we could discover was a tympanum over one of the doors of the church of the Apostles; but the amount of pulling down and rebuilding of houses which is now going on is not favourable to the preservation of ancient buildings.

In the castle which I have been describing William Villehardouin was born, and there also he died. The history of the place was for the most part prosperous and uneventful; but one incident of a somewhat startling character relating to it is worthy of mention. This was its capture by the Slavonians and its recovery in the time of Florenz of Hainault, the narrative of which is given in the *Livre de la Conquete*, for the *Greek Chronicle* comes to an end shortly before this occurrence took place. Two chieftains of the Slavonian tribe of Melings, who occupied the northern slopes of Taygetus, after frequently reconnoitring the castle, conceived the idea of making themselves masters of it. This they carried into effect by attacking the place one stormy night with a band of fifty followers, when they scaled a tower which commanded the interior of the citadel—probably the one which I have described as the keep. The altitude of this had been measured with a cord by one of their people when he was imprisoned there, and a ladder had been made of corresponding height, by which they mounted. Being joined at daybreak by six hundred of their countrymen, they occupied both the fortress and the town of Kalamata, and proceeded to proclaim the emperor Andronicus II. its rightful sovereign. Florenz, when he heard of the occurrence, hastened to form the siege of the place, but the enemy were now strongly

reinforced, and the castle was well provisioned. These Slavonians were at this time nominally subjects of the Greek empire, but from time immemorial had been practically independent; accordingly, when complaints on the subject of this violation of the treaty were addressed to the Byzantine governor at Mistra, he professed himself incapable of acting in the matter, and the question was referred for settlement to Constantinople. By the interposition of an ambassador of Charles II. of Naples, who happened to be present in that city, the Greek emperor was persuaded to take the affair in hand, though there can be little doubt that he desired the negotiations for the surrender of the place to fail. The person, however, whom he selected as his agent, proved a facile tool in the hands of the French. His name, Sgouros-Mailly, from its double element, Greek and French, seems to show that he was a Gasmul, and this may account for his partiality to the Latins. He had also been bribed before he left Constantinople, for it proved afterwards that 300 gold florins and a handsome horse had been promised him in case of his succeeding in obtaining the restoration of Kalamata. When he arrived in the Morea, he took with him a force of three hundred soldiers from Mistra, and on arriving at Kalamata he persuaded the leading Slavonians to come down from the castle in order to receive the emperor's letter, and in the meanwhile occupied it by his own followers. By this device the Slavonians were forced to evacuate the fortress, and it was once more placed in the hands of the French.¹

The most remote in its position of all the baronies was that of Passava, the name of which is a corruption of 'Passe-avant,' the battle-cry of Champagne. Its castle lies on the western side of the head of the Laconian gulf, slightly withdrawn from the sea, six miles from Marathonisi, the modern representative of Gythium. The deep valley near the mouth of which it stands pierces through the Taenarian peninsula at its base almost from sea to sea, thus forming the most practicable passage in that direction; and the fortress which commanded it served the double purpose of overawing the inhabitants of that peninsula, the Mainotes, who have always been the most independent of the Greek races in the Peloponnese, and of protecting the commerce

¹ The whole story is well worth reading in the original; *Livre de la Con-* *queste*, pp. 335—356; see Finlay, iv. 212, 213; Hertzberg, ii. 193, 194.

of the neighbouring port from the attacks of corsairs. Its importance was shown by the baron of Passava at the time of the conquest, Jean de Neuilly, being named hereditary marshal of Achaia, which office made him the head of the military establishment of the Principality. At the present day the castle is the most perfectly preserved of all those that I have undertaken to describe, and presents a striking appearance when seen from the neighbouring heights, as it crowns an isolated hill, which rises 400 feet above the valley, and though nowhere precipitous is steep on all sides. It forms a square of about 300 feet, and faces eastward, for its western wall follows the line of the ridge, while that parallel to it runs along some little way down the slope. With the exception of a small portion on the southern side, the walls and battlements remain perfect, and there is the usual passage inside, and loopholes at intervals through the battlements. A round tower occupies the north-west angle, and another of square form stands in one part of the eastern face; inside there are large cisterns, and in the middle a guard-house—a rectangular building, lighted by large windows with pointed arches. The inclosure is now overgrown with thorn bushes, valonia oaks, and olive trees. The view from it comprises the Laconian Gulf, the gorge already mentioned, and the summit of Taygetus, which here assumes a pyramidal shape. The present appearance of the place, and especially of its regular line of battlements, is, I must confess, much more that of a Venetian than a Frankish fortress; but there is no evidence of the Venetians having occupied it, and Coronelli, writing of Morosini's campaign in 1687, speaks of it as incapable at that time of resisting a serious attack, and says the Venetians had the intention of razing it.¹ This they evidently did not carry out, and, apparently, we must conclude that this is the original building. The name of Passava has perished as completely as that of Las, the old Laconian town which occupied the site in classical times. It is now known as Turco-vrysis, from a stream of that name which flows in the valley.

Sic vos non vobis might well have been the motto of William Villehardouin's city of Mistra, which was erected and fortified by him at great cost in 1249, and lost for ever in 1262. From

¹ Coronelli, *Mémoires historiques et géographiques du Royaume de la Morée*, &c., translated from the Italian, p. 89.

the time of its cession it became the capital of the Byzantine province in the Peloponnese. Of the two forms of its name, Mizithrá and Mistrá, the former is undoubtedly the earlier. Buchon, indeed, maintains the contrary, and says that Mistra in French *patois* means 'maitresse ville.'¹ But the *Greek Chronicle* in the account it gives of its foundation expressly states that the name Mizithra was attached to the spot before William Villehardouin's time:—

ᾠρισεν ἀπάνω εἰς τὸ βουνὸν καὶ ἔκτισαν ἓνα κάστρον,
καὶ Μιζιθρᾶ τ' ὠνόμασε, διατὶ τὸ ἐκράξαν οὕτως·
λαμπρὸν κάστρον τὸ ἔπηκε, καὶ μέγα δυναμάριν.²

It is far more likely that Mistra is an abbreviation for Mizithra. It is also probably an error to connect the name, notwithstanding its similarity, with *μυζήθρα*, the word in modern Greek for a kind of cream-cheese which is found in Crete and the Morea; it would rather seem to be of Slavonic origin, since the inhabitants of the neighbouring mountains belonged to that nationality.³ At the present day the name of Mistra alone is used. By the Byzantine writers, who affect classical expressions—*e.g.* Phranzes and the author of the satire of *Mazaris*—it was often called Sparta, a name which is apt to cause confusion. During the Byzantine period the site of Sparta—or rather a portion of the area which that city covered—was occupied by the town of Lacedaemonia, some of the fortifications of which still remain on the hillsides in the direction of the Eurotas. This place, as we have already seen, remained in the possession of the Franks for some time after the cession of Mistra; but after it passed again into the hands of the Greeks its inhabitants were gradually absorbed by that city, which thus became populous, and continued to be so under the Turkish rule. Even as late as 1821, when the War of Independence broke out, Mistra

¹ Buchon, *La Grèce*, p. 430.

² *Gr. Chron.* 1662–64. The same thing is stated more explicitly in the *Chronicle* of Abp. Dorotheus, which was probably first published in 1684: τὸ ὠνόμασε Μιζηθρᾶν, διότι ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος ἔτρη ἐλέγετο Μιζηθρᾶς. Buchon,

Chroniques étrangères, prefatory notice, p. xxx. Cp. also Leake, *Peloponnesiaca*, p. 135.

³ Hopf, *Griechische Geschichte*, p. 267; Fallmerayer, *Geschichte des Halbinsels Morea*, i. pp. 293, 294.

contained a population of nearly 20,000,¹ and the number of ruined buildings that now remain, testify to its former prosperity. But the foundation of the modern town of Sparta, on or near the site of the ancient capital, caused the tide to set once more the other way, and those of the inhabitants of Mistra who have not emigrated thither, have established themselves in a village on the edge of the plain below the mediæval city. At the present time the population of Old Mistra amounts to fifteen persons.

The position which William Villehardouin selected for his fortress was a spur, which projects from the eastern side of the Taygetus range, and is flanked by a deep gorge formed by a stream that descends from the recesses of those mountains. On the rocky summit of this, which rises to a height of 1,750 feet above the sea, and 250 feet above the hillside behind, was placed the castle; while the town, in which it was intended that the Franks should dwell apart from their Greek and Slavonian subjects, was built halfway down towards the plain, and surrounded by walls of its own. The extensive area covered by this is now a mass of deserted ruins, with the exception of a few ecclesiastical buildings which have been preserved. The entrance is at the south-eastern angle, near which stands a tower pierced in one place by a trefoil opening; and from this a steep street leads upwards in a diagonal line, until a small stone doorway is reached, called the Iron Gate (*σιδηρενία πόρτα*), which gives admission into a separate, perhaps royal, quarter in the highest part of the town. Within this there lies an open space, on two sides of which are the ruins of a palace of several storeys high. A further ascent leads to the *kastron*, which is entered from the back, and is rendered almost impregnable in its precipitous position by a number of round or square towers. The view from it commands on the one side the ravine and the summits of Taygetus, on the other the plain in which the Eurotas flows, with the town of Sparta three miles off on its opposite side, and behind this the long chain of Parnon, while far away to the north may be seen the heights of Mount Parthenium in eastern Arcadia.

The antiquities of the place consist of five churches in the lower part of the town, all of which belong to a period subsequent to

¹ Bory de Saint Vincent, *Relation du Voyage*, ii. 266.

its surrender to the Greeks. They are interesting specimens of Byzantine architecture, especially as several of them possess features more or less alien to that style, in which the influence of Western Europe is traceable, though from what source exactly it was derived it is not easy to decide. Two of these are still used, and consequently are in good repair, while the rest are falling into ruin. The first of them, which is situated just within the gate of entrance, is now called Perilefton, the name of its dedication having been lost. It consists of a central cupola, and a nave and aisles, roofed with barrel vaulting, and ending in three apses; through a door at the south-west angle a small vaulted chamber is entered, and along the south side, without the building, runs a portico. The whole is covered with half obliterated frescoes. Higher up than this is the church of the Virgin, called Pantanassa. This stands in a steep position on the hillside, and formerly belonged to a monastery called *Ζωοδότου πηγῆς* ('Mother of the Saviour'),¹ the inclosure of which is marked by a wall of circuit, while in places the ruined monastic buildings remain, especially on the eastern side below the church. From these a marble staircase leads up to a corridor or *loggia*, which formerly ran round both the north and east sides of the building, but now remains only towards the east, where there are four arches supported by columns, and a campanile with windows divided by pillars and pierced with trefoils, surmounted by a cupola. The church itself faces south and the nave, which is divided into four bays, is separated from the aisles only by pillars. Thus, though the ornaments throughout are Byzantine, the shape and arrangement are those of a Latin church; and the same is true of the long choir, with three rows of arcades round the apse, the upper one of which is pierced with windows, and supports a semi-cupola. There are four cupolas over the four angles, one over the northern end, and a central one, which however, is of modern construction. A gallery for women, resembling that of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, runs round three sides of the building.

At this place we were destined to a disappointment. Buchon affirms—and his statement has been repeated by subsequent

¹ In Phranzes' time it was called after the Saviour himself, *Ζωοδότου ὁσίου*.

writers—that the tombs of Theodora Tocco, and Cleopa Malatesta, the wives of Constantine Palaeologus and his brother Theodore, still exist in these precincts; and we had looked forward to finding them there. That those ladies were buried in this place there can be no doubt, for the fact is mentioned by Phranzes the historian, who was their contemporary.¹ But it seems equally certain, that there is no evidence of any person having seen their sepulchres since that time, and all the information which Buchon obtained amounted to this—that people on the spot believed in their existence.² At the time of our visit neither the priest who lives there, nor any other person had ever heard of them. So we may conclude that, like the tombs of the Villehardouins at Andravida, they may still remain in their original position, but without excavation it is impossible to state anything definitely about them. Our ill success in this matter was compensated by the sight of an object of great interest on the western wall of the narthex of the church. This is a likeness in fresco of a Byzantine emperor, who, according to the resident priest, is none other than Constantine Palaeologus. He wears the purple robe and the round-topped crown of the Eastern Empire, and his eyes are uplifted, apparently towards the figure of a saint who is appearing to him; but this part of the picture is much obliterated. The face has marked features and a red beard, and though the colours are faint it is evidently a portrait. The fresco is inclosed in a niche, by the side of

¹ Phranzes, pp. 154, 158, edit. Bonn.

² Buchon says in his narrative of his journey, 'Les tombeaux subsistent encore au milieu des ruines du cloître, et sont connus comme tels dans les traditions du pays' (*La Grèce*, p. 432). And again, speaking of Theodora, he says, 'Son tombeau, transporté, comme le dit Phranzi, à Mistra dans le monastère de Zoodotou-Pigi (Mère du Sauveur), s'y trouve encore' (*ibid.* p. 507). In his *Recherches historiques* (i. Pref. p. liv.), we find the evidence on which these affirmations rest. Speaking of the church of Pantanassa, he says, 'Ce n'était pas là que pouvaient être les tombeaux de Théodora Tocco et

Cléophas Malatesta. Ils ne pouvaient être que dans le monastère adjoint à l'église, mais en bonne partie ruiné. Je cherchai à me faire jour au milieu des décombres, mais je trouvai les passages obstrués. Je fis venir plusieurs des habitants et m'enquis des tombeaux. Tous furent unanimes pour me dire qu'ils les connaissaient bien et qu'ils étaient placés au milieu des ruines du cloître; mais il me fut impossible d'y parvenir.' Much would depend on the amount of caution with which these questions were put. No praise can be too great for the ardour with which M. Buchon pursued his investigations, but occasionally his enthusiasm outstripped his judgment.

which stood another, though it is now destroyed. As Constantine, the last emperor of Constantinople, was crowned at Mistra, there is none other of his line whose likeness we should so readily expect to meet with here. If such is the case, the other niche may possibly have contained that of the despot Theodore, for Constantine's wife Theodora, whom we should otherwise expect to find in such a position, died before he succeeded to the throne.¹

The three other churches—those of St. Nicholas, Efendiko, and the metropolitan church—are situated close together, near the north-eastern angle of the city. St. Nicholas is distinguished by the size of its central cupola, in the drum of which numerous small windows are pierced, but the cupola itself has fallen in. The aisles are very narrow, and end in small apses. At the four angles of the building are four small low chapels, forming distinct chambers.² The church at present known as Efendiko—for its real name is lost—almost exactly resembles that of the Pantanassa, having the same gallery for women, numerous domes, and three arcades in the apse; outside there is a chamber and a chapel attached to the west wall. Just below this on the hillside is the old archiepiscopal palace, an unpretending building forming three sides of a square, on one of which stands the metropolitan church (St. Demetrius), while the fourth side is left open, and commands an enchanting view over the olive-groves and mulberry plantations of the plain of Sparta. It is now tenanted by a priest who conducts the services in the church, and consequently this edifice, like that of Pantanassa, is kept in repair. Two inscriptions, one in hexameters on the lintel of the northern door, the other in iambics on the western wall, commemorate its erection by Bishop Nicephorus in the reign of Andronicus II. Palaeologus in conjunction with his son Michael IX. (A.D. 1295-1320): the exact date was 1312, that

¹ The evidence of my informant in this matter may not be of much value, but it is not impaired by his having added that the emperor Constantine was the founder of the monastery, and is buried under a rectangular slab which is let into the pavement of the nave. Can this slab by any chance mark the tomb of Theodora? The idea that the other picture was a portrait of the

despot Theodore would seem to be confirmed by Bory de Saint-Vincent's statement, that in his time there were traditions of a likeness of him having once existed in the church (*Relation du Voyage*, ii. 271).

² Plans of St. Nicholas and Pantanassa are given in Couchaud's *Choix d'Églises Byzantines en Grèce*.

is, just fifty years from the cession of Mistra by the Franks.¹ This building also has a woman's gallery and a small dome over the centre, but in other respects it resembles a Latin church, as there is a long barrel vault both to the nave and the aisles. The floor is inlaid in one place with a two-headed Byzantine eagle, and elsewhere with pieces of *opus Alexandrinum*. On two of the columns are inscriptions relating to property which once belonged to the church.

One more place connected with the history of the Franks in the Peloponnese remains to be spoken of—Monemvasia. The island or peninsula on which it is built—for owing to its nearness to the shore it may almost equally well be called either one or the other—in ancient times bore the name of Minoa, which usually implies that there was a Phoenician settlement where it is found. The Greeks, however, appear never to have occupied the spot, but preferred for the site of their town of Epidaurus Limera, the sheltered bay to the northward of it, to which Minoa formed an effectual breakwater. So shoreless are its rocky sides, that the wonder rather is that any one should have built a city there, and still more that it should have become, as it did during the Middle Ages, one of the most important commercial towns in the Levant, and one of the stations of the fleet of Byzantium. This circumstance lends probability to Hertzberg's conjecture, that the foundation of Monemvasia dates from the time of Alaric's invasion of Greece at the end of the fourth century, when the ravages of the Goths drove the inhabitants to take refuge in easily defensible positions, such as promontories and the islands off the coast—a practice which became still more frequent at the time of the Slavonic inroads. Anyhow, when it first appears in history, at the beginning of the eighth century, it was already an important place. Owing to its commerce with Italy, the pestilence was introduced through it into Greece from that country, which fearfully depopulated the Byzantine empire in 747, and thus prepared the way for the Slavonic immigrations. Finlay calls it the Venice of the iconoclastic period.² In 1147 it was strong enough to beat off the attack of Roger the Norman, in the

¹ An accurate copy of these inscriptions is given in the 'Lives of the Archbishops of Lacedaemonia,' written in

1755, and published by Buchon in his *Recherches historiques*, vol. i. p. lxxviii.

² *History of Greece*, ii. 321.

expedition during which he captured Thebes and Corinth; and it was only by blockade that it was forced to surrender to William Villehardouin. After its restoration to the Greeks it changed hands several times. In 1419 the Venetians obtained possession of it, but ceded it again to the Byzantines. In 1460 the despot Thomas, fearing his inability to defend it against the Ottomans, made it over to Pope Pius II.; but the Venetians seized it in 1464, and held it till 1538, in which year they were forced to yield it to the Turks. When, however, they reoccupied the Peloponnese at the time of Morosini's famous campaign in 1689, Monemvasia once more fell to them, and remained in their possession until 1714, when they finally lost it. During this period it was constituted the capital of Laconia. Finally, at the beginning of the War of Independence in 1821, the Turkish garrison was starved out, and forced to capitulate by the Greeks, to whom it has since belonged.

The island projects eastward into the Aegean, at right angles to the coast of Laconia, twenty miles to the north of Cape Malea, the fine summits of which are visible from the town. It is about a mile in length, and the highest point, which is at the western end where it faces the land, rising in steep precipices, reaches the height of 600 feet above the water. From thence the ground descends gradually towards the eastern extremity, where it falls rapidly to the open sea. Along the northern side the cliffs are almost perpendicular, but towards the south, half-way between the upper level and the water, there is a sloping plateau on which the town is situated. It is joined to the land by a stone bridge of thirteen arches, the further end of which, towards the island, is guarded by a square tower; but the lion of St. Mark, which Castellan, in 1797, speaks of as standing over the gateway, has been removed.¹ This bridge has given to the place its name of Monemvasia, as being the sole means of approach (*μόνη ἔμβασις*). The name is more familiar to English readers than they are commonly aware, for it was corrupted through Malvasia and Malvoisie into Malmsey, and in this form was attached to the Greek wine which was brought from Monemvasia to England during the Middle Ages. It has been doubted whether this wine was made on the spot, or whether it was grown elsewhere, and merely exported from this

Castellan, *Lettres sur la Morée*, i. 40.

place as a depôt.¹ The latter suggestion is likely enough to be partially true; but, on the other hand, though grapes could hardly have been grown either on the island itself, or the rocky coasts in its neighbourhood, yet in the district which intervenes between this and the Laconian gulf there is a large tract of ground—the same which in classical times was called Leucae Campi—which is excellently suited for the cultivation of the vine. At the present day the export of wine has ceased, and that which claims to be the lineal descendant of the old Malmsey is found in the Cyclades, especially in the island of Tenos.

The town is surrounded by strong fortifications of the Venetian period, within which the houses are piled one upon another, with twisted streets and irregular passages, which recall the small Italian towns of the Riviera. A considerable number of these are ruined, for the population of 22,000, which it is said once to have contained, has dwindled at the present day to 500. There are no springs in the whole place, so that the inhabitants have to depend on cisterns; at the time of our visit, which was at the end of an unusually dry season, all the water was being brought from a cistern in the fortress, those below having been exhausted. Owing to its southern aspect and position underneath the rocks the heat is great in summer. No traces of the Frankish occupation remain, unless some of the upper walls date from that time. Buchon, indeed, attributes one of the churches to that age,² but he must have overlooked the inscription over the western door, which says that it was completed in 1697—that is, during the last period of Venetian occupation; and there is nothing in its architecture that would suggest an earlier date. It is dedicated, not as Sir T. Wyse states,³ to St. Peter, but to 'Christ in bonds' (ὁ ἐλκόμενος), a picture of whom stands at the eastern end of the building. Another church closely resembling it in style, which is dedicated to St. Nicholas, is stated by an inscription to have been built in 1703 by Andreas Licinius, a patrician of Monemvasia and doctor of medicine (Μονεμβασίας πατρίκιος δόκτωρ τε ἀκεστορίας). Between the town and the fortress above are steep precipices

¹ Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland*, ii. 138, note.

² *La Grèce*, p. 412.

³ *Excursion into the Peloponnesus*, i. p. 6.

of red and grey limestone, on which the cactus grows in patches, and these are surmounted by a line of walls. The ascent is by a zigzag path, which leads up to a gateway in the citadel, where there is an old door plated with iron, and a winding passage and guardroom inside. The only object of interest on the upper level is the monastery of St. Sophia founded by Andronicus II. Palaeologus, which overhangs the sea on the northern side, where the rocks are most precipitous. With the exception of the church, almost all the buildings which belonged to this are a mass of ruins, and even the cloister which was attached to the church has in many parts fallen down and formed heaps of *débris*. The church, which somewhat resembles that of St. Nicholas at Mistra, is in shape nearly an exact Greek cross. In the centre is a large low cupola, with numerous single-light windows in the drum, supported on four round arches that span the choir, the nave, and the two transepts, between which are four semi-cupolas over four piers that stand at the angles. The carving of the lintels of some of the doors is elaborate, but the frescoes are almost obliterated. The architecture and ornamentation throughout are purely Byzantine. The cliffs on this northern side are so steep that they have not been fortified by walls except at certain points where escalade might have been possible. At the highest point, which overlooks the bridge, there is a fort of no great antiquity, certainly not as old as the Frank period, to which Buchon thinks it may belong.¹ The natives say that the mountains of Crete are visible from hence in clear weather.

H. F. TOZER.

¹ *La Grèce*, p. 414.