The Annual of the British School at Athens

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ATH>

Additional services for *The Annual of the British School at Athens*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Mediaeval Fortresses of the North-Western Peloponnesus

Ramsay Traquair and A. Van de Put

The Annual of the British School at Athens / Volume 13 / January 1907, pp 268 - 284

DOI: 10.1017/S0068245400002926, Published online: 18 October 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0068245400002926

How to cite this article:

Ramsay Traquair and A. Van de Put (1907). Mediaeval Fortresses of the North-Western Peloponnesus. The Annual of the British School at Athens, 13, pp 268-284 doi:10.1017/S0068245400002926

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MEDIAEVAL FORTRESSES OF THE NORTH-WESTERN PELOPONNESUS.¹

KARYTAENA.

THE Castle of Karytaena² was built by Hugues Bruyères de Champagne and his son Geoffrey in 1254. The Barony was one of the twelve original fiefs of the Morea, and from its position, guarding the fertile plain of Megalopolis against the inroads of the wild highlanders of Skortá, the castle must have been of the greatest importance. By the year 1278 the family of Bruyères was extinct in the male line and the Barony had passed to the house of Brienne. In the will of the Princess Isabelle of Achaia, in 1311, the castle of Karytaena, along with Beauvoir and Beauregard in Elis, is assigned as dowry to her younger daughter Marguerite; it was, however, captured by the Greeks in 1320. After Mohammed II.'s invasion of the Morea in 1458 we find Karytaena included in the list of towns which opened their gates to the Venetians under Bertholdo d' Este. There still remains, built into the wall of the Panagia, a Sicilian coat of arms of the seventeenth century (Plate VIII.). The fortress was garrisoned by the Turks and later was held by Kolokotrones in the War of Independence.

The Castle stands on a very imposing rock at the head of the plain of Megalopolis, surrounded on three sides by the river Alpheius (Plate

¹ See *B.S.A.* xii. pp. 259-276.

² I have particularly to thank Mr. W. Miller for help in the historical notes. He has not only made valuable suggestions, but has very kindly permitted me to read in proof his forthcoming book *The Latins in the Levant*, and to take from it much material, without which many of the architectural problems would have remained unsolved.

VIII). The town stands on the ridge between the castle and the mountains and on the southern face of the rock. The entrance, on the southern side, is by a long and involved road passing through at least three outworks. Of the first, only traces are left; at the second the road passes through a gate with a flanking tower into a small square fort, on the north side of which, against the rock, is a small cross-planned church. The central dome is supported within, on two columns and two square piers, between the latter of which is the Eikonostasis. The capitals of the columns are carved with an elaborate though rather meaningless pattern of *guilloche* and bosses.

From this fort the road seems to have turned completely round and to have led up to the castle gate, but all traces of the walls which must have supported it are gone. At the gate is the third outwork, a simple court enclosing the entrance, flanked on the east by a large square tower, set above which are still three machicolations and an empty panel which once held the escutcheon; the central court is entered through a large vaulted chamber with a guard-house, still partly vaulted, on one side.

The castle is very long and narrow (Fig. 1). It terminates to the east in a rounded point, and the walls, following the irregularities of the rock, widen towards the west, forming a long triangle. It has evidently been much altered at various times, and the only building of which the walls remain is that against the western wall, a rectangular hall with large windows, from which, however, all the dressings have been removed. This is evidently the building to which Mr. Tozer refers (*J.H.S.* iv. p. 220) as showing traces of trefoil arches. The windows and door are now mere shapeless holes and the general appearance of the building, both in plan and masonry, is late. The arches seem to have been originally segmental, but have been broken into their present slightly trefoiled shape by the removal of the 'dressing' stones. The main walls of the Castle are of rubble with bricks and with large stones at the angles, there is a distinct line of rebuilding towards the top, but the lower parts are probably Frankish. The upper parts still show a few traces of battlements loop-holed for musketry and a few embrasures for the cannon, of which one or two are still lying about.

The churches in the town have all been modernised. Built into the wall of the Panagia is a seventeenth century Italian coat of arms surmounted by what looks like an ecclesiastical hat of dignity (Plate VIII.).

Mr. M. Rosenheim has been kind enough to identify this coat as that of the Albamonte family from Sicily. Inserting the tinctures, which of course are absent in the carving, it reads (*de gules*) *un soleil (d'or) se levant derrière une montagne (d'argent) mouvante de la pointe*. It is the one witness of Italian influence at Karytaena.

KALAMATA.

Kalamata was one of the first conquests of the Franks in 1206, and was used by them as a base for their further operations. Later it was granted to Villehardouin and became the hereditary fief of his family. Here Guillaume II. de Villehardouin, fourth prince of Achaia, was born in 1218, and here he died in 1278. In 1304 it was granted to Guy de la Roche on

FIG. 2.—PLAN OF THE CASTLE OF KALAMATA.

his marriage with Maud of Hainault, but the family became extinct on his death in 1308, and in 1338 we hear of its being refortified by Nicholas Acciaiuoli (Buchon). In 1347 it was assigned by Robert to his wife Marie de Bourbon, widow of Hugues IV. King of Cyprus, along with other estates. On the Greek reconquest of the Morea it passed into the hands of Constantine, afterwards last Emperor of Byzantium, and was captured by Mohammed II. in 1458. Towards the close of the Turco-Venetian war which followed on this invasion we hear of its being burnt by the Venetians

to prevent its falling into Turkish hands. Subsequently in 1659 and again in 1685 it was taken by the Venetians and, after its second capture by Degenfeldt in Morosini's campaign, was ruined.

The present plan is in three parts (Fig. 2), the keep, the inner fortress, and an outer court. The keep is a very solidly built structure of large square stones, and is much better built than the other walls, indeed several of the vaults are still standing. It is situated on the highest point of the hill at the north end of the inner fortress, overlooking the precipice on the west and the outer court on the north (Plate IX.). The inner fortress, an oblong court, communicates with the outer bailey by a vaulted gatehouse on the east side. The walls of the outer court encircle the central buildings on the north, east, and south; they are Venetian and closely resemble the town walls of Monemvasia, even to the little domed sentry-box at the northern end. Above the entrance is a slab with the Lion of St. Mark, badly worn, but still recognisable. It is very probable that the Frankish Castle included only the existing keep and inner fortress, and that the outer court is an addition of the Venetian occupation of 1659.

CLARENZA, KATAKOLO, AND CASTEL TORNESE.

On the large peninsula known in classic times as Chelonatas and lying on the north-eastern coast of Elis are the ruins of three castles—Clarenza, a corruption of the Frankish 'Clarence,' on the north;—Pontikocastro, 'Rats' castle' or 'Beauvoir,' on the south, above Katakolo; and Clairmont or Chlomoutsi, called later Castel Tornese, in the centre.

Of Clarenza only a few fragments remain, sufficient however to show that it must have been one of the largest castles in Greece (Fig. 3). It is some 480 metres in length, as compared with 110 at Karytaena, and is broader in proportion. The line of the walls is now marked only by a mound and to the western and landward side by a deep ditch, here necessary owing to the level nature of the site. It had a gate to the south and one to the east, both still marked by fragments of the wall, and on the steep northern side was perhaps a gate communicating with the sea. At the southern end are the ruins of an early building with a large circular arched window, decorated with a notched ornament in brick.

The remains of Pontikocastro at Katakolo are slightly more extensive, but are so overgrown with bushes and thistles as to be very difficult of

examination (Plate IX.). In plan the castle is an irregular rectangle (Fig. 4) crowning the top of the hill, which though steep, is nowhere precipitous. The entrance, at the southern end, passed through a large square tower beneath the pointed arch which is still standing. At the northern end is a second large tower square at the base and having the angles rounded off above. The masonry of this tower is of squared ashlar, with tiles in both horizontal and vertical joints; elsewhere it is of the usual rubble. Within are a number of cisterns, cut deep into the rock, and a few fragmentary walls. The keep may have been at the southern end, but the ruins are not sufficient to decide this point definitely.

The castle of Chlomoutsi stands on a considerable hill, steep but not precipitous, and commands a view both of the whole peninsula and of the great plain which stretches back from the coast to the mountains (Plate IX.). No finer site could have been chosen from which to guard the most prosperous of the Frankish possessions. The buildings consist of a large keep with a courtyard on the northern side (Fig. 5). The keep buildings are for the most part in two stories, a low basement and a lofty hall, evidently originally floored in wood and covered by a pointed barrel-vault in cut masonry, and enclose an irregular hexagonal court, from which broad stone staircases lead up to the various rooms. The vault is strengthened at intervals by flat unmoulded transverse arches supported on pilasters, built quite independently of the vaults and not bonded into them in any way. The doors and windows are mainly in the inner wall and were covered by semicircular or segmental arches, principally the latter, though, as usual, the 'dressing' stones have been torn out. The masonry of the walls is of rubble with a few tiles.

In spite of its ruined state the principal hall on the southern side is still most impressive (Plate IX.). It measures 7.50 metres in breadth by some 46 metres long, and from the floor to the top of the vault 7 metres. The door, with its double external staircase, was in the centre with windows on either side of it. Opposite was a great fireplace whose back of brickwork and great vent, a metre square, in the vault above, can still be seen, but the hood and jambs which completed it have disappeared; on either side of the fireplace are arched niches. The hall is divided into five bays by transverse arches with an irregular bay at the east end.

On the north side a large hall extended over the entrance. It terminates in an apse and may have been the chapel, though there are no

traces of decoration. The remaining rooms are similar to the hall but smaller, and in some are brick fireplaces of the same type ; at the east end, however, there is no basement. This part may have been used as a store, or as stables. The only cistern in the keep is a very large one under the great hall.

FIG. 5.—PLAN OF CASTEL TORNESE.

At the east end of the court a stair leads up to the flat roof over the vaults, a broad and level platform suitable for artillery, or engines of the largest kind ; the battlements remain only in part and are of a very simple type (Plate IX.). Beside the staircase are the remains of a watch tower

rising to a considerable height above the rest of the building. This tower is the one feature which is not shown in M. de Neovin's drawing.¹

There are only two flanking towers on the keep, both placed, rather curiously, on the side enclosed by the outer court. This court is attached to the northern and north-western sides of the keep and is very irregular in plan. The entrance, by an elaborate gatehouse on the north side, is in two parts, the outer covered by a dome, the inner open above and provided with a portcullis for which the grooves can still be seen at either side. The only tower on the *enceinte* is that placed in the centre of the long north side; it was evidently considered necessary here, to defend so long a stretch of straight wall.

The houses and barracks for the garrison were built against the outer wall; little more than the foundations are now left, but the brick backs of the fireplaces still show on the walls. In the centre of the court, between the entrance and the keep, is a square building with a circular projection on one side, probably the mosque shown on M. de Neovin's drawing. On the outside, the walls have in places the familiar Italian form with a torus and long slope to the base, so well shown by the walls of the Castle of Corinth (Plate VIII.). A small masonry *glacis* has been added at numerous points both to the *enceinte* and keep walls.

The history of the three castles is necessarily closely interwoven, and they may with convenience be considered together. In 1210, when Robert, the claimant to the Principality on the death of Champlitte, arrived at the port of S. Zacharias, later known as Clarenza, he was told that Villehardouin was at Vlisiri or La Glisière, a castle near Katakolo.² No remains can now be identified with this castle, but the Castle of Clarenza was not yet built, nor had the town received its Frankish name. In 1217 Geoffrey II. built a great fortress at Clarenza, which took three years to construct and was called *Clairmont* or Chlomoutsis,³ and here a mint was established by William de Villehardouin, whose coins bore the inscription *de Clarenziâ*. From these coins, known as *tournois* from their being originally minted at Tours, was derived the later name of 'Castel Tornese.' From the earliest times Clarenza was a town of great importance. The Minorite church of S. Francis is mentioned in the Chronicle as a meeting place of the High Court of the Principality, and the town is spoken of as the

¹ See below, p. 277.

² *Chronicle of the Morea*, ll. 2096-2437.

³ *Ibid.* ll. 2631-57.

first town in Achaia and as an important trade centre. When the wife and daughter of the Emperor Peter of Courtenay put in to Katakolo on their way to Constantinople, we hear that Geoffrey de Villehardouin invited them to the adjoining castle of Pontikocastro.¹ This identifies the ruin *above Katakolo with this castle of Pontikocastro or Beauvoir*. In 1278 the list of castles ordered to be handed over to Charles I. of Naples includes Chlomoutsi and Beauvoir. In 1315 Ferdinand of Majorca landed near Clarenza, routed the force sent to oppose him and followed up his success by capturing Pontikocastro, though had the existing powerful fortress of Castel Tornese been built, we should have expected its capture to be noticed rather than that of the smaller fortress above Katakolo. Further, in consequence of having married her daughter to Ferdinand, Marguerite, Lady of Akova, was at this time imprisoned in 'Chlomoutsi' by Nicholas Mavro and her deliverance must have been of some account with Ferdinand. On his defeat at Manolada in 1316 we read that he was urged to escape to Chlomoutsi, which was evidently in his hands, but, being killed, his head was next day displayed before the gates of Clarenza, which shortly afterwards surrendered.² Throughout this account there seems to be some confusion between Clarenza and Chlomoutsi.

In 1324 John of Gravina³ received the homage of the barons at Clarenza, and in 1364 the list of the Achaian Baronies owned by Marie de Bourbon includes Chlomoutsi and Katakolo. In 1391 Clarenza and Belveder (or Pontikocastro) were in the hands of the Navarrese. In 1427 Constantine, who had married Carlo Tocco's niece Theodora and had obtained Clarenza as her dowry, fixed his court at the castle of Chlomoutsi. The town of Clarenza was captured by the Catalan galleys sent to the relief of Patras when that town was besieged by Constantine, but was at once sold back to him, when he ordered its destruction, lest it should again give foothold to an enemy.⁴

In the lists of 1463 and 1467 Chlomoutsi appears as 'Chiaramante'; in the former list with a garrison of eighty men. In 1471 it is given as Venetian, but after 1479 Venice had no possessions in this part of Greece. In 1620, however, it was captured and partly destroyed by the knights of Malta.

¹ Sàthas, *Μνημεῖα Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας*, i. p. xxxiii.

² *Libro de los Fechos et Conquistas del Principado de la Morea*; see Miller, *op. cit.* p. 254.

³ Schlumberger, *Numismatique*, 31.

⁴ Phranzès, pp. 122-139, 144-158; *Θρήνος τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, ll. 52-62.

Coronelli, after Morosini's campaign, speaks of Clarenza as ruined, and gives a drawing of Castel Tornese 'following the drawing of M. de Neovin, aide-de-camp to Prince Maximilian.' This renders the castle quite accurately enough to be recognizable as the present building in the centre of the Peninsula, and shows that no alteration has taken place since then. In 1825 it was finally dismantled by Ibrahim Pasha.

Architecturally the existing remains of Clarenza and Pontikocastro are quite distinct from those of Castel Tornese, and belong evidently to an earlier period. At Pontikocastro the northern tower is built of large squared stones with flat tiles or bricks in both horizontal and vertical joints; at Clarenza the one considerable fragment which still stands shows the typical Byzantine brick dentil ornament. The masonry in both is a mixture of stone and brick, and in neither do we find cut masonry without bricks. The chancel of St. Sophia at Andravida, built in the early days of the Frankish occupation, is an excellent example of the mixed style adopted by the invaders; the walls are of purely Byzantine type of cut stone with tiles in the horizontal courses, and support true Gothic ribbed vaults with a rubble infilling. No vaults now remain at Pontikocastro, but the masonry of the northern tower is of the same type as that of the church. The mixed rubble walling is paralleled at Geraki, where it dates from 1254, and is found in the walls of every Frankish castle.

The general masonry of Castel Tornese is of very large, strong rubble with but few tiles, and the splendid barrel vaults are of cut and polished stone with unstructural transverse ribs applied underneath. In a Gothic castle these ribs would have been moulded, or at least chamfered; here they are square and rest on simple chamfered impost blocks of rather Byzantine type. The few remaining arches at Castel Tornese are of cut stone, without any attempt at brick ornamentation, and are struck to the low segment of a circle, a form quite unknown to either Gothic or Byzantine architecture. The late Renaissance churches of Monemvasia, however, are roofed with similar pointed barrel vaults and have segmental arches in cut masonry without tiles.¹

In plan also Castle Tornese differs from the typical mediaeval castle of Greece. The monumental character of the hexagonal court, the double external staircases to the principal rooms on the *piano nobile*, the

¹ *B.S.A.* xii, p. 271, and Plate III.

wooden floors to these rooms, the numerous and well constructed fireplaces, and above all the method of forming a courtyard by great surrounding halls, in place of building on houses or rooms against the external enceinte wall, all these points indicate a date not earlier than the fifteenth century. At the same time the lofty walls crowned by battlements in place of embrasures, prove that the castle was built previous to the full development of cannon fire. The castle of Bracciano in Italy, built in the fifteenth century, shows such lofty walls with the Italian torus and sloping glacis, here surmounted by elaborate machicolations. At the Turkish castle of Hissarlik on the Bosphoros, built about the year 1400, we have a closer parallel. Here the lofty walls are flanked by large solidly-built towers of rubble masonry with a glacis and plain battlements which have sloping copes, and are pierced with loopholes in the same manner as those of Castel Tornese (Pl. IX.). Over the gatehouse we have already mentioned a dome; this is of cut stone and, like the vaults, is built without tiles. Similar domes are found over the little sentry-boxes and on the late churches of Monemvasia. They are quite unknown to pure Byzantine architecture.

In the historical accounts the distinction between 'Clarenza' and 'Castel Tornese' or 'Chlomoutsi' is exceedingly difficult to unravel. The mint, from which Castel Tornese took its name, issued coins inscribed *de Clarenziâ*; and early accounts of conquests, or lists of castles in the Peloponnese, record the capture or surrender of two fortresses—Pontikocastro and Chlomoutsi—and of the town of Clarenza. Now the remains at Clarenza are those of a very large fortress; they cover an area about thirty times as great as Pontikocastro, and are surrounded by a well-marked ditch. It is difficult to imagine that such a castle, built, as the remains show, in the early years of the conquest, could have remained unchronicled, and it seems certain that here we have the castle of Chlomoutsi which Geoffrey II. spent three years in building at Clarenza. Here too, were coined the 'tournois' with their quite accurate inscription. It is quite probable, that the present ruins are not only those of the castle of Chlomoutsi, but mark also the fortifications of the town of Clarenza. The position, on the very beach, is well suited to a seaport, and the name Chlomoutsi, Clairmont, or Castel Tornese, may have been more especially applied to the fortress whose walls still stand in great fragments on the cliffs overlooking the sea. Such a castle, placed here at one end of the

town *enceinte* and in close communication with the sea, was indeed an integral part of the defences of a mediaeval town.

We read that Constantine settled at Chlomoutsi in 1427, and in 1430 destroyed Clarenza. His work of destruction must have included both town and castle; indeed at this time he perhaps also ruined Pontikocastro, which is heard of no more. The need of a stronghold more removed from the attacks of sea-rovers may then have led to the erection of the present 'Castel Tornese' on its commanding site. The architectural evidence will hardly permit us to date it earlier, and we shall see that at about the same time Patras was strengthened with walls of similar type, the last efforts of Constantine to hold his own against the Turkish deluge. It is not probable that the castle was built by the Turks, for in 1463 the Turkish garrison numbered only eighty men, and it is unlikely that they built so large a fortress only to hold it with so meagre a force.

The evidence both of history and architecture seems to show that the ruins above Katakolo are those of the castle called Pontikocastro, Beauvoir or Belveder. The large ruin at Clarenza is that of the mediaeval town with its citadel Chlomoutsi, Clairmont or Castel Tornese, whilst the castle in the centre of the peninsula is the second Castel Tornese, built probably by Constantine in the second quarter of the fifteenth century.

PATRAS.

At the time of the Frankish invasion the hill of Patras was already fortified and was captured by Geoffrey de Champlitte. The Barony was assigned to Guillaume Aleman, who pulled down the Archbishop's palace and even his church, to use the materials in the castle walls, where fragments can still be seen. As a seaport the town was second only to Clarenza and, after the destruction of that town, became the leading city of Achaia. The Barony early passed from the Aleman family and the town was governed by the Archbishops under various suzerains. In 1408, Venice rented Patras from Archbishop Steven Laccaria at an annual rent of 1000 ducats, and again in 1417, we find a Venetian Governor here for two years. In 1426, we learn from an inscription now built into the keep door that Archbishop Pandulph Malatesta restored the church of St. Andrew inside the fortress, which had been destroyed by Aleman; in 1429, the town opened its gates to Constantine, but not till 1430 did hunger

compel the castle to surrender. Murad II. captured and sacked the town, but, though he breached the walls, he was unable to take the castle. In 1458 both town and castle finally surrendered to Mohammed II.

The castle (Pl. VIII.) consists in a keep with a central citadel and a large courtyard; the walls show signs of at least two rebuildings. The lower walls of the keep, and particularly those of the northern side of the court, are full of fragments of classic buildings, whilst the upper part is of rubble and in places is smeared with plaster. On the east wall of the keep are the remains of stone corbels which must originally have supported the hoards or *huchettes* of the Frankish castle.

FIG. 6.

The entrance is on the south side by a fine vaulted gatehouse, the sheeted iron doors are still in use, and above the arch is a little *huchette* on two brackets. The western end of the court, and particularly the south-western tower, are fine examples of Italian fortification; the tower is octagonal, with the usual torus and batter at its base, and is built in irregular courses of well cut stone. On the outer face is a little Italian niche, now empty. The defence is in two stories, a battlemented rampart above, with under it, a range of chambers and loopholes.

The plan is typically mediaeval (Fig. 6) and is probably very little changed from the castle so ruthlessly constructed by Aleman, to whom we

may attribute the greater part of the keep walls and the northern wall of the court. To Italian influence are due the notched battlements, and at some time in the fifteenth century an extensive reconstruction must have taken place which included the upper parts of the keep walls, the gatehouse and the southern and western walls of the court, with their octagonal towers. These are very carefully built of cut stone and without bricks, and it may be suggested that both here and at Castel Tornese, we find the efforts of Constantine to defend Achaia against the Turks. The later Turkish repairs are easily distinguishable by their plastered surface.

Patras is in some ways the most interesting of the Greek castles ; it is still in fairly good preservation and has never been completely rebuilt, unlike so many of the famous Frankish castles whose sites are now marked only by crumbling Turkish walls.

At Kalavryta, nothing remains of the castle of the Tremouilles but a few stones on the summit of the magnificent rock which towers over the little town (Pl. IX.). The castle must have been large and well-nigh impregnable, but now even the ground plan cannot be distinguished.

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR.

NOTE ON THE ARMORIAL INSIGNIA IN THE CHURCH OF ST. GEORGE, GERAKI.¹

THE armorial insignia existing at the church of St George, Geraki, may be grouped in three categories : I, carved shields over the door of the church and at the apex of the shrine within ; II, insignia (?) upon the exterior of the frame or shrine ; and III, the shield borne by Joshua in the painting within the latter.

Concerning I, it is a legitimate inference that arms placed so prominently exemplify either the builder of the church or his successors and, possibly, a family allied with one or the other. But the scanty data embodied in the Nivelet pedigree, as known, and the fact that Western armorial records may be searched in vain for arms answering to the name so spelt,² are against a direct verification of either shield. As regards the shield at the apex of the shrine's gable, however, there are grounds for supposing that we have here the arms of Nivelet. Regarded in the light of thirteenth century methods of cadency (*i.e.* of means employed to difference the arms of various branches of a house by the superimposition of labels, bends, or

¹ *B.S.A.* xii. 265-9.

² The Flemish house of Nivelles, which might conceivably have furnished an ancestor to the barons of Geraki, bore *argent a cross gules*.

bordures upon the shield common to all members of a house) the possibility that this is a coat so differenced and that, consequently, its prototype was merely *lozengy*,¹ becomes at once apparent. If this process of authentic armorial evolution, or its possibility, be admitted in this case, the kinship of the Geraki shield to that of another house, its name having a strong likeness to that of Nivelet, follows. In Rey's edition of Du Cange's *Familles d'Outre-Mer* (pp. 570-1) are various recorded occurrences in the Latin Orient, of the name Neufville or Neuville from the twelfth century: Gui de Nova Villa (1168), Eustache de Neuville (end of twelfth century), Baudouin de Neuville killed at Adrianople, 1205, whose daughter married Robert de Courtenay, emperor of Constantinople; Pierre de Neuville, who fought at Mansurah (1250), a messire de Néviles, butler of the kingdom of Cyprus, whose wife died 1393, and the form Nevile. Most of these are found in Cyprus, whence also Johannes de Nivillis (1390), and two monuments to individuals which appear to be the only published armorial records of the Neuville in the East. These monuments are portions of engraved sepulchral slabs in the church of the Austin Friars (now the Omergheh mosque) at Nicosia. They are reproduced in Major T. J. Chamberlayne's *Lacrimae Nicossenses*.² The first bears the effigy of 'NOBLE CHEVALIER MÔSEIGNOR JOHAN D'NEVILES, NOBLE SEIGNOR DARSUF QUI TREPASSA LAN MCCCXC,' etc. His shield is *lozengy*. The second, a mere fragment, has the head and shoulders of a younger man, with the date 1403, and the arms *Lozengy a label of three points*—the difference of an elder, or only son, in his father's lifetime. It is interesting to compare the variants of these Eastern Neufvilles' surname with those of the English Nevilles.³ The Cypriote *Nivillis* suggests the latinisation of a vernacular itself corrupt; the same might be urged for the original *Nivelet*.

Upon the frame or exterior of the shrine are (II) *A crescent between six stars*, and *a fleur-de-lys between four rosettes*. That these are armorial is, in the writer's opinion, doubtful. But assuming the latter to be the Angevin lily, and dismissing its accompanying rosettes as mere enrichments or space-fillings, the cause of its representation at Geraki, and the light thrown thereby upon the date of the work, result as follows. In 1267, Charles I. of Anjou, king of Sicily, became suzerain of Achaia. In 1270, Philip of Anjou, his third son, married Isabelle de Villehardouin, heiress of Achaia. He died in 1277. A second, lengthier and more effective period of French supremacy commenced in 1294, when Philip, prince of Taranto, fourth son of Charles II. of Naples (titular of Sicily), received from his father the suzerainty of Achaia, etc., upon his marriage with Thamar Angela (d. 1308), daughter of Nicephoros Angelos, despot of Epirus. Philip of Taranto died in 1332. Though the writer is unconvinced as to the existence of any connection in fact between the heraldry at Geraki and that at Altamura,⁴ (see *B.S.A. loc. cit.*), there are enough similarities between certain of the insignia at both places for an explanation of the same to be desirable. The

¹ Whether simply *lozengy*, i.e. with the lozenges perpendicular, or *lozengy in bend*, the lozenges slanting obliquely downward from the shield's right top corner, as at Geraki, is not very material. The Geraki shield would be blazoned *Lozengy in bend . . . a bend . . .* The vagaries of armorial design beyond its normal western and northern limits, as to a lesser degree within them, must be acknowledged by every armist.

² I. Pl. X. No. 150, and Pl. IX. No. 137, pp. 45-47, 1891.

³ See p. 1 of the pedigree in Drummond's *Noble British Families*, vol. ii. They include the form 'Neuvillie.'

⁴ The citation of the Angevin architectural details in Altamura is otherwise important, however, in view of the fact that until the seventeenth century the Greeks had three churches in that city. See Schulz's *Denkmäler*, i. 1860, and Serena in *Rassegna Pugliese*, xix. 1902.

arms upon the façade at Altamura group themselves into two periods. Those over the great door—*Semée of fleurs-de-lys a label of three points* (Anjou), *impaling a cross potence between four crosslets* (Jerusalem); and *Semée of fleurs-de-lys a label of three points and a bend* (Anjou-Taranto), *impaling a cross between four bezants, each between four, and charged with one, cross* (Courtenay of Constantinople)—exemplify, respectively, Robert¹ (of Anjou), king of Naples and Jerusalem (1309–43), and his above mentioned brother Philip, of Taranto, titular emperor of Constantinople (d. 1332) in right of his second wife (1313–46) Catherine, daughter of Charles, count of Valois, and of Catherine, heiress of the Courtenay emperors. The second group of arms at Altamura dates some two centuries posterior to the foregoing; they represent the triumph of imperial resumption of the patronage of the Altamura archpriestship. In the centre is the great shield of the Emperor Charles V.; on the left the arms of the thirty-third prelate and court nominee, Vincenzo Avila Salazar (1550–57); on the right a shield ensigned by a coronet: *Checky of fifteen* (in five rows of three), for Pedro de Toledo, second marquis of Villafranca, the contemporary viceroy and captain-general of Naples. What gives an *air de famille* to the checky shield and the shrine insignia at Geraki are the banners which, according to Spanish armorial usage, surround it in a trophy. These are emblazoned with crescents and stars (or rather, singly: a crescent, a star, four crescents, etc.), and represent the ensigns captured by the viceroy's early fifteenth century ancestor, the first count of Alba, in warfare with the Moors. The early history, as an emblem, of the stars and crescent moon in connection with Byzantium, has yet to be adequately explored, so also has to be fixed the exact period in the later middle-ages when a star, combined with the crescent of the Moslems, came definitely to be associated with their creed.² The Geraki *crescent with six stars* bears a close resemblance to a standard captured, according to a sixteenth century Spanish writer,³ by Alfonso VIII. of Castile from the 'Muramolin' or Almohade sultan at the victory of Las Navas de Tolosa, in 1212, which bore: *a crescent* (its points downwards) *between five stars*. But, even if the Spanish tradition be correct, it is at least open to doubt that Moslem insignia would have been employed in the decoration of a thirteenth century Christian church. It is consequently impossible to decide definitely the character of the Geraki crescent and stars. The checky shield, over the door of St. George, must also, for the present at least, remain unidentified; it is a common bearing, and its verification would depend finally, in any case, upon tinctures; these are unknown. The insignia (III) upon Joshua's shield, in the painting within the shrine, belong to the very curious class of fictitious arms assigned during the armorial age to scriptural personages, saints, mythical and national heroes, impartially, but by no means always consistently.⁴

A. VAN DE PUT.

Mr. W. Miller of Rome has been kind enough to investigate the dates of the ambo in Bitonto Cathedral and of the Falcone tombs in S. Margherita, Biseglio, monuments which are of particular interest as they closely resemble in style the

¹ The great portal dates from his reign. See Schulz, etc., *loc. cit.*

² Some of the materials for the question are to be found in Artin Pasha's *Contribution à l'étude du blason en Orient*, 1902.

³ Argote de Molina, *Nobleza del Andaluzia*, 1588.

⁴ Some examples of arms attributed to Joshua are: three bulls' heads; a lion's head; the sun; the sun in glory, winged and darting thunderbolts, etc.

work at Geraki. The Bitonto ambo bears the inscription '*Hoc opus fecit Nicolaus sacerdos et magister anno 1229.*' The chapel of S. Margherita at Biseglio contains three Falcone tombs, of which one is said to have been built in 1246. The particular tomb which so closely resembles the Geraki shrine is undated, but belongs to the same period. Both are given by Avena, *Monumenti dell' Italia Meridionale*. 1903. Plates 59, 87.

Jehan de Nivelet founded the castle in 1254 and, as Pachymeres is almost certainly right in stating that Geraki was surrendered along with Mistra and Monemvasia to Michael VIII. in 1263, the shrine which bears his arms must have been built in the intervening nine years. In any case the Nivelet family left Geraki, for Jehan established himself later at Nivelet near Vostitza, on the Gulf of Lepanto, and died there in 1268.

The church was evidently built before the shrine, yet over the door is a coat '*checky*,' which can hardly be a mistake for the '*lozengy*' of Nivelet. Equally difficult is it to imagine anyone but the lord of the castle placing his arms in this prominent position, and we seem driven to assume the existence of some Frankish knight who established himself here between the conquest and 1254. The *fleur-de-lys* in this case cannot be the Angevin emblem, as Charles I. of Anjou was not crowned King of Sicily until 1266.

The monuments are of peculiar interest as being amongst the very few remains of the first Frankish Barons of the Peloponnese.

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR.

KARYTAENA, FROM THE SOUTH.

COAT OF ARMS FROM THE
PANAGIA, KARYTAENA.

PATRAS, FROM THE TOWN.

THE ENTRANCE, CORINTH.

A BYZANTINE SCULPTURED STONE FROM
THE KEEP WALL OF PATRAS.

KALAMATA, FROM THE NORTH.

KATAKOLO, FROM THE NORTH.

CASTEL TORNESE, FROM THE NORTH-WEST.

CASTEL TORNESE, THE BATTLEMENTS OF THE COURT.

CASTEL TORNESE, THE GREAT HALL.

KALAVRYTA.