KIVERI AND THERMISI

(PLATES 114–117)

URING the years 1209-1212 Geoffroy I de Villehardouin, the Frankish Prince of Achaea, reduced the Byzantine strongholds of Acrocorinth, Nauplia, and Argos. Othon de la Roche, Great Lord of Athens, had assisted in their capture; for this service he was awarded the castles of Argos and Nauplia. These fortresses presumably brought with them the Argolic plain which they dominate. For ninety-nine years Othon’s heirs on the Cadmea were also Seigneurs of Argos and Nauplia.

On March 15, 1311, Gautier I (V) de Brienne, Duke of Athens, led the brave Frankish chivalry of Greece to its annihilation on the field of the Boeotian Kephissos. After the carnage the victorious Catalan Grand Company found itself master of all the lands of the late Duke with the exception of the “Argive appurtenances beyond the Isthmus,” which were salvaged for the rightful heir by the faithful castellan Gautier de Foucherolles.

1 This study was undertaken while the author, as Charles Eliot Norton Fellow, was participating in the American School Excavations at Lerna; the director, John L. Caskey, suggested the topic and offered constant encouragement. Peter Topping gave liberal assistance on specific points as well as criticizing preliminary drafts. The author was also privileged to consult Kevin Andrews, Colin Edmonson, Andreas Ioannou, Michael Jameson, Joseph Last, Anthony Luttrell, and Wulf Schaefer on various matters connected with the sites.

2 The Chronicle of Morea, edited by John Schmitt, London, 1904, lines 2875-2883; Livre de la Conqueste de la Princée de l’Amorée: Chronique de Morée, edited by Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, paragraph 200; Libro de los fechos et conquistas del Principado de la Morea, edited by Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, paragraph 212. These all incorrectly date the event to 1248, just before the capture of Monemvasia; see Carl Hopf, Griechenland im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit: Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters bis auf unsere Zeit (in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste), LXXXV, Leipzig, 1867, pp. 240, 273. Othon was also awarded a share of the income of Corinth; see Marino Sanudo Torsello, quoted by Carl Hopf, Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues publiées avec notes et tables généalogiques, Berlin, 1873, p. 100.

3 Posited by Gustave Schlumberger, Numismatique de l’Orient latin, Paris, 1878, p. 329. That Athens controlled the whole Argolic peninsula is stated by Jean Alexandre Buchon, La Grèce continentale et la Morée, Paris, 1843, p. 26; Longnon, Livre de la Conqueste, p. cvii. But it is not likely that the powerful Villehardouin princes of the 13th century would allow the la Roches to exercise real suzerainty over the Akte as a whole. On the other hand, they may have controlled the south shore, if the building of castles at Thermisi and Kastri demonstrates preexisting territorial rights. Until 1311 a cadet branch of the la Roche family held the castle of Damala, near the site of ancient Troizen.

The rest of the fourteenth century witnessed the continual weakening and gradual retreat westward of the Principality of the Morea, which nominally held the Lordship of Argos and Nauplia in fief. The Argolid was isolated by acquisitive neighbors—the able Byzantines on the southwest marches (from 1320) and the vigorous Accia-juoli to the north and east (from 1342). Thus the subsequent Lords of Argos and Nauplia decided to increase their fortifications.

Gautier II (VI) de Brienne, Count of Lecce, de jure Duke of Athens, de facto Lord of Argos and Nauplia, quondam Tyrant of Florence, Constable of France, a proud and predatory paladin, was killed in battle at Poitiers, September 19, 1356, the last of his line. He spent very little of his life in Greece. Yet in his will, June 18, 1347, two new castles are first mentioned, “Chamires” (or “Chamères”) and “Trémis”; these are identified as Kiveri and Thermisi (Fig. 1).

On Gautier’s death the Argolic property passed to his nephew, Guy d’Enghien (1356-1377), who assumed the title, “Seigneur d'Argos de Nauplia et de Kiveri.” He made his home in Nauplia, where he maintained the semblance of a Frankish court. From Nauplia his brother, the Count of Conversano, led two fruitless campaigns against Athens.


The relevant extracts from the will can be found in Hopf, Chroniques gréco-romanes, pp. xxix-xxx, who first made the identifications; accepted by e.g. Miller, Latins, p. 265, note.


Guy did however employ as well the title “Lord of Argos and Nauplia”; e.g. grants of 1364 and 1376, Hopf, Chroniques gréco-romanes, pp. 240, 241; cf. also documents of Marie d’Enghien in 1388, which specify her property as “castra, loca, et fortitiae Argos et Neapolis, cum districtibus, pertinentiis, juridictionibus et iuribus ipsorum locorum et utriusque eorum” (Georg M. Thomas and Riccardo Predelli, Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum, Venice, 1880-1899, II, pp. 211-215).

There is no evidence for the fanciful notion that “Chamieres” was the summer residence of the Frankish Lords of Nauplia (Lambrynidis, Ναυμλία, p. 45).

His attack in 1371; see Hopf, Griechenland im Mittelalter, in Ersch-Gruber, LXXXVI, p. 20; Miller, Latins, p. 298; Setton, Catalan Domination, p. 76; in 1378, sources collected by Setton, Catalan Domination, p. 136.

Curiously, there is no mention of either Chamieres or Trémis in a list of Frankish castles in Greece (now dated ca. 1377; A. T. Luttrell, Byz. Zitschr., LI, 1958, pp. 355 f.), although Argos and Nauplia are noted as belonging to “el conte de Cupersano”; see Hopf, Chroniques gréco-romanes, pp. 227-229; Sir Rennell Rodd, The Princes of Achaia, London, 1907, II, pp. 288-291. This attribu-
In 1388, Guy’s daughter, Marie d’Enghien, Lady of Argos, Nauplia, and Kiveri, sold the Lordship to the Duchy of Venice. But before the Proveditor, Perazzo Malipiero, could assume control, the castles of Argos, Kiveri, and Thermisi were seized by the Despot of Mistra, who did not relinquish them to the Serenissima until 1394.9 Thereafter for a century and a half the Argolid was a Venetian province.

Fig. 1. Map of the Argolid, showing location of Frankish Fortifications. The shaded area is the Argolic plain; the dotted line represents the watershed.

In 1451 the last Catalan Lord of Aegina bequeathed his island to Venice; it was governed henceforth as an appanage of Nauplia. In 1456 a renegade Greek archon offered to Venice the northern half of the Akte, with its castles of Ligourio, Phanari, and Damala; the offer was not accepted.10


In 1458 the northeastern third of the Morea was ceded to Mehmet the Conqueror; the new Turkish sancak was contiguous to the Argolid. In 1460 the Sultan conquered the remainder of the Greek Despotates of the Morea. Except for Monemvasia and the Venetian enclaves in Messenia and the Argolid the whole Peloponnese now followed the Ottoman standard. In 1463 the castle of Argos was lost by treachery. Soon Kiveri ("Civeri," as it was now called) fell into disrepair, perhaps as a result of the great Veneto-Turkish war, 1463-1479; by a treaty of 1481, it was allowed to remain in Venetian hands on condition that it not be rebuilt.\(^{11}\) Thereafter the castle of Civeri vanishes from the pages of history; the "mills of Civeri," at its foot, appear occasionally in records.\(^{13}\)

Venice however retained the rest of its Argolic province, with the island of Aegina and the castles of Nauplia, Thermisi, and Kastri.\(^{13}\) Thermisi acquired the reputation of being impregnable.\(^{14}\) Along with Nauplia it bred the most valiant of the stradiots, mercenaries who acquired an awesome reputation in western Europe.\(^{15}\) Throughout the Venetian occupation Thermisi maintained its importance, largely on account of the salt-pond on the shore below.\(^{16}\) The residents of the castle had a clear view of the Turkish capture of Kastri in 1537; this prompted them to surrender to


\(^{13}\) The Venetian fortress of Kastri occupied the low eastern hill of the Bisti, the hog-backed promontory of Hermione, almost exactly six kilometers southwest of Thermisi; a plan of the fort by August Frickenhaus and Walter Müller is reproduced on a small scale, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXVI, 1911, pl. 1. I have found no reference earlier than ca. 1480. The western wall of the fortress was still standing to a height of 30 feet in 1729, when the Abbé Michel Fourmont came upon it. His letters describe proudly how he kept fifteen men busy for ten days, dismantling the wall, reapining a harvest of 47 inscriptions (Henri Omont, *Missions archéologiques françaises en Orient aux xvié et xviiié siècles*, Paris, 1902, I, pp. 576-577, 580-581, 587, 607, 611-612; cf. p. 662). His finds form the core of the Hermionic corpus (*I.G.*, IV, 679-745, 1609). Since his day the wall has continued, on occasion, to yield other inscriptions (A. Philadelphia, *Πρακτικά*, 1909, p. 174; Werner Peek, *Ath. Mitt.*, LXVI, 1941, p. 68, no. 16, p. 69, no. 16a; J. Marcadé, *B.C.H.*, LXXIII, 1949, p. 537; M. Jameson, *Hesperia*, XXII, 1953, p. 150, no. 3, p. 154, no. 5; XXVIII, 1959, p. 109, no. 1).

\(^{14}\) "Fortezza inexpugnabile" in 1479-1481, Sathas, *Documents inédits*, VI, p. 123, line 17, p. 127, line 33, p. 185, line 38, p. 186, line 20; in 1525, *ibid.*, VI, p. 246, line 41.

\(^{15}\) Müller, *Latin*, pp. 482 ff.

Kasim Güzelce without a battle. Aegina fell the same year; and Nauplia was ceded to the Porte in 1540. Presumably the undefended Civeri had succumbed previously. Such was the end of the last Latin colonies in the Morea.

Under Ottoman rule Thermisi continued to be occupied. When the army of the Holy League reestablished Venetian rule in the Peloponnese, the small garrison of Thermisi surrendered to Admiral Duodo on August 13, 1686 (Pl. 114, a). As late as 1708 the reports of the Venetian provveditori mention the castle, which still derived significance from its salt flats. But it is not named in the accounts of the Turkish reconquest in 1715 by the grand vizir Ali Kömürçü. As the Turks approached, the castle of Argos was blown up by the Venetians, who were unable to man it. Perhaps Thermisi suffered a like fate.

* * * * *

A spur of the Arcadian uplands comes down almost to the Gulf of Nauplia, leaving a narrow pass by which one enters upon the Argolic plain from the southwest. This is Mount Pontinos. Not especially precipitous or difficult to climb, it rises 179 m. above the village of Myloi and the prehistoric mound of Lerna. In antiquity the summit was crowned by the Temple of Athena Saitis and the house of Hippomedon, both of which were already in ruins in Pausanias’ day (II, 36, 8). Today there is, besides a chapel of the Prophet Elias, only a mediaeval castle.

During the early years of the eighteenth century the ruined castle was known


18 Vincenzo Coronelli, Description géographique et historique de la Morée, Paris, 1686-1687, p. 160; Alessandro Locatelli, Racconto storico della Veneta Guerra in Levante, Venice, 1691, pp. 259, 261; The History of the Venetian Conquests from the year 1684 to this present year 1688, translated by J. M., London, 1689, pp. 99-100; cf. D. G(io:) B(attista) P(ittoni), Il Regno della Morea sotto i Veneti, Venice, 1688, p. 70, where it is called “fortezza di qualche rimauro.”


21 The ruins of the Frankish castle are visible in the background of the pictures published in Hesperia, XXVII, 1958, pls. 31, b, 40, c; the only other published picture of the fort is a photograph of the south tower of the redoubt, Dimitrios A. Lambropoulos, ‘Η Δέρνα, μετ’ ιστορικον σημείωσεων περι τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων πολιχνῶν Ἀποβάθμων, Γενεσίω, Ἑλλαδοῦσις καὶ Ὑσιῶν τῆς Ἀργολίδος, Athens, 1959, p. 82.
locally as the Castle, or Citadel, of Helen. They the travellers of the later eighteenth century identified it with the fortification built by Temenos at the time of the Dorian invasion (Pausanias II, 38, 1). The ruins were briefly noted by the antiquarians of the nineteenth century. They were described at greater length by Buchon, the historian of Frankish Greece.

As recently as 1715 the settlement at the foot of Pontinos was called Tziveri. Thus the fortress on the summit must be the mediaeval castle of Civeri, Kiveri, or Chamires.


Helen of Troy and St. Helen the mother of Constantine seem to have fused in the mediaeval mind; there was a cycle dealing with “la Belle Hélène de Constantinople”; see Sabine Baring-Gould, The Lives of the Saints, 2nd edition, Edinburgh, 1914, IX, pp. 171 ff. It is not unusual for palaiokastro in Greece to be assigned to Helen or St. Helen, e.g. the acropolis of Thisoa between Andritsaina and Karytaina; William Martin Leake, Travels in the Morea, London, 1830, II, pp. 18, 315; Buchon, La Grèce continentale, p. 475; J. G. Frazer, Pausanias’s Description of Greece, 2nd edition, London, 1913, IV, p. 387.


26 Buchon, La Grèce continentale, pp. 416-417.

27 The name Tsiveri is explicitly associated with the mills at the foot of Pontinos by Brue, Journal de la Campagne, p. 33; cf. p. 37, also pp. 58-59, where the site is called les Moulins.

28 The identification has been made by Miliarakis, Περιγραφή πολιτική, p. 42; S. E. Lykoudis, in Μεγάλη Έλληνσ τέχνη και τέχνες (hereinafter abbreviated Μ.Ε.Ε.), XVII, 1931, p. 862, s.v. Μύλοι; N. Kalomenopoulos, M.E.E. XIV, 1930, p. 356, s.v. Κυβέρνησας; Lehmann, Argolis, I, pp. 80-81; Alfrd Philippson and Ernst Kirsten, Die griechischen Landschaften, III, 1, Frankfort-on-Main, 1959, p. 153.

The name Kyveri is now applied to a village about three and a half kilometers south of Myloi; but neither there nor at Palaiokyveri, near the chapel of Hagia Kyriaki, one kilometer north (located on the map of the Expedition Scientifique, 1832), are there extensive mediaeval fortifications. Lambropoulos, Δέρφα, p. 81, note 2, locates Chamires-Kiveri at Kyveri, where he describes an enceinte with a mill, etc., near the shore; but these remains (which are no longer traceable) are probably Turkish. In any case, the situation is hardly suitable for a fort.
A survey of the ruins of the castle reveals three lines of defense, enclosing progressively smaller areas. The largest was an outer court, the “ward” or “bailey” (A in Fig. 2), roughly pentagonal in shape, extending some eighty meters down the gentler north slopes of the mountain. The bailey is outlined by a curtain wall or enceinte, about two meters thick. To the west the curtain follows a steep cliff, which in places is six meters high; elsewhere it acts as a retaining wall, raising the level of the court several meters above that of the exterior. Along the line of the enceinte there are seven towers. There was probably an eighth at the apex of the second salient on the west, which has completely disappeared. The towers are, for the most part, rectangular, from 2.60 m. to 4.60 m. in width; they project 2.5 m. to 3.0 m. from the wall. The interval between them varies from less than 25 m. to 45 m. The towers are not bonded with the curtain. One tower (the southwest) has a single face with a batter; elsewhere the walls are vertical (Pl. 115, a, b).

The bailey is filled with the foundations of numerous small buildings. Towards the northeast, against the curtain, is a small apsidal church. These structures presumably date from the period when the fort was in use.

The summit of the hill was fortified with an inner court, the “redoubt” (B in Fig. 2), hexagonal with towers at the salients. The diameter of the court is about 30 m. The curtain (again two meters thick) has collapsed; its line is marked by a ridge of debris a meter higher than the ground level. The gate may have been between the south and southwest towers—the route by which the modern path enters (marked by an arrow in Fig. 2). No indication was found of a gate between bailey and redoubt. The towers, which are twenty meters apart, are not bonded with the adjoining curtain.\(^{29}\) They vary in size, shape, and to some extent in building technique (Pls. 114, b, 115, c, d). The two on the east are rectangular, the others quadrangular but asymmetrical. None of the towers is preserved to full height. The two best-preserved are the termini of the bailey enceinte; both are hollow.

The most notable edifice still visible in the redoubt is a cistern, doubly vaulted with a transverse arch (C in Fig. 2); its floor is below ground level. It is surrounded on three sides by piles of fallen rubble, in which one can trace the outer faces of massive walls. This is all that remains of the keep or “donjon.” In Buchon’s time more survived; he describes it as a square tower, several storeys high. It was nine meters square, with walls about 1.35 m. thick. The cistern was in the southeast corner.

Within the redoubt there are also foundations of several isolated walls, as well as a second cistern, similar to the preceding.

The whole fortress is built of the gray limestone of Pontinos. The walls are con-

\(^{29}\) Otherwise the weight of the towers would cause fissures in the wall; Philo Byzantius, *Mechanicae Syntaxis*, Book V, p. 84, Thévenot, lines 18-24. So too the towers on the Larissa at Argos are not bonded with their curtains; Andrews, *Castles of the Morea*, pp. 114-115.
Fig. 2. Plan of the Castle of Kiveri.

A = Bailey;  B = Redoubt;  C = Cistern in Keep.
structured of roughly coursed field stones; in some of the towers the interstices between the stones are filled with tile fragments. Corners (particularly of the redoubt) are reinforced by the use of larger stones. The mortar employed has in general deteriorated until it has become like earth or sand; it has however remained quite hard and cement-like in the two cisterns and in four of the redoubt towers (northwest, northeast, southeast, and south). The northwest tower preserves on the south side and in its front face traces of a wooden beam laid horizontally three meters above ground level.

A comparison of the ruins of Kiveri with those of other mediaeval fortifications in Greece reveals a few datable characteristics.

The square keep is typically Frankish. The hexagonal redoubt is associated with the Crusaders. The tripartite division into keep, redoubt, and ward is usually Frankish, although it may have been employed on occasion by the Byzantines. One may perhaps derive support for a Frankish date from Andrews’ observation that “walls of small, oblong field stones set in courses, lacking any distinctive feature, ... probably belong to the Frankish period.”

By studying the documentary sources in conjunction with the archaeological remains we are enabled to outline the architectural history of the castle of Kiveri. It was built in Frankish times, perhaps in the first half of the fourteenth century. It did not undergo extensive repairs of a distinctive nature. It fell into ruin and disuse by the end of the fifteenth century.

* * * * *

On the south coast of the Argolic Akte, opposite Hydra, is the tiny settlement of Thermisia. It takes its name from the ancient temple of Demeter Thermasia (Pau-
sanias II, 34, 12) which was located in this area. Towering behind the village to an elevation of nearly 300 m. are the heights on which stands the castle of Thermisi.

A legend associated with the castle relates that it was the home of a young princess, who was besieged by the Turks for many years; the enemy commander was encamped on the hill opposite the castle (still called “Vizir's Ridge,” Βεζυροπάχι). Finally the princess admitted within the walls a “monk,” in reality a disguised dervish. He opened the gates for his master. The castle was captured, and the princess was hurled from the battlements. One need not associate this story with either the campaign of 1537 or that of 1715; it is a variant of a common Greek folktale.

The castle is built on a ridge running from east to west. At the west are two precipitous pinnacles, joined by a saddle; these are fortified. A lower rocky spur extends eastward (Pl. 116, a). The north slopes of the ridge have yielded scattered late Mycenaean sherds.

The western summit (A in Fig. 3) falls away in sheer cliffs on the west. It slopes down more gently towards the saddle, and from there spreads south to form a broad sloping triangle, limited at its southern edge by a cliff. This whole area constitutes the ward or bailey, and is filled with the foundations of collapsed buildings. It is fortified to the north and west only. No traces were found of the entrance to the complex, which must have been from the north, by way of the saddle, either just at the foot of the redoubt or further west (marked by an arrow in Fig. 3).

The eastern summit (B in Fig. 3), an isolated massif which is now inaccessible from the west, served as the redoubt. It is an elongated plateau, about 90 m. by 30 m., with sheer thirty-meter cliffs on the west, even higher cliffs on the south. In shape and situation it is reminiscent of the site of the Barozzi Castle of Skaro, in Santorini, though the latter is neither so large nor so high. Most of the southern side of this massif is unfortified. The other three sides, which are slightly more accessible, are protected by walls (Pl. 116, b, c). There are traces of a staircase which led down to

---

26 Located on e.g. British Staff Map (1943). British Admiralty Chart no. 843 (of 1899) gives the elevation of Vezyrorakhi as 1152' (351 m.).


29 W. A. Heurtley quoted by Georg Karo, R.E., Supplementband VI, 1935, col. 606, lines 25-28; fragments of a krater bowl, probably L.H. III B, were picked up on the north slope, March 16, 1959.

the saddle (marked by an arrow in Fig. 3). There are also the remains, near the northeast corner, of what must have been a pulley-entrance (Pl. 116, d). A few buildings can be seen in the redoubt: a cistern (C in Fig. 3) against the east wall, a tower (about 6.10 m. by 5.20 m.) at the highest point of the fort, and a Byzantine chapel which may be as old as the 11th or 12th century 41 (Pl. 114, c).

Outside the enclosure on the long low rocky eastern spur are the ruins of a few buildings, notably another chapel.

---

41 Tentative dating on the basis of the decorative brickwork on the exterior of the apse, which includes dentil courses and filling patterns resembling Greek characters; Gabriel Millet, *L'École grecque dans l'architecture byzantine*, Paris, 1916, p. 253, fig. 114, b; H. Megaw, *B.S.A.*, XXXII, 1931-1932, pp. 109-111.
noted in the north wall of the bailey and the east wall of the redoubt (above the cistern). The whole wall of the redoubt with the exception of the western salient (which looks down into the ward) was crenellated, with notched merlons (p. 116, c). Elsewhere in the redoubt and throughout the bailey the walls have plain flat or rounded tops.

There was a second building period, similar in technique to the first. The height of a western outwork was increased; and the embrasures in the crenellated east wall were filled, leaving only meurtrières. There is no evidence of reworking for the convenience of artillery.

The notched merlons which play such a prominent rôle in Thermisi are characteristically Italian, and appear in Venetian colonies in Greece during the fifteenth century.\(^42\) Apparently then the present remains of the fort can be assigned to the first period of Venetian rule (1394-1537). There is no recognizable trace of the Frankish fortification which preceded. The Turkish occupation (1537-1686) provided only the minimum repairs and alterations necessary to maintain the castle in serviceable condition; perhaps to this period belong the alterations to the western outwork and to the east wall.\(^43\) Thermisi was not among the castles of the Morea which were reconditioned in the second Venetian period (1686-1715).

* * * *

This study of the material remains at Kiveri and Thermisi has added a few details to our knowledge of the life and architecture of mediaeval Greece. Although the two castles appear in records at the same time, they were not twin fortresses. Thermisi, from its lofty and impregnable height, protected the salt flats, an important item in the mediaeval economy. Kiveri, dominant but not unassailable, commanded one of the main roads leading south from the Argolid. Each was adapted to its peculiar situation and function.

* * * *

\(^42\) On the notched merlon (\textit{Schwalbenschwanzsinne}), which originated in the last half of the twelfth century in Northern Italy, see Bodo Ebhardt, \textit{Die Burgen Italiens}, Berlin, 1916, esp. pp. 63 ff., 150, 182, and plates and text-figures \textit{passim}. In Greece it is regarded as characteristically Italian (Andrews, \textit{Castles of the Morea}, pp. 48, 229), although also used occasionally by the Turks (\textit{ibid.}, p. 48). It is to be found at Nauplia in walls built soon after 1470 (Andrews, \textit{Castles of the Morea}, figs. 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108), at Old Navarino in walls of (probably) the fifteenth century (\textit{ibid.}, figs. 40, 41, 44, 45, 46), in the western of the Towers of Mytikas in the Lelantine plain (William Miller and Sp. Lambros, \textit{Ιστορία τῆς Φραγκοκρατίας ἐν Ἑλλάδι}, Athens, 1909-1910, p. 201). Philippson-Kirsten, \textit{Die griechischen Landschaften}, III, 1, p. 116, describe Thermisi as "a Venetian (?) stronghold of the 15th century."

APPENDIX. THE TOWER OF THE PRINCESS

Some five hundred meters south of Kiveri is a long flat spur (elevation about 74 m.). On it stands a tower-and-court complex, known locally as "The Tower of the Princess" (ὁ πύργος τῆς βασιλευτικῆς).44 The people of the vicinity say that it is named for a princess who lived there long ago; because of her incredible beauty (others say, "her unspeakable ugliness") she had a subterranean passage built from the tower to the shore, so that she could descend unobserved to bathe in the sea.

![Plan of the Tower of the Princesses.](image)

The court, roughly rectangular, and oriented east-west, measures about 20 m. by 60 m. It is built on a nearly flat plateau. The wall, which is 0.60 m. thick, stands to a height of two meters on the south and east, one meter on the north (Fig. 4).

The central tower measures 5.50 m. by 6.75 m.; its walls are also 0.60 m. thick. The entrance must have been in the west face near the north side, which has collapsed; one cannot determine whether the entrance was at ground level or higher. The tower is standing to its full height (nearly ten meters). Above ground there were two floors,

44 The Princess's Tower is visible in the left middle distance of the photograph published in *Hesperia*, XXVII, 1958, pl. 40, c.
as indicated by the beam holes. Between the two floor levels the interior is stuccoed; the north and south walls each have two niche-like cupboards set into the wall about a meter above the floor. There were large windows in this second storey, one each on the north and south, two on the east, probably one on the west.

The tower is crowned with a crenellated parapet, four rectangular merlons on the east and west, three on the north and south. The third storey has smaller windows beneath the merlons (two on the east and west, one on the north and south), originally protected by huchettes. At each corner of the third storey is a meurrière. The third storey, with its crenellations, huchettes, and meurtrières, can have had no purpose but defense (Pl. 117, a, b).

Both the circuit wall and the tower are constructed of the local limestone, roughly coursed; in the tower a high course frequently alternates with one or two thin courses. Tile fragments are employed to fill the crannies of both wall and tower. The mortar is hard and sandy, with many pebbles; it is thickly applied, often like a stucco.

The tower has been called Venetian and even Frankish; it is certainly Turkish. It would be tempting to recognize in it a Turkish counterpart to the Venetian Civeri. But the small scale, uncomplicated plan, and unsubstantial walls are unsuitable for a military strong point in such an exposed position.

During the Turkish period the home of a sipahi or an ağa or even of a farm owner was known as a πύργος or κουλᾶς (Turkish kule, “tower”). Country estates (τσιφλίκια, Turkish çiftlik, “farm”) were scattered throughout the more fertile

45 Labelled as Venetian by A. Conze and A. Michaelis, Annali dell' Instituto di Correspondenza archeologica, XXXIII, 1861, Tav. d'Agg. F, 2; cf. also Buchon, La Grèce continentale, p. 417, “une tour de vigie vénitienne”; Les Guides Bleus (Grèce), edited by Gustave Fougères, Paris, 1911, p. 420; ibid., edited by Yves Béquignon, Paris, 1932, p. 406; ibid., edited by Francis Baulier, Paris, 1956, p. 24, “une belle tour de vigie vénitienne”; apparently taken to be “le chateau de Chamires,” Lambrynidis, Naxia, p. 45; Lambropoulos, Déva, p. 82 and p. 85, note 3, states that the tower is Frankish, and that the Princess for whom it is named was Isabelle de Brienne, sister of Gautier II (VI) and heiress of Argos and Nauplia. The tower was recognized as Turkish by Walther Wrede, cited by Lehmann, Argolis, I, p. 80, note 5.


In Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace, and Epiros, up to the time of the liberation, farm estates were still called tsiflikia, and the home of the farm owner was called a koulas; see D. K. Tsopotos, Γαλατική γεωργία της Θεσσαλίας κατά την Τουρκοκρατίαν, Volos, 1912; Costas Phalaitis, M.E.E., XV, 1931, p. 43, s.v. koulas; G. Kordatos, M.E.E. XXIII, 1933, p. 465, s.v. τσιφλίκια. A kule and çiftlik in association are also mentioned at Preveza by William Martin Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, London, 1835, I, p. 174.
districts of Greece. Their concomitant towers are mentioned by nineteenth century travellers, who often obtained overnight lodging in them. These towers were often square, with as many as four floors; the entrance was by an exterior staircase and drawbridge. The ground floor, which did not communicate with the living quarters, sheltered domestic animals. Occasionally near-by antiquities were pillaged to provide building material. When the Turks were finally expelled, the Greeks demolished many of their πύργου.

There was such a κολυτός at Myloi, on lower ground between the marsh and the river. Evidence indicates that the Princess’s Tower may be another. The unstuccoed ground floor suggests stables; the stuccoed second storey suggests living quarters. The third storey, with its adaptations for defense, recalls the parapets of the Maniote towers. In plan the complex resembles the fortified farms both of ancient Greece and of the mediaeval Aegean islands.
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**Wallace E. McLeod: Kiveri and Thermisi**

b. Bailey wall. Outer Face, looking toward Second Tower of East side. In background, the Conical Hill is the Larissa of Argos.

c. Redoubt. Southeast Tower, from South.

d. Redoubt. South Tower, from Southwest.

WALLACE E. McLEOD: KIVERI AND THERMISI
a. From South. The Fortifications on the two summits to the left.

b. View Southwest through Breach in Wall at West of Redoubt. In the distance, Hermione.

c. Redoubt. North Wall, showing Notched Merlons.

d. Redoubt. Northeast Corner, showing Pulley Entrance.

WALLACE E. MCLEOD: KIVERI AND THERMISI
a. Tower of the Princess, from Southeast. In foreground, Circuit Wall.

b. Tower of the Princess, from Southwest.

WALLACE E. McLEOD: KIVERI AND THERMISI

EDWARD W. BODNAR: MARCUS PORCIUS CATO

EUGENE N. LANE: AN UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTION FROM LAKONIA