

NIKOS D. KONTOGIANNIS

Euripos – Negroponte – Eġriboz: Material Culture and Historical Topography of Chalcis from Byzantium to the End of the Ottoman Rule*

With 22 illustrations and maps

Abstract: The aim of the paper is to reassess the body of archaeological and historic evidence in order to present a concise picture of the topography and material culture of the middle Byzantine Euripos, the Lombard/Venetian Negroponte and the Ottoman Eġriboz. These three successive settlements that developed in the area of Chalcis, though occupying the same location, were in each case integrated within a different socio-cultural and political reality, directly linked both to the identity of the population that exercised local authority and to the broader historical framework.

The paper builds upon the work of earlier researchers from various disciplines, historians, archaeologists and architects, with the intention of presenting in brief the body of archaeological evidence that we currently possess on the historical topography and material Culture of Chalcis (mod. Chalkida) in Euboea from the Middle Ages to the beginning of modern times.

Locating the site of the ancient city of Chalcis has been a subject of long-term research. It is currently accepted that from the proto-geometric period down to the end of late Roman (early Christian) times the city spread over the foothills of Mt. Bathrobounia and the bay of Agios Stephanos, with a size fluctuating according to changing political and economic conditions.¹ A large number of early Christian architectural sculptures, mainly of religious character, have been collected from various parts of the modern town and re-used in later buildings down to the present time. However, no religious foundation dating to that period has been located so far.²

At an unspecified time between the 6th/7th and the 9th century and for reasons that probably relate to general historic conditions, the city was relocated in the area next to the Euripos Channel and occupied its present historic centre.³ This was a strategic location, since it controlled the major sea route leading from Italy and Crete to Constantinople and the Black Sea, while being at the same time a crossroads between mainland Euboea and Boeotia.⁴ In any case, there was an established settlement

* I would like to thank all my colleagues at the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities in Chalkida for their precious help, and especially the former director, Eugenia Bedermacher-Geroussi. My thanks also go to the chief-editor of *JÖB* and two anonymous reviewers for their precious remarks.

¹ A. A. SAMPSON, Συμβολή στην τοπογραφία της Αρχαίας Χαλκίδος από τους προϊστορικούς χρόνους μέχρι το τέλος της ρωμαϊκής περιόδου. *Chalkida* 1976, esp. 12–44; P. G. KALLIGAS, Η αρχαία πόλη της Χαλκίδας I. *Archaiologia* 3 (1982) 66, 68–69; IDEM, Η αρχαία πόλη της Χαλκίδας II. *Archaiologia* 4 (1982) 53–55; S. C. BAKHUIZEN, Chalcidian Studies I. Studies in the Topography of Chalcis on Euboea. A Discussion of the Sources (*Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* XI). Leiden 1985, esp. 35, 75–76, 94–95.

² Twenty five fragments (capitals from columns, pilasters, doorjambs, iconostasis, bases and parts of columns, mullions) are presently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

³ BAKHUIZEN, Chalcidian Studies I 97; D. D. TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα: ανασκόπηση της νεώτερης αρχαιολογικής έρευνας, in: Diethnes epistimoniko synedrio ‘E pole tes Chalkidas’, Chalkida 24–27 Septembriou 1987. Athens 1990, 165–170 believes that the transfer was completed before the creation of the Hellas theme in the 7th century; KALLIGAS, Η αρχαία πόλη II 55–57 proposes a date in the reign of emperor Herakleios (610–641).

⁴ For the geography and the strategic location of the area, see J. KODER, Negroponte, Untersuchungen zur Topographie und Siedlungsgeschichte der Insel Euboea während der Zeit der Venezianerherrschaft (*VTIB* 1). Wien 1973, 40–42; E. KISLINGER, Verkehrsrouten zur See im byzantinischen Raum, in: Handelsgüter und Verkehrswege. Aspekte der Warenversorgung im

here during the Middle Byzantine period (9th–12th century) under the name of Euripos. Following the dismantlement of the Empire in 1204, the city of Negroponte became a focal point of the Venetian maritime network. After the Ottoman conquest of 1470, Eğriboz served as one of the administration and economic centres of the southern Balkans and the Aegean region until the Greek War of Independence in 1821.

Written and material evidence attest that each change of political rule brought about a distinct and major change in the composition of the population, whether gradual or abrupt. Although these three “cities” (Euripos, Negroponte, Eğriboz) shared features deriving from their common geopolitical background, each was integrated within a different socio-cultural milieu. This was directly linked to the political situation of each period, but also to the different identity of the population, at least the part that exercised power and conducted public affairs (Byzantines, Franks/Venetians or Ottoman Muslims). In this light, available archaeological evidence from each period will be examined separately with a view to providing an insight into the profile of each “city”. This will also help identify the factors that remained unchanged, as opposed to those that fluctuated in connection with the broader historical framework.

THE BYZANTINE KASTRON OF EURIPOS

The actual role of Euripos within the Byzantine administrative system is little known. The presence of port facilities was critical to the city’s establishment and flourishing. After the creation of the theme of Hellas (first mention in 695) with nearby Thebes as capital, Euripos became the station for the flotilla of the theme and its port authorities.⁵

Detailed information for the period – with the exception of the Arab siege to be examined later – is restricted to isolated references to the city and a number of inhabitants and dignitaries of the island.⁶ The earliest surviving reference relates to the participation of its bishop Theodoros in the synod of 869–870 and the seal of an anonymous κομερκιάρτιος Εγρίπου (ca. 750–850).⁷ The growing importance and status of the local bishopric, witnessed already from the late 8th–9th century and culminating during the 12th century, has been considered as indicator of the parallel development of the city itself.⁸

Euripos figures among the places where Venetians were allowed to trade freely, according to the concessions of emperors Alexis I, John II, Manuel and Alexis III in 1082, 1126, 1148 and 1198 respectively. Despite earlier views according to which these concessions were evidence for the establishment of a Venetian commercial base in Euripos⁹, it is presently agreed that the city only served as a transit station for the Serenissima’s people, ships and merchandise.¹⁰

östlichen Mittelmeerraum (4. bis 15. Jahrhundert), ed. E. Kislinger – J. Koder – A. Külzer (*Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung* 18). Wien 2010, 151, 173.

⁵ J. KODER – F. HILD, *Hellas und Thessalia (TIB 1)*. Wien 1976, 156; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, *Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα* 170; M. GEORGOPOULOU, *Venice’s Mediterranean Colonies, Architecture and Urbanism*. Cambridge, Mass. 2001, 73.

⁶ For a concise prosopographical list see E. MALAMUT, *Les îles de l’empire byzantin, VIII–XII siècles, I–II (Byzantina Sorbonensia 8)*. Paris 1988, 495–498, also 300–301, 366; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, *Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα* 170; KODER, *Negroponte* 65–66; G.D.A. CHATZIKOSTAS, *Η Χαλκίς κατά τον 12^{ον} αιώνα (βάσει της μαρτυρίας Μιχαήλ Ακομινάτου). Archeion Euboikon Meleton 6 (1959)* 188–193.

⁷ BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies I* 97, n. 119; KODER – HILD, *Hellas und Thessalia* 156; MALAMUT, *îles de l’empire byzantin* 141, 344, 346; G. ZACOS – A. VEGLERY, *Byzantine Lead Seals, vol I, part 2*. Basel 1972, nr. 2581.

⁸ MALAMUT, *îles de l’empire byzantin* 141, 346, 357.

⁹ KODER, *Negroponte* 43–44; KODER – HILD, *Hellas und Thessalia* 156; R.-J. LILIE, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeli (1081–1204)*. Amsterdam 1984, 119–120 *et passim*.

¹⁰ D. JACOBY, *The Demographic Evolution of Euboea under Latin Rule, 1205–1470*, in: *The Greek Islands and the Sea, Proceedings of the First International Colloquium held at The Hellenic Institute, Royal Holloway, University of London*, 21–22

The city was included among those conquered and plundered by the Normans during their raids of central Greece in 1147, and among those attacked by the Venetians during their reprisals against Byzantium in 1171.¹¹ Benjamin of Tudela visited the place around 1160, reporting the presence of an active Jewish community of 200 members and a substantial commercial activity.¹²

The fact that Euripos and the central part of the island do not appear in the *Partitio Romaniae* (April–May 1204) is interpreted as an indication that at an earlier stage (between 1202 and 1204) the area had escaped central Byzantine control. It had probably been integrated within the independent territory that the local magnate Leon Sgouros forged out of the imperial lands, an occurrence paralleled in various parts of the empire during the later 12th century.¹³

The scarce written information about the Byzantine city itself leads one to rely almost exclusively on archaeological material. The overall conclusion, based on excavation data and artifacts (ceramics and sculpture), is that the settlement developed and thrived in its present location, especially during the 10th–12th centuries. It was a fortified city with the bulk of population residing within the enclosure, while isolated habitations and cemeteries were located beyond the walls.

The Byzantine walls of the city are mentioned in relation to a failed siege of the city by a certain Esman or Osman, Amir of Tarsus, at ca. 880, an information repeated by several historians.¹⁴ The main points of interest in the relevant passage are the following: walls and towers surrounded the city and had been prepared for the expected attack by the general who gathered all his available forces. The enemies arrived by sea, and made a first assault from their vessels, to which the Byzantines responded with Greek fire. The defenders used a number of weapons, stone- and arrow-throwing catapults, which students of military architecture traditionally consider as situated on towers. The main operation took place at the land front, where there was a moat surrounding the city. This is where Esman offered large rewards in order to motivate his people in their assaults, provoking the fierce response of the defenders and his own doom. The walls are noted again on two occasions: in the 10th century, when a man that fell from the battlements was miraculously healed by Saint Nikon Metanoite, and again during the 1171 siege by the Venetians, when a section of the city (perhaps the suburbs outside the walls) was occupied and put to fire before the Venetian fleet retreated.¹⁵

September 2001, ed. J. Chrysostomides – Ch. Dendrinou – J. Harris. Camberley 2004, 138–139; IDEM, La consolidation de la domination de Venise dans la ville de Négropont (1205–1390). Un aspect de sa politique coloniale, in: Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo), ed. Ch. A. Maltezou – P. Schreiner (*Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani. Convegno* 5). Venezia 2002, 152–153.

¹¹ KODER, Negroponte 43; N. PAPADAKIS, Το μεσαιωνικό τείχος της Χαλκίδας. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 20 (1975) 285.

¹² A. ASHER, The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela. London – Berlin 1840, 47; KODER – HILD, Hellas und Thessalia 156; D. GOFAS, Το βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte. Ιστορικό σχέδιασμα, in: Charaktika tes Euboiias. Sylloge Gianni K. Karakosta. Athena 1999, 13–14; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 159.

¹³ N. OIKONOMIDES, La decomposition de l'empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: à propos de la 'Partitio Romaniae', in: XV^e Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines, Rapports et co-rapports, I/1. Athenes 1976, 17–18 (= IDEM, Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade, Studies, Texts, Monuments. Aldershot 1992, XX); MALAMUT, îles de l'empire byzantin 101; JACOBY, consolidation 153–154. For the contrary view, that the mention of the island's two extreme points (Oreos and Karystos) were a cursory form of including the whole Euboea in the treaty, see GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 14.

¹⁴ Theophanes continuatus V 59B (ed. I. BEKKER, Theophanes continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus. Bonn 1838, 298–299); Georgios Kedrenos (ed. I. BEKKER, Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope. Bonn 1838, II 225–226); Ioannes Zonaras XVI 9 (ed. I. Gregoriades, Ιωάννης Ζωναράς Επιτομή Ιστοριών [*Keimena Byzantines Istoriografias* 5]. Athens 1998, II 214–217). BAKHUIZEN, Chalcidian Studies I 97, n. 119; KODER – HILD, Hellas und Thessalia 156; MALAMUT, îles de l'empire byzantin 82, 110, 141, 221, 606; PAPADAKIS, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 282. For the identity of Esman and the date of his raid, see G. C. MILES, Byzantium and the Arabs: Relations in Crete and the Aegean Area. *DOP* 19 (1964) 7, n. 23.

¹⁵ Nicetas Choniates, Chronike diegesis, ed. J.L. VAN DIETEN, Nicetae Choniatae Historia [*CFHB* 11/1]. Berlin – New York 1975, I 172; KODER – HILD, Hellas und Thessalia 156; JACOBY, consolidation 153; MALAMUT, îles de l'empire byzantin 610; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 170–171.

A noteworthy result of field research was the excavation and identification of the mid-Byzantine defensive enclosure. It was extensively uncovered, along with later additions, in a number of rescue excavations conducted in various plots of buildings that were constructed on the mainland line of the walls, especially along the Eleutheriou Venizelou, Papanastasiou and Mardochoaiou Frizi streets (fig. 1.1–3).¹⁶

The Byzantine walls lay at the core and formed the earlier part of the city's urban enclosure; the one that surrounded the town until its destruction at the end of the 19th–early 20th century. It enclosed a trapezoidal area, whose three sides were aligned with the coastline, while the fourth slightly concave side faced the Euboean mainland. The trace of this enclosure, whose general outline had earlier been the subject of speculation¹⁷, is now fairly accurately known, based on a topographical plan executed in the 1840s (fig. 1).¹⁸ It records in detail both the settlement and the still extant walls, preserving the image of the city right at the aftermath of the Ottoman period. It is therefore proposed that the city's mainland front remained unchanged from the 9th to the 19th century, being constantly repaired and reinforced in the course of centuries and receiving various additions in order to meet the new requirements posed by the developing military technology.

The plan testifies to the earlier existence of a number of rectangular towers along a linear curtain wall at almost identical intervals; they were all clearly enveloped in later structures during subsequent reinforcements (fig. 1.4–18). The use of a simple – yet consistent – defense form may indicate that the earliest (Byzantine) fortification was a result of a concrete and single-phase scheme. This conclusion is enhanced by the masonry features of these walls, which are consistent in all their excavated parts.¹⁹ The Byzantine urban enclosure of Euripos (indicated as wall A in the reports, fig. 2) has a thickness of ca. 3.50 m. It is constructed with a mortared rubble core and facings of large ashlar porous – and to a lesser extent marble – blocks, many of which were second-hand material from older buildings. It was usually built on bedrock with a foundation of hydraulic lime mortar and pebbles. In the part excavated at the Mardochoaiou Frizi street (fig. 1.3), the external face formed a pedestal at its lower part, built with large marble blocks and pieces of an ancient architrave.²⁰

A part of this enclosure is currently preserved within the military camp at the city's southern flank (figs. 1.9, 3.a). A typical medieval wall with a rectangular tower lies at the center of later additions, built with well-cut blocks, many of which originated from older buildings and were re-used here. The upper end of another medieval tower is discerned in photographs of the first decades of the 20th century: it was a circular structure that occupied the strategic southeastern corner of the fortification (fig. 1.12).

The suggested dates for the construction of the Byzantine enclosure vary from the 6th to the 12th century: the age of Justinian has been proposed, even though there is no written evidence for such an endeavor.²¹ Lazaridis, excavator of plots at Eleutheriou Venizelou, believed that this hasty construction was a result of an imminent danger, represented in his opinion by the advancing armies of crusaders in 1204.²² Georgopoulou found an ivory comb of the 10th–11th century at another Venizelou

¹⁶ P. LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά και Μεσαιωνικά Ευβοίας. *AD* 20 (1965), Β'2, *Chronika* 294–296; IDEM, Μεσαιωνικά Ευβοίας. *AD* 21 (1966), Β'1 *Chronika* 236; M. GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά μνημεία Ευβοίας. *AD* 29 (1973–74), Β'2 *Chronika* 508; ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 277–279, 290–293.

¹⁷ Koder in his seminal study on the topography of the city walls (KODER, *Negroponte* 70–74, 76–77) considered it as purely Frankish/Venetian, relying upon a number of late 17th–early 18th century plans as well as later evidence, in order to reconstruct the enclosure, its course and individual features.

¹⁸ S. KOKKINIS – G. P. ΓΙΚΑΣ, Το πρώτο πολεοδομικό διάγραμμα του «Κάστρου» της Χαλκίδας και κατάλογος των κτισμάτων. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 19 (1974) 277–291.

¹⁹ ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 304–305.

²⁰ ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 292.

²¹ MALAMUT, îles de l'empire byzantin 611; BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies* I 100, n.245; ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 314–315.

²² LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1965, 294–296.

plot.²³ On yet another similar case, the pottery belonged to the 12th century, though she acknowledged that it had probably been inserted in a previously existing wall when it was repaired.²⁴ The same excavator identified middle Byzantine ceramics along with five coins of Basil I at the Mardochoiου Frizi excavation, while Papadakis published late 11th–12th century ceramics and five coins of the 10th–11th century.²⁵ In corroboration of these dates, we may add that the testimony of the Arab siege in the 880s should serve as a secure *terminus ante quem* for dating the walls, whose construction can be attributed to the early or mid-9th century with a phase of repairs in the 12th century.

As for the sea front walls, a problem was raised by the recovery of a solid semi-circular tower and a small wall fragment at the area of the Plateia Pesonton Opliton whose masonry was similar to the Byzantine wall excavated elsewhere. This was something unexpected, since the location lies far behind the Venetian-Ottoman wall front (fig. 1.19). Furthermore, excavations at this spot revealed a layer of sea-shells and sand at a depth of 3–4 m., which identified the structure as a sea-front bastion. The archaeologist assumed the existence of an earlier sea-side fortification, yet the date was impossible to determine due to the lack of evidence.²⁶ Until further evidence is discovered, the idea that the Byzantine sea walls were following a different trace than the latter (Venetian-Ottoman) ones remains a hypothesis that cannot be further substantiated.

Within the urban enclosure rescue work revealed parts of a dense settlement, with houses, streets and churches composing a typical medieval pattern whose earlier structures were dated to the 9th–11th century. At the Agia Barbara square, the earliest structures were attributed to the 9th–10th century, based on ceramics, with numismatic findings dating from as back as the 7th century (fig. 1.5). A second building phase, with house facades made of porous blocks and bricks, the latter forming occasionally kufic (or pseudo-kufic) motifs and letters, was dated to the 11th–12th century.²⁷ At the Kotsou street, one of the main streets of the city throughout its history, digging for public facilities brought to light a series of partially unearthened buildings, built pithoi, and pipes (fig. 1.20, 1.32). It is interesting that the pithoi belonged to the earlier phase and were built over by later structures. Some of the walls were constructed with a variety of older (ancient and late roman) material, with smaller stones and broken bricks at the joints. Other walls feature lines of rectangular porous blocks with broken bricks at the joints. Lazaridis believed them to be parts of Byzantine Euripos.²⁸ In adjacent parts of the city²⁹, rescue work revealed walls built in cloisonné style, with ashlar porous blocks and brick ornaments imitating kufic lettering at the joints, interpreted once more as parts of the Byzantine settlement. Walls from buildings that were attributed to the same period were found in numerous other parts of the city but no details were published.³⁰

²³ GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973–74, 508.

²⁴ M. GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά μνημεία Ευβοίας*. *AD* 27 (1972), B'2 Chronika 365–366, fig.1–2; M. GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά μνημεία Ευβοίας*. *AD* 28 (1973), B'1 Chronika 312–314.

²⁵ PΑΡΑΔΑΚΗΣ, *μεσαιωνικό τείχος* 294–303, 315.

²⁶ GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973–74, 507–508.

²⁷ GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973–74, 499–507. For the use of decorative motifs imitating kufic letters in Byzantine architecture of Greece from the 10th to the 12th century, as well as in Christian art in general, see H. MEGAW, *The Chronology of Some Middle-Byzantine Churches*. *ABSA* 32 (1931–1932) 104–109; S. D. T. SPITTLE, *Cufic Lettering in Christian Art*. *The Archaeological Journal* 111 (1954) 138–152; MILES, *Byzantium and the Arabs* 21–23; L. BOURA, *Ο γλυπτός διάκοσμος του Ναού της Παναγίας στο Μοναστήρι του Οσίου Λουκά (Bibliothèque des en Athenais Archaiologikes Etaireias* 95). Athens 1980, 17–21; CH. BOURAS – L. BOURA, *Η ελλαδική ναοδομία κατά τον 12^ο αιώνα*. Athens 2002, 468–469.

²⁸ P. LAZARIDIS, *Βυζαντινά και μεσαιωνικά μνημεία Ευβοίας*. *AD* 26 (1971), B'1 Chronika 274–277.

²⁹ This includes the Matsa plot in Angeli Gobiou and Fabierou streets, dated to the 11th–12th century (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1972, 367–368), the Malliou plot in Kotsou street, as well as the electricity ditches dug in 1972 at the Angeli Gobiou street (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973, 316) (fig. 1.31).

³⁰ As in the cases of the Technike Etaireia Dome plot in Trapezountiou and Isaiou streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973–74, 509–510) (fig. 1.33), the Desimpri plot at 17, Skalkota street, the Anna Tzani plot at 4, Fabierou street (P. LAZARIDIS, *Βυζαντινά και μεσαιωνικά μνημεία Ευβοίας*. *AD* 25 (1970), B'1 Chronika 261). A similar house complex, including a series

Outside the urban enclosure, earlier excavators recognized the existence of Byzantine burial grounds probably located within and around churches, a common practice from the end of antiquity onwards. The churches have not survived. A large concentration of tombs was uncovered in the area of the modern metropolitan church of Agios Demetrios (fig. 1.21), and another stretching along the Venizelou street, especially in the area of the Market square, outside the walls (fig. 1.22).³¹ Some of them were luxurious constructions, rectangular in shape, covered with semicircular brick vaults, their entrance being from the north short side. Their floor was covered with clay slabs. Some of them had their lower parts dug in bedrock, with the upper part only made of stones and bricks. There were however also simple schist tombs.

A schist tomb of a child was also uncovered within the urban enclosure, at the square of Agia Paraskevi (fig. 1.23).³² Another cemetery of rock-cut graves of unknown origin was located at the Karampampa hill, at the eastern part of the Ottoman Fort. The use of the site during the Byzantine period was confirmed by the presence of architectural sculptures that were re-used both at the tombs and at the walls of the fort.³³ Finally, the bell-shaped cisterns and tunnels on the (modern) Cemetery Hill of Agios Ioannes were interpreted in the late 19th century as Christian catacombs, though no evidence survives for such identification.³⁴

The impression that the Byzantine city was constrained within its walls, while only the cemeteries were located outside, has been lately challenged by the discovery of a partly surviving bath in the rescue excavation of the Delivorias plot, at Orionos street (figs. 1.24, 4a).³⁵ This was an area that was continuously inhabited, and later reused by workshops down to the late Ottoman period. The earlier installation of the bath, which was used over an extended period between the 9th and the 11th century as indicated by ceramic material finds, preserved the lower parts of the hypocausts, built with a coarse masonry with the use of large stones from older buildings.

The ceramic material from Euripos deriving from rescue work of the last three decades includes items of a wide variety, known from other major centres of Greece, such as Corinth or Thebes (fig. 5a). A number of them were clearly imported from Constantinople, belonging to the high quality polychrome ware or the white clay variants. They reflect a flourishing trading centre, integrated in the networks of the middle Byzantine Greece and following the patterns, forms and motifs known in other parts of the Empire.

The same conclusion is also reached by the examination of the surviving architectural sculpture, all pieces having been detached from their original buildings and surviving as spolia or random finds from within or around the city.³⁶ Their ornamental repertoire includes mainly geometric and vegetal motifs. A group of twelve items with animal representations have recently been studied anew and interpreted as both decorative and symbolic, most of them dated to the 11th and 12th centu-

of storage pithoi, has been excavated in 2009 opposite the Agia Paraskevi church, at the Toulitsi-Loumou-Loumaki plot at Erotokritou and Olynthou streets (excavator: I. Vaxevanis) (fig. 1.23).

³¹ LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1971, 277–278; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 510–511; EADEM, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 366–367; EADEM, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 314.

³² GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 315–316

³³ BAKHUIZEN, Chalcidian Studies I 41–46; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 370.

³⁴ D. D. TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, Η μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα και τα μνημεία της (Σχέδιασμα αρχαιολογικής βιβλιογραφίας). *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 16 (1970) 184–186 (= Charaktika tes Eubois. Sylloge Gianni K. Karakosta. Athena 1999, 37–38); BAKHUIZEN, Chalcidian Studies I 72–73, n. 127; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 370.

³⁵ I would like to thank the excavator, Ioannis Vaxevanis, for this information.

³⁶ A. GRABAR, Sculptures Byzantines du Moyen Age, II (XIe–XIVe siècle) (*Bibliothèque des Cahiers Archéologiques* XII). Paris 1976, 67–68, 110, nos. 60, 99, pl. LXXXVc; BOURAS – BOURA, ελληνική ναοδομία 145–146. Sixty fragmented sculptures are presently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

ries (fig. 6a).³⁷ The majority of the surviving sculptures originate from iconostases of presently unidentified churches (panels, columns, architraves), while a number of them served other purposes (doorframes, cornices, pilaster capitals, mensa). A marble slab stands apart, featuring the “Ascension of Alexander” with the frontal king holding spears in what appears to be a basket dragged by two griffons (fig. 6b).³⁸ All these sculptures are of high technical and artistic merit, the outcome of local itinerant workshops that worked for the embellishment of the various religious buildings of the city.³⁹ Indeed they show a particular uniformity and are wholly integrated in the sculptural tradition of middle Byzantium both in subject matter and technique, a feature noted throughout the Empire.⁴⁰

Finally, one should notice the two inscriptions that bear direct testimonies to the city’s inhabitants and public officials commemorating the construction or restoration of public buildings. The first one mentions the church of Panagia Peribleptos in 1186,⁴¹ while the second one, donated by Protospatharios Theophylaktos (late 9th or 10th century), refers to the road linking the city to the Lelantine plain.⁴²

LOMBARD AND VENETIAN NEGROPONTE

The city and its namesake island in the years following the dismantlement of the Byzantine Empire in 1204 quickly passed under Frankish rule and was divided in three fiefs granted to Lombard noblemen, known as *terzieri* or ‘triarchs’ in English.⁴³ Negroponte became a theatre of inadequately known successive feuds where local figures and regional conflicts probably reflected the wider political interests of the time. The best known cases figured the Prince of Achaea, William Villehardouin, and the Knight Licario, both conducting their respective forces against the other feudal lords over the rule of the island in the second half of the 13th century. All these upheavals occurred simultaneously and possibly contributed to or even resulted in the gradual reinforcement of the Venetian presence. In any case, the Serenissima’s representative, known as *Baiulus et capitaneus Nigropontis*, unified the entire island under his rule from 1390 onwards.

Negroponte is far better documented than its predecessor, Euripos. Being a key commercial hub and naval crossroads of the Venetian maritime empire in the East, it connected the Black Sea and

³⁷ E. ΚΟΥΝΟΥΠΙΟΤΟΥ-ΜΑΝΟΛΕΣΣΟΥ, Μεσοβυζαντινά γλυπτά με ζώα από τη συλλογή γλυπτών στο Τζαμί της Χαλκίδας. *DChAE* 29 (2008) 221–232 with previous bibliography.

³⁸ This was a random find during public works in the Mardochoaiou Frizi street.

³⁹ MALAMUT, îles de l’empire byzantin 221–222.

⁴⁰ ΚΟΥΝΟΥΠΙΟΤΟΥ-ΜΑΝΟΛΕΣΣΟΥ, Μεσοβυζαντινά γλυπτά 231–232.

⁴¹ BOURAS – BOURA, ελληνική ναοδομία 147. Presently exhibited at the Karampampa collection, initially interpreted as referring to (the mid-byzantine phase of) Agia Paraskevi (N. I. GIANNΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Χριστιανικά αρχαιότητες Χαλκίδος. *DIEE* 9 [1926] 123–126, 721–722), it is currently dissociated from the surviving monument, see below 43–44.

⁴² This presently lost inscription was first recorded in L. ROSS – J. A. SCHMELLER, Urkunden zur Geschichte Griechenlands im Mittelalter (*Denkschriften Bayer. Akad. Wiss.* XV). München 1837, 158–159; see also KODER, Negroponte 40; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 194; MALAMUT, îles de l’empire byzantin 222.

⁴³ J. B. BURY, The Lombards and Venetians in Euboea. *JHS* 7 (1886) 309–352, 8 (1887) 194–213; D. JACOBY, La féodalité en Grèce medievale. Les “Assises de Romanie” sources, application et diffusion (*Documents et Recherches* X). Paris 1971, 185–211. Brief historic overviews are repeated by numerous authors, see esp. F. THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne au moyen âge, le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIe–XVe siècles). Paris 1959, 87, 93–95, 151, 163–164, 242; KODER, Negroponte 44–62; P. LOCK, The Franks in the Aegean, 1204–1500. London 1995, 150–151; also K. ANDREWS, Castles of the Morea (*Gennadeion Monographs* IV). Princeton 2006, 183–187; GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 14–21; Chr.A. MALTEZOU, Γιατί μια συνάντηση για το Νεγροπόντε, in: Venezia–Eubea. Da Egripos a Negroponte. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Chalkida 12–14 novembre 2004, ed. Chr. A. Maltezoú – Chr.E. Papakosta (*Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, Società di Studi sull’Eubea. Convegni* 10). Venezia – Atene 2006, 17–18; A. PΑΡΑΔΙΑ-LALA, Κοινωνική οργάνωση και αστική κοινότητα στην Εύβοια κατά τη βενετική περίοδο (1390–1470), in: Venezia–Eubea 27–28, 34; MOSCHONAS, Εύριπος, κέντρο βενετικού εμπορίου, in: Venezia–Eubea 158–159; L. BALLETTTO, Negroponte nei traffici commerciali genovesi nel Mediterraneo orientale sulla fine del Medioevo, in: Venezia–Eubea 173; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 132–134.

Constantinople, with southern Greece, Crete, and Venice.⁴⁴ Especially in the 14th and 15th centuries, the city gradually became the major transit station in the western Aegean, with commodities arriving from various areas, such as Andros, in order to be transhipped either to local or distant destinations.⁴⁵ For this reason, there is a relative abundance of historic documents, archival sources and traveler accounts on the city and its inhabitants, whose study has shed light on a number of issues, such as the administration system, central and local authorities⁴⁶, church affairs (including the relocated Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople)⁴⁷, demography, ethnic groups and individual cases of Negroponte residents (locally stationed or travelling)⁴⁸, the manufacture, trade and export of goods (such as wood, woolen and silk textiles)⁴⁹, the justice system (the Assizes of Romania and Venetian laws)⁵⁰.

As far as the fortifications of the city are concerned, it appears that this period should be separated into two parts, both on grounds of historical and technological reasons: the first covers the 13th–14th centuries, when Venice and the Lombard lords co-existed, while the second includes the 15th century when defenses were erected in accordance with the new artillery technology to protect the Venetian-ruled city.

During the 13th–14th centuries, the period of Lombard and Venetian co-existence, a number of distinct fortified structures functioned simultaneously, reflecting the social and political reality of the period, namely the urban enclosure, the Castle of the Bridge, and the separate enclosure of the Venetian quarter. Outside the walls lay the suburbs, which are mentioned in the sources, yet their extension or exact location remains unknown.⁵¹

The urban enclosure almost certainly coincided with the Byzantine circuit of walls. We may assume that it was repaired on a number of occasions or even adjusted to fit the inhabitants' needs.⁵² It

⁴⁴ For the Venetian commerce, see esp. N.G. MOSCHONAS, Εύριπος 157–171; GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 29–30; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 148–150. For the Genoese commerce, see BALLETO, Negroponte 173–202; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 147. On practical questions concerning the handling of freight through the straits, see KODER, Negroponte 85–86; P. A. MACKEY, New Light on Negropont. http://home.um.edu.mt/medinst/mmhn/pierre_mckay.pdf (accessed 16-5-2011) 7.

⁴⁵ F. THIRIET, Les Vénitiens à Thessalonique dans la première moitié du XIV^e siècle. *Byz* 22 (1952) 330–331 (= IDEM, Etudes sur la Romanie greco-vénitienne [Xe–XVe siècles]). London 1977, I); IDEM, La Romanie Vénitienne 282, 337–341, 434; D. JACOBY, Foreigners and the Urban Economy in Thessalonike, ca. 1150 – ca.1450. *DOP* 57 (2003) 105–106 (= IDEM, Latins, Greeks and Muslims: Encounters in the Eastern Mediterranean. Tenth-Fifteenth Centuries. Farnham – Burlington 2009, VII); IDEM, Silk in Medieval Andros, in: Captain and Scholar, Papers in Memory of Demetrios I. Polemis, ed. E. Chrysos – E. A. Zachariadou. Andros 2009, 142.

⁴⁶ A. MAJOR, L' administration vénitienne à Néropont (fin XIV^e–XV^e siècle), in: Coloniser au Moyen Âge, ed. M. Balard – A. Ducellier. Paris 1995, 246–258; C. CAPIZZI, Un documento inedito sulla guarnigione veneziana di Negroponte negli anni 1460–1462. *RBSN* 12–13 (1975–1976) 55–60; GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 22; PAPADIA-LALA, Κοινωνική οργάνωση 33–40.

⁴⁷ THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 284; GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 22–23, 27.

⁴⁸ THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 298; R. C. MUELLER, Greeks in Venice and 'Venetians' in Greece. Notes on Citizenship and Immigration in the Late Middle Ages, in: Ricchi e poveri nella società dell'Oriente grecolatino. Simposio Internazionale, ed. Ch. A. Maltezos (*Biblioteca dell'Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia* 19). Venezia 1998, 172–172; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 131–179; IDEM, Foreigners 97–98, 101, 110; E. CONCINA, Zorzi da Negroponte: nobili, schiavi, stratioti, in: Venezia–Eubea 109–116; TH. GANCHOU, La famille Koumousès (Κουμούσης) à Constantinople et Néropont, avant et après 1453, in: Venezia–Eubea 45–107; GOFAS, Το βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 23–28; M. KOUMANOUDI, Contra deum, jus et justitiam. The trial of Bartolomeo Querini, bailo and capitano of Negroponte (14th c.), in: Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco 235–255; CAPIZZI, Un documento inedito 60–71.

⁴⁹ THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 100, 338; D. JACOBY, The Production of Silk Textiles in Latin Greece, in: Technognosia ste latinokratoumene Ellada, Emerida / 8 Febrouariou 1997, Gennadios Bibliothek. Athens 2000, 28–29; IDEM, Foreigners 106–108, 115; IDEM, Silk 143–149.

⁵⁰ JACOBY, féodalité esp. 95–113; THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 210–211; GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 31; MALTEZOU, Γιατί μια συνάντηση 18; PAPADIA-LALA, Κοινωνική οργάνωση 30–31; GEORGOPOULOU, Colonies 166.

⁵¹ KODER, Negroponte 86–88. JACOBY, consolidation 175–176, mentions that during various pirate raids the people of the suburbs found refuge within the walls. See also below 45 on rescue excavations outside the walls.

⁵² GEORGOPOULOU, Colonies 57; PAPADIA-LALA, Κοινωνική οργάνωση 29.

is clearly mentioned or assumed as existing in documents on a number of occasions: in treaties and concessions, in case of raids and attacks, when repairs are in order, as for ex. in 1216⁵³, 1273⁵⁴, ca. 1310⁵⁵, 1338⁵⁶, 1351⁵⁷; 1353⁵⁸, 1388⁵⁹.

As for its architecture, we can only assume that the pre-existing, typical medieval, linear wall, reinforced by rectangular towers at regular intervals, was sustained. In fact, the excavations revealed no overall change from the earlier Byzantine construction, only repairs, additions and rebuilding that were obviously sufficient both in terms of size and defensive features.

Control of circulation in the Euripos channel, one of the main naval roads of the ancient world, has been a subject of continuous efforts resulting in the building of a fortified bridge already in Antiquity.⁶⁰ A baffling question, however, regards the medieval Castle of the Bridge, located on the bridge across Euripos. It is explicitly recorded that right at the onset of the Frankish rule, Boniface of Montferrat erected a fort with a strong guard on the channel.⁶¹ A variety of slightly later sources speak of the *Castrum Pontis*, *Castrum Nigropontis* or *Castrum et pontis Nigropontis*. Despite occasional confusion with the urban enclosure⁶², it is usually assumed that these names refer to the predecessor of the Fort of Euripos Bridge, built in the 15th century on a rock island within the channel, that survived until the late 19th century (figs. 1.25, 7).

Yet, Jacoby re-interpreted the sources (i.e. the 1245 treaty between Venice and the triarchs⁶³, the 1262 treaty between Venice, Villehardouin and the triarchs⁶⁴, the documents relating to the Catalan siege of the city in 1317) and concluded that this Castle, acting as the city's keep should have been located on the city-side of the bridge, occupying the present Athanaton square (fig. 1.26).⁶⁵ A castle at that side could control not only the channel, but also the city itself. According to the 1262 agreement the castle should have been destroyed, and the area (*platea*) given over to the triarchs for habitation. Since it is explicitly mentioned as functioning in 1317, Jacoby⁶⁶ believes that between 1262 and 1317 Venice re-acquired the plot of the old *Castrum Pontis* and rebuilt a new military work, in order to protect its own fortified quarter. This was probably the structure that housed the *Porta di Marina*, giving access to the Euripos bridge.

The third fortification structure of 14th century Negroponte is known only through the sources: in 1304 the Venetian community decided to separate its quarter from the Lombard section by building gates and walls and blocking passages; the cost of these works was to be partly covered by the Jewish community.⁶⁷ The works were surely over by 1317 when during the Catalan assault on the city, the Lombard section was occupied while the Venetian one resisted successfully. This proves that these fortifications were of a substantial volume and defensive capacity.

The 15th century, when Negroponte was entirely under direct Venetian rule, saw the need for continuous experimentation in fortification patterns as a result of the new artillery technology, one

⁵³ JACOBY, consolidation 156.

⁵⁴ JACOBY, consolidation 167–168.

⁵⁵ KODER, *Negroponte* 75; ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, *μεσαιωνικό τείχος* 282; GEORGOPOULOU, *Colonies* 59–60.

⁵⁶ KODER, *Negroponte* 75.

⁵⁷ KODER – HILD, *Hellas und Thessalia* 157; JACOBY, consolidation 175; IDEM, *Demographic Evolution* 158.

⁵⁸ JACOBY, consolidation 177.

⁵⁹ ANDREWS, *Castles* 186.

⁶⁰ KODER, *Negroponte* 80; BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies* I 48–54; SAMPSON, *Συμβολή* 18–19.

⁶¹ Nicetas Choniates 610 (VAN DIETEN).

⁶² KODER, *Negroponte* 47; ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, *μεσαιωνικό τείχος* 283; GEORGOPOULOU, *Colonies* 59–60.

⁶³ JACOBY, consolidation 162–163, 166.

⁶⁴ JACOBY, consolidation 166–167.

⁶⁵ JACOBY, consolidation 173.

⁶⁶ JACOBY, consolidation 168, 172–174.

⁶⁷ JACOBY, consolidation 169–172; ΓΟΦΑΣ, *βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte* 26; ANDREWS, *Castles* 186.

that proved itself on the walls of Constantinople.⁶⁸ Furthermore, a series of earthquakes around 1450 damaged the walls and necessitated extensive rebuilding. Venice carried on a centrally-controlled large-scale fortification plan that concentrated on the urban enclosure and can be roughly dated to the mid-15th century up to 1470, when the city fell to the Ottomans. Archival sources refer to the sums spent and the resources provided for the operation, with no specific details as to the work itself.⁶⁹

On the ground, it seems that the medieval walls were modified, never wholly destroyed but only constantly added upon, a clear sign of the omnipresent Ottoman danger. It can be observed, again thanks to old pictures and the 1840 topographical plan, that curtains became more massive with the construction of an external talus, and their height was reduced in order to withstand enemy artillery (fig. 3b).

The moat that encircled the mainland front since Byzantine times took its final form, its width and construction taking into account the existence and function of counter-artillery works.⁷⁰ It completely cut off the city from its hinterland: when filled with water, as it seems to have been the original intention of its builders, Negroponte would have literally been turned into an island. In fact, the surviving part of the urban enclosure within the military camp preserves this defensive arrangement with a small section of the walls, the moat and the counterscarp on the opposite side (fig. 3).

Massive earthworks, sort of early bastions or independent forts were constructed at the middle and corners of the mainland front, obviously the side which was considered strategically most vulnerable. The earthworks were combined with, and protected the main gates that connected the city to its hinterland through bridges. Mackay⁷¹ identified these earthworks with the *rivellini* mentioned in Angiolello's 1470-siege account, namely the Rivellino del Tempio, Rivellino "il Stretto" and Rivellino del Burchio, following his reconstruction of the city's topography (figs. 1.27, 1.2, 1.12); another one, the Rivellino di Mollini should probably be placed on the sea front, across the Euripos Bridge at the area of the Porta di Marina and the famous water-powered mills (fig. 1.26).⁷²

These additions to the medieval enclosure were repeatedly recorded in a number of rescue excavations along Eleutheriou Venizelou, Papanastasiou and Favierou streets, proving that they were part of a systematic endeavor throughout the perimeter of the city (figs. 1.1–1.2).⁷³ The following structures were identified (fig. 2): a) a second wall, (recorded as wall B) built directly on the outside and parallel to the previous wall A, thus virtually doubling the fortification's width. Wall B was constructed with rubble and its foundations were ca. 0,50 m higher than wall A proving that this was a later addition to a pre-existing structure, b) a talus that covered the lower parts of the walls and defined the edge of a deep moat, c) a polygonal structure for canons in front of the medieval rectangular tower, built with cannon holes at the basement and arrow slits at a floor above, d) a series of tunnels that run along the base of the walls, obviously in order to detect enemy mining activity and to repair possible damages⁷⁴, e) one of the bridges crossing the moat was found intact under the pavement of the Papanastasiou street. Its pointed arch, made of mortared masonry of large stones had a width of 3,86 m stretching over a distance of 6,80 m.

Another defensive structure dating from this period was the Fort of Euripos Bridge (figs. 1.25, 7). The structure, which survived up to the 19th century, was a dominant feature of the city and is

⁶⁸ K. DE VRIES, Gunpowder Weapons at the Siege of Constantinople, 1453, in: War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean 7th–15th Centuries, ed. Y. Lev. Leiden 1997, 343–362.

⁶⁹ THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 384; KODER, Negroponte 59, 75; PAPADAKIS, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 283–284.

⁷⁰ KODER, Negroponte 72–73 records earlier works in the moat in 1415–1416.

⁷¹ MACKAY, New Light 4–5.

⁷² KODER, Negroponte 81. See below, n. 111.

⁷³ A. K. ANDREIOMENOU, Εύβοια. AD 16 (1960), Chronika 151; LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1971, 277; GEORGIOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 314–315.

⁷⁴ The excavators dated all these structures to the ottoman period (second half of the 17th century), at the time just before the Venetian siege of the city, see PAPADAKIS, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 278.

represented on numerous engravings, photographs and postcards.⁷⁵ It was a defense construction of trapezoidal shape, with two massive circular towers to the side overlooking the Boeotian coastline. The latest study by Pantelidou-Alexiadou and Mamaloukos⁷⁶ has thoroughly treated both the written sources and the archaeological remains. The basic conclusion is that the fort belonged to a single construction phase and was part of a building program that underwent only minor additions in later times. Architectural evidence in combination with the coat-of-arms that once adorned the Fort's gate suggests that the project dates from the mid 15th century and was probably carried out in the early 1460s. The Fort of Euripos Bridge was a singular fortification specimen in Greece: on the one hand its plan shows originality and the ability to adapt its defensive features to a very particular location, ie a small islet within a channel. On the other hand, it was obviously a high quality military structure, well suited to withstand the advances of gunpowder technology.

The placement of the wall gates of Negroponte was of vital importance to the historic topography of the city, since their positioning defined also the settlement's main axis. We assume that the streets remained unaltered as long as their entrances and exits, that is, their starting points, were fixed by the walls. Even though there is no evidence for the previous centuries, a number of notes have survived for the Lombard-Venetian period (including the accounts of the 1470 siege and later map depictions) leading to the identification both of gates recorded on the 1840 topographical plan, and of a number of gates that did not survive and were probably blocked at the time.

In the first group we may include the Porta di Marina, connecting the city to the Euripos bridge and the Boeotian coast (fig. 1.26)⁷⁷, the Porta di Cristo (later known as Upper Gate, or Gate of the Jews, fig. 1.2) at the end of the city's main artery leading to the east, approximately the present Kotsou street (figs. 1.20, 1.32), and the later known Lower Gate (Κάτω Πόρτα, fig. 1.27), at the northern corner of the walls, very near the northern Euboean Gulf.⁷⁸ Mackay identified the last one with the gate of the Temple (porta del Tempio), while previous research placed the Porta del Tempio at the southern area of the city leading to the area of Bourko.⁷⁹

Among the lesser gates whose exact location is still conjectural, we can cite: the postern gate of the Patriarchate (Portello del Patriarcado) probably situated along the eastern wall between the Gate of Christ and the one of Bourko⁸⁰; the gate of the Shipyard/Arsenal (porta del Arsenal) along the southern wall⁸¹; the gate known as La Castagnola located by the western sea-front between the northern angle of the town and the Euripos bridge⁸²; finally the postern gates leading to the fish market (de la Pescharia) and the Judeca (de la Zudecha)⁸³.

Two groups of items are directly linked to the defenses of the Venetian city. The first includes the architectural reliefs with the Lion of St. Mark and the coat-of-arms of the city's officials, which were originally inserted in the sections of the walls for whose erection or rebuilding they were responsible. As expected, the majority of these reliefs are reported to have come from around the gates, where they would be best viewed in order to communicate their visual message. A number of them are presently exhibited in the Karampampa Fortress (fig. 8). The lions of St. Mark, roughly dated

⁷⁵ See for ex. S. KOKKINIS, Ιστορικά μνημεία και λαϊκή αρχιτεκτονική στη Χαλκίδα. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 15 (1969) figs. 15–21, 46–50.

⁷⁶ A. PANTELIDOU-ALEXIADOU – ST. MAMALOUKOS, Το φρούριο της γέφυρας του Ευρίπου, in: Venezia-Eubea 293–318. For previous studies, see KODER, Negroponte 79–85; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 191–192.

⁷⁷ KODER, Negroponte 78; GEORGOPOULOU, Colonies 73.

⁷⁸ KODER, Negroponte 78; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 199.

⁷⁹ MAC KAY, New Light 2–3. For the opposite view see KODER, Negroponte 79; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 199.

⁸⁰ KODER, Negroponte 79; MAC KAY, New Light 3.

⁸¹ KODER, Negroponte 78–79.

⁸² MAC KAY, New Light 6, based on the Camoccio plan.

⁸³ KODER, Negroponte 79.

from the 14th–15th century, are in various postures, some emerging from the waters, others walking or seated with open or closed gospel.⁸⁴ Their provenance, save for isolated cases, is still a matter of speculation, except that many of them decorated the gates and were probably collected once the walls were suppressed in the late 19th–early 20th century.⁸⁵ As a result, they were deprived of any historic significance related to the original placement.

Coat-of-arms, usually in groups of three carved on a single slab, reflect the Venetian system of administration with the *bailo* and his two counsellors being collectively responsible for public works.⁸⁶ Buchon was the first to record them in the 19th century, while Tipaldo verified and recognized a number of them in the 1920s.⁸⁷ Some may be attributed to the most distinguished Venetian families, such as the Bembo, Loredan, Dandolo, Barbarigo, Foscarini, Civran, Quirini and Michiel. They are probably dated to the second half of the 15th century, the period of extensive works on the walls.

The second group of items linked to the defense of the Venetian city is the well known “armour of Chalcis”. In 1840 sacks with helmets, breast plates and other armorial accoutrements were allegedly found bricked up in a wall next to the city’s military hospital (whose exact location is presently unknown). Fabricius, the military commander at the time, notified immediately King Otto and dispatched the items to Athens. They were first placed in the palace, then stored on the Acropolis, and were finally deposited in the Ethnological Museum (mod. National Historical Museum, run by the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece).⁸⁸

Soon after its discovery, the find was examined and recorded by Buchon. He spoke of circa hundred helmets which, in his opinion, should be a remnant of the battle fought by the Franks against the invading Catalan Company in 1311.⁸⁹ In the early 20th century, Traquair measured and photographed the items once again.⁹⁰ At the time Ffoulkes published his study, there were sixty-three helmets left, “two large cases full of pieces of body-armour, cuisses, knee-cops, jambs, gauntlets, and portions of breast- and back-plates ... a jazeran coat of plates, and a case full of arrow-heads and caltrops”.⁹¹ The majority of helmets were identified as essentially of Italian making, though some belonged to forms used in German-speaking lands. They included various types, known as bascinets, salads, Turkish (-style) helmets, armets. Together with the body armour Ffoulkes dated them from the mid-fourteenth to mid-fifteenth century. The idea proposed was that they were piled in the wall crypt before or during the 1470 siege in the hope of later use.⁹² Of special interest were the armourers’ stamps

⁸⁴ Thirteen lions, isolated or combined with coat-of-arms are currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

⁸⁵ Mentioned by Bronzetti who visited the site in the period 1832–1835, see ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 287.

⁸⁶ Five such slabs are currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities), while a sixth is kept at the Ephorate store-rooms.

⁸⁷ G. E. TIPALDO, Τα φράγκικα οικόσημα της Χαλκίδος. *EEBS* 4 (1927) 352–364.

⁸⁸ K.N. RADOS, Τα εκ Χαλκίδος κράνη του Ιστορικού και Εθνολογικού Μουσείου. *DIEE* 8 (1921) 606–607; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 194–195; S.W. PYHRR, European Armor from the Imperial Ottoman Arsenal. *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 24 (1989) 85.

⁸⁹ CH. FFOLKES, On Italian Armour from Chalcis in the Ethnological Museum at Athens. *Archaeologia* 62 (1911) 382; RADOS, Τα εκ Χαλκίδος κράνη 607–608, 610–612. Buchon and his contemporary writers located the battle in the plain of Kopais, while later research concluded in favor of the Almyros in Thessaly, see D. JACOBY, Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Roumanie (1305–1332): un nouveau témoignage de Marino Sanudo Torsello. *Studi Medievali* 15 (1974) 223–230 (= IDEM, Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies. London 1979, V) with previous bibliography.

⁹⁰ The majority of these photos are kept in the Byzantine Research Fund, at the British School at Athens. I would like to thank A. Kakissis and the staff of the School for their help and for providing digital reproductions of this material.

⁹¹ FFOLKES, On Italian Armour 382. See also RADOS, Τα εκ Χαλκίδος κράνη 610; IDEM (ed.), Κατάλογος του μουσείου της Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής Εταιρείας. Athena 1927, 217–218; I.A. ΜΕΛΕΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οδηγός του Εθνικού Ιστορικού Μουσείου. Athena 1965, 18–19.

⁹² FFOLKES, On Italian Armour 383–388; RADOS, Τα εκ Χαλκίδος κράνη 608–609; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 195.

preserved on a number of pieces, of which Ffoulkes identified only the initials of Antonio da Misaglia, who worked in Milan from 1451 to 1490.⁹³ In 1919–1920 Dean acquired, by exchange after “thirty years’ troublesome negotiation”⁹⁴, virtually all of the body armour and about a dozen helmets, approximately two hundred pieces in all. They ended in the Metropolitan Museum of New York following his death in 1928. Cleaned and repaired, they are incorporated and exhibited into composite armours, in an effort to visually ‘reconstruct’ pre–1500 weaponry.⁹⁵ Most of them are identified as Italian and dated to ca. 1400.⁹⁶

The variety observed in the ‘Chalcis armour’ fits perfectly with the information deriving from a manuscript preserved at the Top Kapi library, Istanbul, and listing the Negroponte garrison in 1460–1462.⁹⁷ It records the numbers, payments, and different weapons of the soldiers. The men came from different states and origins, Italians from every part of the peninsula, Greeks, Slaves, Spaniards, French, Germans, Scots, Hungarians, even one from Crimea. This varied mercenary force was constantly strengthened by the Venetian authorities in their effort to battle against an omnipresent Ottoman threat.

The Venetian defense system proved its reliability in the 1470 fierce siege, accounts of which survive in a number of chronicles.⁹⁸ The presence of Turkish artillery proved a decisive factor, since the defenders were unable to counterbalance its effectiveness. In the end the enemy succeeded in breaking the single-lined land front. After filling-in the moat and escalating or mining the walls, the attackers forced their way through the medieval city, with the defenders gradually retreating to their last refuge (the Fort of Euripos Bridge). The naval superiority of Venice proved unequal to the Ottoman land supremacy.

The topography of the city within the walls is illustrated by two complementary data sets, namely the historic-archival information and the archaeological-architectural record. Historical interest has mainly focused on locating the various areas mentioned in the documents in relation to the surviving monuments.

Jacoby has thoroughly dealt with correlating the Venetian presence and expansion within the Lombard settlement in the 13th and 14th century to the actual city’s topography.⁹⁹ It started with the 1211 concession by Ravanno dale Carceri of a *fondaco* (shops around a campus or *platea*) and an existing church re-dedicated to St. Mark, and continued with the 1216 agreements between the *bailo* and the new triarchs, when further Venetian acquisitions were ratified as clusters not subject to the latter’s authority.¹⁰⁰ However, it was with the treaties of 1256 that a unified Venetian space seems to have been created within Negroponte. This led to the creation of two sections co-existing within the urban walls, the Venetian and the Lombard one.¹⁰¹

⁹³ FFOULKES, On Italian Armour 388–389.

⁹⁴ B. DEAN, Early Gothic Armor. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 1925, 133. The exchange included “important items, icons, weapons and flags”; RADOS, Τα εκ Χαλκίδος κράνη 606, n. 1.

⁹⁵ PYHRR, European Armor 85–86, n. 2.

⁹⁶ DEAN, Early Gothic Armor 133–134; H. NICKEL, Arms and Armor from the permanent collection. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 49 (1991) 15, 64.

⁹⁷ CAPIZZI, Un documento inedito 86–103; M. ZORZI, Le truppe veneziane a Negroponte nel 1460–1462 in un codice trascritto e commentato dal compianto C. Capizzi, in: Venezia-Eubea 41–43.

⁹⁸ THIRIET, La Romanie Vénitienne 390; KODER, Negroponte 60–62, 70, 77, 98–99. For the chronicles of Giacomo Rizzardo and Jacopo dalla Castellana, see G. ΓΙΚΑΣ, Δύο βενετσιάνικα χρονικά για την άλωση της Χαλκίδας από τους Τούρκους στα 1470. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 6 (1959) 205–229, 245–254; ΡΑΠΑΔΑΚΙΣ, μεσαιωνικό τείχος 284–285. For the account of Giovan-Maria Angiolello (original text and translation by P.A. ΜΑΚΚΑΥ), see <http://angiolello.net/ANG-text.pdf> and <http://angiolello.net/ANG-trans.pdf> (accessed 16-5-2011). For a visual reconstruction of the 1470 siege as proposed by P.A. Mackay, see <http://angiolello.net/NegroponteSiege.html> (accessed 16-5-2011). For Ottoman chronicles, see G. C. ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές της Χαλκίδας, in: Tourkologika. Timetikos tomos gia ton Anastasio K. Iordanoglou, ed. G. Salakides. Thessaloniki 2011, 65, n. 6.

⁹⁹ JACOBY, consolidation 152–181; IDEM, Demographic Evolution 132–133.

¹⁰⁰ JACOBY, consolidation 157–159; see also KODER, Negroponte 46–47.

¹⁰¹ JACOBY, consolidation 166, 169–170; also IDEM, Demographic Evolution 142–143.

The relevant documents preserve a number of topographic landmarks and directions defining the areas under discussion, such as the church Santa Maria dei Cruciferi di Bologna, the Castrum Pontis, the Ruga Maistra, Santa Margarita, the Bishop's residence, the Dominican convent. Jacoby¹⁰² concluded that, following these concessions, the Venetian quarter extended along the larger part of Negroponte's maritime front. Its boundary to the north of the Euripos Bridge reached the northeastern flank of the city next to the Porta di Cristo, and continued southwards reaching down to the bay of Bourko. Despite provisions for free circulation and respect of the public character of streets, Venice fortified its own section in 1304, as mentioned above, a situation that must have persisted until 1390 when she acquired direct control of the whole city.¹⁰³

Recreating the historic topography of Negroponte resembles a puzzle with a number of pieces that seem to fall into their correct place, while others cannot presently be located, even tentatively.¹⁰⁴ The San Marco church is usually identified with the surviving Emir Zade mosque of Chalcis, while the original Venetian market would be in the area of the Pesonton Opliton square (fig. 1.19).¹⁰⁵ Castrum Pontis is set at the present Athanaton square (fig. 1.26), while the Euripos Bridge was also known under the name of San Marco. The Dominican church has been acknowledged as the still-standing Agia Paraskevi building (fig. 1.23). Mackay has located the district known as *il Tempio* to the north sea-side angle of the town, while placing in the northeastern area the Bishopric (*Vescovado*) and the cathedral dedicated to St Nicholas.¹⁰⁶ This church was also the seat of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, relocated to Negroponte in 1261 and whose function was combined with that of the city's prelate after 1314.¹⁰⁷

For the Ruga Maistra, the main axis of the city, we only know that it started at the Castrum Pontis and proceeded in a southeastern direction towards the bay of Bourko.¹⁰⁸ It was therefore proposed that it may be identified with two actual axes of the historic centre:¹⁰⁹ the east-west axis coincides with Kotsou Street (figs. 1.20, 1.32) starting at the present Euripos Bridge (the location of the Castrum Pontis, figs. 1.25–1.26) and leading past the Pesonton Opliton square (San Marco fondaco, fig. 1.19) straight to the east end of the city where the Porta di Cristo would have been (fig. 1.2). The second north-south axis splits off from Kotsou street: its southern section (*Paidon* and *Stamati* streets, figs. 1.28–1.30) heads towards the Bourko area, passing along the Pesonton Opliton square (the San Marco area) and then the Agia Paraskevi church (the Dominican church, fig. 1.23). Its northern extension (the present *Angeli Goviou* street, fig. 1.31) leads straight to the Lower Gate of the walls (fig. 1.27).

The Venetian arsenal, built probably around 1300 and first attested in 1319, lay at the bay of Bourko, near the southwest angle of the urban enclosure.¹¹⁰ A series of watermills stood next to the Porta di Marina and are known through engravings and traveler accounts (fig. 1.26). They were built along the urban wall and were operated by the power of the tide waves, the famous Euripos current

¹⁰² JACOBY, consolidation 161–166.

¹⁰³ JACOBY, consolidation 172–173, 174–181.

¹⁰⁴ For a map presenting the topographic reconstruction of P.A. Mackay, see <http://angiolello.net/Medieval%20Negropont.htm> (accessed 16-5-2011).

¹⁰⁵ KODER, Negroponte 90–91; JACOBY, consolidation 154–156; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, *μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα* 202. For a different view locating the San Marco district between the north end of the town and the Euripos bridge, see MACKAY, *New Light* 6.

¹⁰⁶ MACKAY, *New Light* 5; however, the same author locates the Patriarchate to the south part of the city.

¹⁰⁷ TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, *Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα* 172; ΡΑΠΑΔΙΑ-ΛΑΛΑ, *Κοινωνική οργάνωση* 28; P.D. MASTRODIMITRIS, *Το Λατινικό Πατριαρχείο στην Εύβοια (Negroponte) και τα εκεί κτήματά του*, in: *Venezia–Eubea* 119–122.

¹⁰⁸ JACOBY, consolidation 161–162.

¹⁰⁹ N.D. DELINIKOLAS – V. VEMI, *Η Αγία Παρασκευή Χαλκίδας. Ένα βενετικό πρόγραμμα ανοικοδόμησης το 13^ο αιώνα*, in: *Venezia–Eubea* 259–260. Also KODER, *Negroponte* 90.

¹¹⁰ KODER, *Negroponte* 77–78; JACOBY, consolidation 169; GEORGOPOULOU, *Colonies* 67.

that alternates its course every six hours. They were regarded as a mechanical achievement.¹¹¹ They continued to function during the Ottoman period and were recorded by Evliya Çelebi.¹¹²

The location of the Jewish quarter and its synagogue has also been a matter of discussion.¹¹³ It was situated until the mid 14th century outside the urban enclosure in the triarchs area. The community was relocated around 1350 within the walls in the Venetian quarter, with the synagogue remaining outside the walls. A new *Judeca* or *Zudaica* was established within the urban enclosure, probably in the second half of the 14th century; it was located along the bay of Bourko and was separated from the Christian population by walls.¹¹⁴ A single dedicatory inscription, dated 1326 and referring to the construction or the restoration of a Jewish synagogue provides the only material evidence for the presence of such a community locally during the Frankish period. The stone was later inserted above the Lower Gate of the walls, and retrieved after their demolition.¹¹⁵

Unfortunately, a substantial number of topographic references cannot be presently located on the ground with any probability: private residences like the house of Geremia Ghisi, which is said to be situated behind the San Marco church; several churches within the walls, both Orthodox and Latin, such as Santi Apostoli, San Giovanni Bocca d'Oro, San Francesco, Santa Margarita, and San Giorgio. Three more churches were found beyond the walls, namely the Santa Maria nunnery that probably lay at the hill later known as Veli Bampa, Santa Chiara and San Filippo. Finally, a series of, locations (such as the Becaria, the Figara, the Fornaci, etc), and hilltops, found in documents or in the chronicles related to the 1470 siege.¹¹⁶

The architectural-archaeological record of urban life in Negroponte, though perhaps inferior to expectations, proves substantial. The largest surviving monument of Negroponte, counting among the principal medieval sites of Greece, is the timber-roofed basilica of Agia Paraskevi (figs. 1.23, 9).¹¹⁷ It has long been the subject of research with a number of contradicting suggestions concerning both its architectural history and its dedication.¹¹⁸ We presently accept the conclusions of Mackay¹¹⁹ and of Delinikolas – Vemi¹²⁰ that the building we see today was erected in the 13th century and should be

¹¹¹ I.N. ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΙΣ, Σκέψεις για τους παλιρροιακούς θαλασσόμυλους του βενετσιάνικου κάστρου της Χαλκίδας, in: Venezia–Eubea 319–346; IDEM, Τριάντα οκτώ ξετροχάρηδες και δύο αζετροχάρηδες ανεμόμυλοι σε δέκα οκτώ περιοχές της Εύβοιας. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 34 (2001–2002) 20–21. Also KODER, Negroponte 81; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 199.

¹¹² G.I. FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' του Εβλιά Τσελεμπί. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 6 (1959) 158.

¹¹³ For a general account on the Negroponte Jewish community as well as individual cases, see I. SIAKIS, Οι Εβραίοι της Χαλκίδας επί Βενετοκρατίας, in: 'E pole tes Chalkidas' 229–249; S. BORSARI, Ricchi e poveri nelle comunità ebraiche di Candia e Negroponte (secc. XIII–XIV), in: Ricchi e poveri 211–222; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 159–167; IDEM, Foreigners 124–125.

¹¹⁴ KODER, Negroponte 79, 87–88, 94; JACOBY, consolidation 165, 179–180; IDEM, Demographic Evolution 160, 162–163. Also GEORGOPOULOU, Colonies 56, 200–202; MOSCHONAS, Εύριπος 160–161.

¹¹⁵ N.I. GIANNOPOULOS, Συμβολαί εις την ιστορίαν των Ιουδαϊκών παροικιών εν τη ανατολική ηπειρωτική Ελλάδι, Χαλκίς. *EEBS* 10 (1933) 188–189; KODER, Negroponte 94–95, n. 166. It must probably be identified with the one published as a tombstone by M. SCHWAB, Une inscription hebraïque à Chalcis. *Revue des Etudes Juives* 53 (1907) 283; JACOBSON, Enigma 121. The inscription was studied anew by the personnel of the Jewish Museum of Greece under the director Zanet Battinou (unpublished report, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities) and is currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress. A tombstone published by GIANNOPOULOS, Συμβολαί 190, fig. 2 and dated 1349, is no longer accounted for.

¹¹⁶ KODER, Negroponte 46, 94–95; GIANNOPOULOS, Χριστιανικά αρχαιότητες 127–128; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 197, 202; IDEM, Χριστιανική και μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 187; JACOBY, consolidation 157; IDEM, Demographic Evolution 140.

¹¹⁷ For restoration and other works carried out by the Archaeological Service on the monument, see LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1965, 292–293; LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1966, 236–237; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 512; E. MANOLESSOU, Νομός Εύβοιας. *AD* 36 (1981), Β'1 Chronika 78; ΚΟΥΝΟΥΠΙΟΤΟΥ, Νομός Εύβοιας 100; E. ΚΟΥΝΟΥΠΙΟΤΟΥ-MANOLESSEU, Βυζαντινά, μεσαιωνικά και νεότερα μνημεία Ευβοίας. *AD* 34 (1979), Β'1 Chronika 182.

¹¹⁸ Summarized and critically evaluated in P.A. MACKAY, St Mary of the Dominicans: The Monastery of the Fratres Praedicatorum in Negropont, in: Venezia–Eubea 138–141. See the older views in KODER, Negroponte 92–93; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 186–191.

¹¹⁹ MACKAY, St Mary 125–156.

¹²⁰ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, Αγία Παρασκευή Χαλκίδας 229–254, esp. 238–239, 251–253.

identified with the *Domus Fratrum Praedicatorum*, the church of the Dominican monastery of Negroponte, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St Domenic. The monastery, a dependency of the order's Lombard branches, is mentioned in 1262 and probably existed already by 1249.¹²¹ This three-aisled basilica bears distinct Gothic features, while using for its colonnade early Christian architectural sculptures.¹²² Useful evidence is provided by the study of the building's timber roof, which survives intact in its original position, decorated with the emblem of Venice and an unidentified coat-of-arms.¹²³ Tree-ring examination coupled with historic information led to the conclusion that the wood was probably shipped from Venice to Negroponte in 1249–1250 for the roof, which was completed before 1254. Of particular importance are the Gothic sculptural elements of the church, including the relief figures of St Domenic and St Peter of Verona at the triumphal arch; they have been compared to French examples of the mid 13th century.¹²⁴ Also, wall-paintings are preserved on the walls of the northeastern chapel.¹²⁵ They bear witness to an eclectic late Byzantine art selecting its stylistic and pictorial motives both from the Byzantine and western European repertoire.

The recent excavation of a plot next to the church has revealed the foundations of small rectangular structures of the Frankish/Venetian period, along with quantities of human bones. These suggest a funerary use of the structures, clearly in relation to nearby Agia Parakevi.¹²⁶

Opposite Agia Paraskevi's entrance lies the single preserved example of Negroponte's civic architecture, currently known as "House of the *Bailo*" (figs. 1.29).¹²⁷ Research has been carried out for years with the aim of producing a final proposal for the monument's restoration project. Despite earlier views and suggestions of an early Christian baptistery, we presently consider that the building consists of two sections, with the southern Venetian being earlier, while the northern part was a later construction under Turkish rule.¹²⁸

The Venetian section of the building has an open gallery at ground floor with its façade being arranged with pointed Gothic arches supported on columns. The first floor was occupied by rooms with a wooden floor and ceiling, whose beams and corbels resemble closely the ones of Agia Paraskevi. The gallery originally continued along three sides of a rectangle, thus creating an open-air public square in front of the church. It is a typical sample of Venetian secular architecture, tentatively dated to the end of the 13th or the 14th century.

The proposed identification of the building with the lodging of the Venetian governor of the city¹²⁹, where various events related to the last days of Venetian rule took place, cannot be presently substantiated. According to the sources the *bailo* palace should be placed at the San Marco's square, the present Pesonton Opliton.¹³⁰ George Wheler was shown a palace to the east of the bridge, where he recorded an inscription dated 1273, presently lost, which mentioned the *bailo* Nicola Miani and

¹²¹ MACKAY, *St Mary* 127–129.

¹²² For a concise description of the monument with all previous bibliography, see MACKAY, *St Mary* 143–152; DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 230–254.

¹²³ P. I. KUNIHOLM, Aegean Dendrochronology Project December 2004 Project Report. <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/dendro/2004News/ADP2004.html> (accessed 28-12-2010); IDEM – C. B. GRIGGS – M. W. NEWTON, Evidence for early Timber Trade in the Mediterranean, in: *Byzantina mediterranea*, ed. K. Belke – E. Kislinger – A. Külzer – M. A. Stassinopoulou. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2007, 378–379; MACKAY, *St Mary* 156; DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 245–247.

¹²⁴ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 233, 241–243, 247–250; also MACKAY, *St Mary* 150.

¹²⁵ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 244–245.

¹²⁶ Toulitsi-Loumi-Loumaki plot at Erotokritou and Olynthou streets (excavator: I. Vaxevanis).

¹²⁷ For the monument, its identity and role within the medieval settlement, see GEORGOPOULOU, *Colonies* 102. For restoration work by the Archaeological Service, see LAZARIDIS, *Βυζαντινά* 1970, 261; IDEM, *Βυζαντινά* 1971, 274; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973, 311.

¹²⁸ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 254–257, 262–263

¹²⁹ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 256–257; MACKAY, *New Light* 3.

¹³⁰ KODER, *Negroponte* 90; JACOBY, *consolidation* 171.

the counselors Michiel da Andro and Pietro Navagero.¹³¹ The building in front of the church has also been identified as the quarters of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, whose seat would be at Agia Paraskevi, again an unsubstantiated hypothesis.¹³²

Rescue excavations in various parts of the castle have proved the existence of densely populated areas, even if this may not have been the case throughout the urban space.¹³³ Many structures, especially those near the main city axis (Kotsou street, figs. 1.20, 1.32), were built of fine mortared masonry with facings of ashlar porous blocks and bricks at the joints, reflecting the luxury and high economic standard of the inhabitants.¹³⁴ Where remains of various periods coexisted, one of the key observations was the continuity of the Byzantine into the Frankish/Venetian building phase. There was nowhere a distinct separation either in the shape of houses, such as a change of orientation or building materials, or in their lay-out. In fact, in a number of cases the finds were inseparably dated to the 12th–13th century, proving the smooth transition between Euripos and Negroponte.¹³⁵ The same observation is valid for a number of tombs investigated in the area outside the walls, along the Eleutheriou Venizelou street.¹³⁶

Three plots, lately excavated outside the walls, to the north and east of the city, gave first indications both for the extent and the character of the suburbs (figs. 1.24, 1.34, 1.38).¹³⁷ In all cases, the structures were of rather poor masonry, usually with rough stones and earth as connecting material, surviving only at foundation level. In the case of the Orionos street (figs. 1.24, 4a) the rooms were interpreted as workshops. Furthermore, the plots at Balalaion and Mitropoleos streets (figs. 1.34, 1.38), despite their poor architecture, yielded large quantities of exclusively 13th–15th century ceramics, including late Byzantine pottery and Venetian Renaissance specimens (fig. 5b), along with tripod stilts, a find connected to ceramic kilns.

A preliminary examination of the pottery of Negroponte deriving both from older and more recent excavations, though still an ongoing process, confirms the impression that the city was a major commercial centre combining international relations with a strong local tradition and production. Categories of imported ceramics, mainly Italian such as proto-majolica, polychrome sgraffito or Spanish luster ware, co-exist with a variety of wares from late-Byzantine workshops. It will now be necessary to identify wares of local production, reflected by the numerous stilts used for the positioning of vessels within the kilns that were found in various plots, both within and outside the walls.

This co-existence of western cultural artifacts with late Byzantine ones is also expressed by the surviving sculpture. The first category includes specimens of distinctly Italian style and character, coming both from secular and religious buildings. Secular sculpture is almost confined to individual coat-of-arms, quite distinct from the ones on the walls (fig. 8b). A number of them probably derived from the facades of houses owned by members of the social elite. When the houses were destroyed or restructured following the 1470 Ottoman conquest, the slabs were re-used as mere construction material. They were initially recorded in the 19th century and studied later by Tipaldo.¹³⁸ However, a

¹³¹ KODER, Negroponte 91; ANDREWS, Castles 187–188.

¹³² KODER, Negroponte 92.

¹³³ See JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 168, 170.

¹³⁴ This has recently been confirmed in the oldest parts of the Sultana Negrin plot at 39–41, Kotsou street (excavator: D. Kotrikas).

¹³⁵ As in the cases of the Ika plot at Agia Barbara square (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 499–507), or the Technike Etaireia Dome plot at Trapezountiou and Isaioiu streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 509–510)

¹³⁶ Xidi plot (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 314).

¹³⁷ Chanos plot at Balalaion street, Atton plot at Metropoleos street, and Delivorias plot at Orionos street (excavator: I. Vaxevanis). For the historic sources, see JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 168–169.

¹³⁸ TIPALDO, Τα φράγκικα οικόσημα 357–364. For written records of noble families residing in Negroponte, see JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 140–141, 144–145.

number of them are no longer accounted for.¹³⁹ Tipaldo recognized the emblems of the Bondumier, Sagredo, Cicogna, Onorati, Marcelo, and Foscarini families, to which we may add the Querini and Zorzi families. An interesting case is the well-head carved of a single meerschaum stone featuring a coat-of-arms with stars and fleur-de-lis, probably dating to the end of the 14th or early 15th century.¹⁴⁰ Finally, three tombstones bear the emblems of their defunct owners, along with inscriptions commemorating them. Two of them, the one belonging to a member of the Contarini family and the second to one Berdarius, are currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress. The last tombstone survives in its original place: it is the funerary effigy of the patrician Pietro Lippomano († 1397) in the northwestern chapel of Agia Paraskevi.¹⁴¹

Another group of religious sculptures follow a typical Gothic style and bear resemblance to the architectural reliefs from Agia Paraskevi.¹⁴² Two of them represent the Agnus Dei subject-matter; a number of capitals are decorated with schematic floral and faunal patterns, while a drain-pipe in the form of a lion-head stands apart for its expressivity. They were all probably detached from unknown religious monuments that served the Latin-rite residents and clearly formed part of a wider stylistic group, found throughout Latin Greece.

The second category of architectural sculpture includes specimens of typically late Byzantine style, decorated with geometric and vegetal motifs that were fully integrated in the artistic repertory of Greek workshops. Next to slabs coming from iconostasis panels, pries-dieu or (pseudo-) sarcophagi covers, there are fragments of cornices, architraves or arched frames.¹⁴³

A group of minor objects originating from Negroponte and presently kept in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and the British Museum, London, testify to the city's high standard of material prosperity. It is known as the "Chalcis Treasure" and consists of a variety of silver, gold and gold-plated objects.¹⁴⁴ They were discovered in the 1860's, allegedly inside a house located within the city's medieval enclosure. The group was subsequently split in two unequal parts and sold to the English museums by Paul Lampros, an Athenian art-dealer and famous numismatist of the day.

The Ashmolean acquired a number of rings, while the British Museum lot included earrings and rings, a silver plate, decorative embellishments from garments and girdles or belts, such as buckles, strap ends, rectangular plaques, small decorative items and buttons. They are all made in a variety of techniques (incised, niello, enameled, filigree) and embellished with diverse motives (incised female figures, heraldic symbols, inscriptions, etc.). Apparently they were valued and considered as markers of personal and family wealth and status. It is plausible that they were hidden by their owners in view of the impending Ottoman attack, in the erroneous hope of retrieving them later.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁹ Six fragmented slabs and a well-head are currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

¹⁴⁰ It was found at the Konstantinou plot, Basileiou street, on 1/1/1977.

¹⁴¹ For this legendary figure and its tombstone, see P. A. MACKAY, The Patrician from Negropont. <http://angiolello.net/Lippomano.html> (accessed 16-5-2011); S. LAMPROS, Πέτρος Λιππαμάνος, ο σύμβουλος Χαλκίδος. *NE* 7 (1910) 314–316; ANDREWS, Castles 188, n. 34; JACOBY, Demographic Evolution 156; MUELLER, Greeks in Venice 175–176.

¹⁴² Twelve fragments of architectural reliefs are exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

¹⁴³ TH. PAZARAS, Ανάγλυφες σαρκοφάγοι και επιτάφιας πλάκες της μέσης και ύστερης βυζαντινής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα (*Demosiumata tou Archaïologikou Deltiou* 38). Athena 1988, 49–50, 146, 153, nos. 67–68, pl. 55α–β. Nine fragments of this category are exhibited at the Karampampa fortress (Catalogue of sculpture exhibits, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

¹⁴⁴ O. M. DALTON, Medieval Personal Ornaments from Chalcis in the British and Ashmolean Museums. *Archaeologia* 62 (1911) 391–404; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 195.

¹⁴⁵ See below 49.

THE OTTOMAN EǦRIBOZ

From 1470 until 1821, the city of Eǧriboz flourished as a major regional centre of the Empire. It became the seat of the Sandjak of Euripos, a division administering the Sporades Islands and eastern Central Greece with the kazas (subdivisions) of Livadia, Athens, Salona (mod. Amphissa) and Talanda (mod. Atalandi), as well as being the base of the Kapudan Pasha, the admiral of the Ottoman fleet. This flourishing economic and commercial hub is clearly reflected in the memories of Evliya Çelebi in ca 1670, as well as by a number of western travelers.¹⁴⁶ The emerging picture is one of a predominantly Muslim city within the walls, with only a couple of Jewish quarters. The Christian population was mainly settled outside the walls, in the newly established suburbs.

The bulk of Ottoman-era fortifications would not have been known if extensive material had not been preserved in the form of plans and reports following the Venetian siege of July–October 1688 (fig. 10). Although unsuccessful, this endeavor provided an opportunity to scrutinize the city's defense preparations.¹⁴⁷

The successful resistance of the city provides indirect evidence that the Ottoman administration did not neglect the defenses of the city and prepared them adequately in expectance of the Venetian siege. Despite the lack of massive new constructions, they tried to adhere to modern standards by organizing a defense 'in depth'; that is, a series of obstacles, mainly earthworks, covering a large area that would force the enemy to proceed slowly and gradually exhaust his resources. In fact, the siege was transformed in an entrenched battle over time and resources, with the aggressor overcoming progressively the obstacles in order to approach its batteries closer to the city, create a breach or mine the urban enclosure; the adversaries were competing on gaining time and restricting their casualties, always expecting relief forces. This was another land battle, with the enemy encamping on Euboea and assaulting the city's land front; it was once more obvious that the small size of the channel would turn any nautical endeavor into a disaster for the incoming fleet.

The outer defenses consisted of four batteries set up on the hills outside the city walls and covering the area from sea to sea. There followed a line of trenches protected by palisades, beyond which stood the city and the suburbs. The area of the suburbs occupied the east and north part outside the urban enclosure and was protected by its own palisade trench. Urban enclosure was still protected by the three *rivellini* at the more vulnerable points. It was encircled by the deep and wide moat, on the counterscarp of which there was a covered way, again protected by palisades. One plan mentions the existence of a *bonetto*, a large earthwork beyond the moat, approximately located at the lower half of the land front. Within the moat, at its southern exit to the sea, another plan notes the existence of a *fausse-braie*, a low corridor at the base of the walls for the patrolling of the moat and defense against attacks. Communication of the besieged with mainland Greece was never interrupted thanks to the new Karampampa fortress and the (Venetian) Fort of Euripos Bridge.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ J. KODER, Ένας γερμανός ταξιδιώτης στη Χαλκίδα του 1588. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 14 (1968) 346; F. PΑΡΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΥ-SPIROU, Η κοινωνία και οικονομία της Χαλκίδας μέσα από τις αφηγήσεις των ταξιδιωτών (1630–1815), in: 'Ε pole tes Chalkidas' 253–260; FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' 154–166; A. ΚΑΤΣΕΛΑΚΙ, Chalkida in the Ottoman Period, in: *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, ed. E. Brouskari. Athens 2009, 83–84; ANDREWS, Castles 188; ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 65–66.

¹⁴⁷ For the events of the siege, the armed forces involved, the progress of the attacking forces as noted on contemporary war diaries and chronicles, the preserved plans and reports, see ANDREWS, Castles 183–185, 251–252, pl. XXXV; I. STERIOΤΟΥ, Η πολιορκία του Negroponte το 1688 από τις συμμαχικές δυνάμεις των Βενετών και η απεικόνισή της στα βενετικά αρχεία, in: Venezia–Eubea 373–403; Chr. E. ΠΑΡΑΚΟΣΤΑ, Η πολιορκία της Χαλκίδας το 1688 μέσα από τα στρατιωτικά ημερολόγια (ιστορικό πλαίσιο), in: Venezia–Eubea 347–371; also KODER, Negroponte 62.

¹⁴⁸ ANDREWS, Castles 183–184; STERIOΤΟΥ, πολιορκία του Negroponte 374, 380–381, 388–392, 394–402; ΠΑΡΑΚΟΣΤΑ, πολιορκία της Χαλκίδας 354–359.

It is concluded, therefore, that the medieval urban enclosure became part of a wider fortification scheme, whose other parts, save the Karampampa fortress, were mostly made of perishable material. They survived until the early 19th century in a dilapidated state¹⁴⁹, and were thereafter unfortunately lost to the city's modern development. A group of iron cannon balls, coupled by large numbers of stone mortar balls, could probably connect to the fierce 1688 siege and the city's successful resistance.¹⁵⁰

The urban enclosure as portrayed in the 1840 plan and the few surviving photographs (fig. 3b), basically retained its 15th century features, assuming that the damages suffered during the 1470 siege were merely amended.¹⁵¹ Later additions are detected in the southeast corner bastion (the Rivellino di Burco, fig. 1.12), whose appearance is clearly in accordance to 17th century military features. Leake probably refers to it when relating 'the most remarkable Turkish monument is an enormous piece of ordnance ... defends the approach to the southern side of the Kastro'.¹⁵² The same should also be true for the northern sea bastion, which was considered the main strongpoint during the 1688 Venetian siege (fig. 1.27).¹⁵³ During this period, only three wall-gates were still functioning: the Sea gate (the former Porta di Marina, fig. 1.26) leading to the Fort of Euripos Bridge, the Upper Gate (the former Porta di Cristo, fig. 1.2) located in the mid-section of the mainland front, and the Lower Gate to the north end of the land walls (fig. 1.27).

A single Ottoman military structure is currently preserved within the modern urban fabric, at the corner of Skalkota and Mardochaiou Frizi streets (fig. 1.9). Originally, it would have been constructed as an addition to the inner part of the enclosure, and it is currently an extension of the surviving section of the land walls, within the military camp. This single storey rectangular building has a series of open arches at ground level leading to long and narrow rooms covered with barrel vaults. Their roofs form a continuous platform ending at the wall parapet. The rooms would serve for the storage of cannons and ammunitions, while the platform would make their movement easier along the walls. This 'hybrid bastion' or casemated wall is typical of the 17th–18th century Ottoman military architecture. Destined to reinforce a weak point of the defenses, it ultimately functioned in the same way as the earlier medieval tower which still survives encased in the later additions. The arches of the ground floor rooms were walled up in the 19th century and presently serve the town's Folkart Museum.

A new addition to the city's defenses, the Karampampa fortress, occupied the hill overlooking Eǧriboz on the Boeotian coast (fig. 11).¹⁵⁴ Though its strategic significance for the security of the city has been acknowledged from the ancient times¹⁵⁵, the hill remained unprotected throughout the medieval period. The present fort was erected only on the eve of the Venetian blockade of 1688, as explicitly mentioned in a number of Venetian sources. It was consequently the subject of numerous plans, which also note a number of points, such as the existence of Ottoman palisades and batteries

¹⁴⁹ W. M. LEAKE, *Travels in Northern Greece*, II. London 1835, 256–257. For various notes on the state of the walls and the moat from 19th century local writers, see KODER, *Negroponte* 74; ΠΑΠΑΔΑΚΗΣ, *μεσαιωνικό τείχος* 287–289.

¹⁵⁰ Forty-two iron balls and 35 stone balls are exhibited at the Karampampa fortress. The rest are kept at the Ephorate store-rooms.

¹⁵¹ ΚΟΚΚΙΝΗΣ, *Ιστορικά μνημεία*, figs. 28, 35–40; KODER, *Negroponte* 69.

¹⁵² LEAKE, *Travels* 256.

¹⁵³ ANDREWS, *Castles* 184.

¹⁵⁴ For past conservation work, see A. ORLANDOS, *Αναστηλώσεις*, *Praktika tes en Athenais Archaialogikes Etaireias* 1958, 254; ANDREIOMENOU, *Εύβοια* 153; P. LAZARIDIS, *Μεσαιωνικά Βοιωτίας και Εύβοιας*, *AD* 16 (1960), *Chronika* 157–158; IDEM, *Βυζαντινά* 1970, 261, pl. 225–226β; IDEM, *Βυζαντινά* 1971, 274, pl. 240α; GEORGIOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1972, 364, pl. 307α–β; ΕΑΔΕΜ, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973, 311, pl. 267β, 268α; ΕΑΔΕΜ, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973–74, 512; Ν. ΔΕΛΙΝΙΚΟΛΑΣ, *Κάστρο Καράμπαμπα*, *AD* 37 (1982), *Β'1 Chronika* 73–74.

¹⁵⁵ For the ancient fortress at the Karampampa hill, known in the sources as the Euripos Fortress, see ΒΑΚΗΖΙΖΕΝ, *Studies* 39–48; SAMPSON, *Συμβολή* 19.

outside the walls, obviously as a first line of defense in case of attack, as well as potential Venetian counterworks.¹⁵⁶

The fortress occupied the site of an earlier Ottoman burial monument mentioned by Evliya Çelebi¹⁵⁷, and was allegedly designed by a Venetian renegade, Girolamo Galoppo of Mantua. Morosini's failure to overtake the fort was a turning point for the whole endeavour. With a curtain following the long and narrow contour of the hill top, it is protected by two large bastions at the east and west end, coupled by smaller solid five-sided bastions placed in the middle of the lateral sides. All in all, despite the ingenious and unique concentric plan of the east bastion, i.e. the current exhibition area, the fort is deemed weak for the standards of the day. Its resistance capability derived mainly from its impregnable position rather than its defenses. It was mainly a guard-post and barracks, an outlook for the observation and the control of the surrounding area, a link between Eğriboz and mainland Greece.¹⁵⁸

As far as population is concerned, the 1470 conquest marked an inevitable change, since the remaining inhabitants of Negroponte were either slaughtered or enslaved.¹⁵⁹ The settlement within the urban enclosure, which continued to play its part as a major landmark, was probably repopulated with transfers of Muslim and Jewish population from other regions of the empire.¹⁶⁰ The general layout of the city seems not to have been drastically altered, since the main axes defined by the city gates continued to function. It was a densely inhabited area with few, if any, open spaces. The present synagogue along the Kotsou street, near the Upper Gate (fig. 1.32), is a 19th century replacement of an older structure that probably marked the epicentre of the Jewish community at the commercial heart of Eğriboz. The suburbs or outer town spread to the northeast area outside the walls. It seems that the Turkish aqueduct served as its southern limit. The zone next to the moat was left free, and was probably occupied by cemeteries. An open space was also formed outside the Upper Gate, serving as market square with a mosque and a clock tower nearby, a function that survived to present time (fig. 1.22).¹⁶¹

Evliya Çelebi¹⁶² reported a total of 1,900 houses within the enclosure, stone built, multi-storied and tile-covered, separated by narrow paved streets. There were eleven Turkish quarters with eleven mosques, many of which were converted churches such as the Sultan Mehmed II camii, the present Agia Paraskevi (figs. 1.23, 9). Moreover, there were six mescids and numerous other foundations, one Jewish quarter with a synagogue; also five Christian quarters with small churches situated in the northern part of the city. In the suburbs, outside the enclosure, Evliya reported 600 houses and 426 workshops of fine craftsmen (obviously Christians). Along them, there were also the residences of all Turkish officials that probably required more space than could be found within the walls; additional structures included mosques, hamams, and schools. Next to the watermills already mentioned above, he also recorded a number of tombs of well known Muslim figures, within the enclosure, in the

¹⁵⁶ STERIOΤΟΥ, πολιορκία του Negroponte 378, 382–388, 390, 395.

¹⁵⁷ KODER, Negroponte 82; FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' 164.

¹⁵⁸ D. A. ZIVAS, Το κάστρο του Καράμπαμπα. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 14 (1968) 247–262; ANDREWS, Castles 188–191; TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, μεσαιωνική Χαλκίδα 195–197; ΠΑΡΑΚΟΣΤΑ, πολιορκία της Χαλκίδας 354; N. KONTOGIANNIS, Karababa Fortress, in: *Ottoman Architecture* 90–92.

¹⁵⁹ For the 1470 siege and the fate of Negroponte's population after its conquest, see. GOFAS, βενετοκρατούμενο Negroponte 32–33; ANDREWS, Castles 187.

¹⁶⁰ The population in the later Ottoman times is estimated to 14.000–16.000 souls, two-thirds of whom were Muslims, M. KIEL, Little-known Ottoman Gravestones from some Provincial Centres in the Balkans, Eğriboz/Chalkis, Niğbolu/Nikopol and Rusçuk/Russe, in: *Cimetières et traditions funéraires dans le monde islamique. Actes du Colloque International du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Istanbul 28–30 Septembre 1991*, I. Ed. J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont – A. Tibet. Ankara 1996, 318.

¹⁶¹ S.V. ΜΑΜΑΛΟΥΚΟΣ, Πολεοδομικά ζητήματα της νεότερης Χαλκίδας (1833–1933), in: 'E pole tes Chalkidas' 310–312.

¹⁶² FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' 160–163; ΜΑΚΚΑΥ, St Mary 152–154; ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 66.

suburbs or outside the city: the Kara Bampa (at the area of the later fort), the Veli Bampa, and others.¹⁶³

Elements of the area's human topography are also present on the Venetian plans executed during the 1688 siege. The suburbs are depicted to the north and the east of the walled city, and they had three mosques. On a number of plans the suburbs are noted as "Grandissimo borgo con belli palazi alla Turchescha" or "Borgo adornato de Palazi e gardini", meaning that it had mansions of Turkish style. A series of constructions, such as windmills and cisterns are depicted in the countryside around the city.¹⁶⁴

The situation seems to have remained unchanged down to the early 19th century, when Leake (1805) recorded that within the walls resided the thirty large land-holding families of the island along with ca. thousand others of the lower orders.¹⁶⁵ Christians did not number more than a third of the inhabitants, while many of the houses of the outer town were ruined and uninhabited as a result of a recent plague.¹⁶⁶ Turkish officials continued to dwell in mansions outside the walls.¹⁶⁷

Of the four mosques preserved until the late 19th century, only one survives today, the complex of Emir Zade in the Pesonton Opliton square (figs. 1.19, 12). As mentioned above, this is considered by many as the site of the San Marco church and of the Venetian *fondaco*.¹⁶⁸ The mosque is a rectangular, single-domed building whose entrance is through a typical portico at the western side. From the original portico with its traditional domical vaults, only the platform survives. The minaret occupied the southwest corner, currently preserving its rectangular base. This complex is a typical specimen of provincial Ottoman architecture with numerous examples all over the Balkans.¹⁶⁹ The only hint for its date remains its mention by Evliya Çelebi, thus providing a *terminus ante quem* in the 16th–17th century.¹⁷⁰

A fountain that probably served the mosque lies in front of its entrance, decorated with Ottoman-style elaborate relief sculpture (fig. 13a). Two inscribed panels, inserted on the sides of the fountain shed light not only to its construction, but also to the history of the town's water supply system. The earliest inscription (dated to E. 1033, A.D. 1623–1624) states that water was brought from the sources thanks to the works of Halil Pasha. The second inscription (dated A.D. 1796) commemorates the restoration of the fountain by Ibrahim Emine Mehmet, deputy artillery commander of the Fortress of Eğriboz.¹⁷¹

Water abundance was of paramount importance for Ottoman society. The supply of water was considered as a primordial necessity and duty of the administration. A number of Ottoman aqueducts have been preserved throughout Greece.¹⁷² The aqueduct of Eğriboz, a large scale work that brought water from the sources of the Lilas river, covering a distance of ca 25 km, survives partially both within the modern settlement (in the Arethousa area) and along its course from the mountains to the plain. Lack of archaeological evidence, save its explicit depiction on a number of Venetian plans¹⁷³,

¹⁶³ FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' 164.

¹⁶⁴ STERIOΤΟΥ, πολιορκία του Negroponte 375, 378–382, 389, 391, 394–401; ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΙΣ, Τριάντα οκτώ ξετροχάρηδες 21–23.

¹⁶⁵ LEAKE, Travels 255; ANDREWS, Castles 187–188.

¹⁶⁶ LEAKE, Travels 255.

¹⁶⁷ ANDREWS, Castles 187.

¹⁶⁸ For various restoration works, see ANDREIOMENOU, Εύβοια 153; LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1970, 261; IDEM, Βυζαντινά 1971, 274; GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 364–365; EADEM, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 311; EADEM, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 512.

¹⁶⁹ S. ČURČIĆ, Architecture in the Balkans from Diocletian to Süleyman the Magnificent. New Haven – London 2010, 775–782, figs. 889–890.

¹⁷⁰ FOUSARAS, Τα 'Ευβοϊκά' 161; E. DAFI, Emir zade Complex, in: Ottoman Architecture 85–86. Kiel has proposed an 18th century date, yet without providing further evidence (KIEL, Little-known Ottoman Gravestones 319).

¹⁷¹ H. STYLIANOU, The Halil Fountain, in: Ottoman Architecture 86–87.

¹⁷² Such as the aqueducts serving the cities of Livadeia (G. VAXEVANIS, Trichino Bridge, in: Ottoman Architecture 96–97), Navarino (S. SAKKARI, Aqueduct of Niokastro, in: Ottoman Architecture 151–152), and Kavalla (M. LYCHOUNAS, Kamares, in: Ottoman Architecture 274–276)

¹⁷³ STERIOΤΟΥ, πολιορκία του Negroponte 375–376, 381, 390, 392, 394, 401.

has led to wide speculation concerning the date of the aqueduct's construction, from Hellenistic and Roman time onwards.¹⁷⁴ Nevertheless, its Ottoman date has been convincingly argued by Kiel¹⁷⁵, whose data included the relevant passage of Evliya Çelebi along with the Halil Fountain inscription mentioned above. The aqueduct was constructed by Halil Pasha, four times grand Admiral of the Ottoman fleet in the period 1610–1623, at the very end of his office term in 1623–1624.

Its mountain track has been surveyed by Bakhuizen.¹⁷⁶ The parts closer to the city include a line of 12 arches supported on stone pillars in the Lelantine Plain along the street between Afrati and Dokos; gutters and foundations dug on bedrock at the hills of Bathrobouni, the Quarry and the Yiftika; a segment known as the Tris Kamares (three arches), demolished in the late 19th century; finally, the surviving part, known as Ipsiles Kamares (High Arches, fig. 13b), a series of 11 arches on pillars.¹⁷⁷ The water pipes would eventually end in large (underground) cisterns within the walls or in the suburbs area. From there on, water would be directed towards the fountains in the various quarters. One of them was apparently the fountain of the Emir Zade mosque mentioned above (fig. 13a).

One of these cisterns presently occupies a large space beneath the Pesonton Opliton square, in front of the mosque (figs. 1.19).¹⁷⁸ It is a solid and well-built structure, with three rectangular vaulted spaces, each measuring 12 × 3 m. They are parallel to each other and connected with arched openings. The cistern is preserved almost intact and the whole interior space is covered with hydraulic mortar; it is still partly filled with water in winter times.

Another construction that is connected to Eǧriboz water supply system is the small bath with its fountain that survives in the area of the suburbs near the metropolitan church of Agios Demetrios (fig. 1.35). The bath occupies the yard of what is presently known as 'the Kriezotis mansion'. It was part of a larger complex belonging to the country residence of Omer Pasha, the last military governor of Euboea, who sold it in 1830–1833 to Nikolaos Kriezotis.¹⁷⁹ The bath, a small rectangular structure, consists of two rooms covered with brick domical vaults and illuminated by small fanlights. Clay pipes built within the walls diffused the hot air from the hypocausts.¹⁸⁰ Water was provided by the nearby fountain that is richly adorned with marble sculptured slabs.¹⁸¹ This was a private bath, part of the residence of a high-ranking Turk.

Also in the suburbs, there survives a late Ottoman clock tower (fig. 1.36, 14).¹⁸² It is currently known as the Seirina Tower, taking its name from the air-raid siren that operated from its top during the Second World War. It is preserved almost intact to its original height, apparently with many later alterations. The circumstances as well as those responsible for its erection remain unknown. Though often misinterpreted as a medieval tower¹⁸³, its limited dimensions and structural features (ground floor entrance, ladder leading to its top, lack of defensive or living arrangements), as well as old photographs

¹⁷⁴ For a concise catalogue of the various proposals with all previous bibliography, see BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies I* 74, n. 139.

¹⁷⁵ M. KIEL, *The Turkish Aqueduct of Chalkis: A Note on the Date of Construction and the Identity of its Founder*, in: BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies I* 151–157.

¹⁷⁶ BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies I* 73, fig.46.

¹⁷⁷ BAKHUIZEN, *Chalcidian Studies I* 74–75; also KODER, *Negroponte* 88–89.

¹⁷⁸ GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, *Μεσαιωνικά* 1973, 316–317; MACKEY, *New Light* 3–4.

¹⁷⁹ It later passed to a number of successive heirs, its current address being 5 Tzavella and Anatoliou streets. See also ANDREIO-MENOU, *Εύβοια* 151.

¹⁸⁰ E. KANETAKI, *Bath and Fountain of Chalkida*, in: *Ottoman Architecture* 88–89.

¹⁸¹ H. STYLIANOU, *The fountain at the Kriezoteio mansion*, in: *Ottoman Architecture* 89.

¹⁸² AI. STEPHANIDOU, *Το ρολοί της πόλης (στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο της Τουρκοκρατίας)*, in: *Orion. Timetikos tomos ston Kathergete D. A. Fatouro, teuchos B*, ed. S. G. Z. Zapheiropoulos. Thessaloniki 1999, 442–443, 453–454; N. SALEMI, *Το ρολοί της Χαλκίδας*. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 34 (2001–2002) 63–68.

¹⁸³ TH. I. SKOURAS, *Οχυρώσεις στην Εύβοια (μερικές λύσεις στα τοπογραφικά τους προβλήματα)*. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 20 (1975) 392; P. LOCK, *The towers of Euboea: Lombard or Venetian, agrarian or strategic*, in: *The Archaeology of Medieval Greece*, ed. P. Lock – G. D. R. Sanders (*Oxbow Monographs* 59). Oxford 1996, 116; JACOBY, *Demographic Evolution* 147–148.

depicting the bell tower at the roof, leave no doubt as to its original function. This was probably a late-18th century structure, very similar to the ones erected in a number of Balkan Ottoman cities around the same time. It was situated near the open market with its mosque (fig. 1.22), in order to facilitate urban and commercial life, being at the same time a symbol of Eğriboz's economic growth.¹⁸⁴

A single specimen of Ottoman domestic architecture is found in 16, Paidon street (figs. 1.28, 15).¹⁸⁵ It is a large mansion which originally comprised two wings around an inner court. Today only the central wing survives. It stands almost intact and comprises a ground floor destined for storage, a middle floor with facilities for the family and servants, and a first floor with the reception rooms. The side facing the street is surmounted by enclosed bay windows that hung out over the street, an elaborate wooden construction typical of the Ottoman era, known as *sachnisi*. The side towards the court yard has a portico with pointed arches supported on columns at ground level, on which rests the large wooden first-floor balcony. Despite its various later uses and present poor condition, it still preserves its wood-carved ceilings, the *sachnisi*, and various sculptural elements that prove the quality of the work. It was apparently the mansion of a Turk landholder (*aga*) who was also a city-dweller. He constructed his house probably during the 18th century, following the established norms of the city's urban architecture. A number of similar mansions were depicted in 19th – early 20th century photographs and have perished since.¹⁸⁶ Situated on the Paidon street, the continuation of Stamati street (Negroponte's Ruga Maistra), and occupying the south part of the Pesonton Opliton square near the Emir Zade mosque (fig. 1.19), it seems that the mansion was built on one of the main arteries of Eğriboz.

During the Ottoman period, the house 'of the *Bailo*' opposite the Agia Paraskevi basilica, was integrated in a larger house complex, only partially surviving today (figs. 1.29).¹⁸⁷ The south part of the present building consists of an arcade at ground level and various smaller rooms at first floor. No date can be deduced from the surviving evidence, since the complex was refurbished in the 19th century, and was given a neo-classical façade. A slab depicting a flying griffon was embedded above its entrance and is often misinterpreted as a Lion of St Mark.¹⁸⁸

Our knowledge of Ottoman Eğriboz is supplemented by a number of sketches and photographs in local archives that depict monuments that have since perished, like the small Muslim monastery (*teke*) of Veli Bampa, which survived until the mid-20th century on the homonym hill outside the city, the mosques of the market square and the one replaced by Agios Nikolaos (fig. 1.37).¹⁸⁹

The historical and architectural record is further corroborated by archaeological material. In all rescue excavations, the buildings of the Ottoman period are distinctly differentiated from those of previous periods. They are founded at a higher level than the earlier constructions, since ground level was considerably raised due perhaps to the fill-ins and leveling of pre-existing debris. They also employed coarser materials in their structures, which probably relates to the presence of white-washed facades as opposed to the ashlar walls of Venetian buildings. When Ottoman structures used previously standing walls, the general arrangement was always different, pointing not to con-

¹⁸⁴ For old photographs of the area, see KOKKINIS, *Ιστορικά μνημεία*, figs. 41–43.

¹⁸⁵ T. KALATHERIS, *Αρχοντικό στη Χαλκίδα*. *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 16 (1970) 148–182; K. MANOUSOU-DELLA – V. MAURROMMATHIS, *Το αρχοντικό της οδού Παιδων στη Χαλκίδα*, in: *Selected Specimens of Greek Domestic Architecture during the Ottoman Period*. Athens 1986, 94–106. See also, MACKAY, *New Light* 4, who proposes a venetian dating; ANDREIOMENOU, *Εύβοια* 151; L. ΚΟΥΝΟΥΠΙΟΤΟΥ, *Νομός Εύβοιας*. *AD* 35 (1980), *B'1 Chronika* 101.

¹⁸⁶ KOKKINIS, *Ιστορικά μνημεία*, figs. 34, 52–54, 71–78, 81–83, 97.

¹⁸⁷ DELINIKOLAS – VEMI, *Αγία Παρασκευή* 254.

¹⁸⁸ KODER, *Negroponte* 92.

¹⁸⁹ KOKKINIS, *Ιστορικά μνημεία*, figs. 41–44, 55–57. For the Veli Bampa teke see also TRIANTAFYLLOPOULOS, *μυσαιωνική Χαλκίδα* 197–198. The building has occasionally been interpreted as a tower (SKOURAS, *Οχυρώσεις* 392).

tinuation but to the restructure of the inhabited areas. Remains of this period were investigated during rescue work both within and outside the walls.¹⁹⁰

However, a distinctive destruction layer has nowhere been observed. We are therefore inclined to believe that after the city was emptied the standing structures were re-inhabited by a new population that re-arranged the spaces according to its needs, rather than being annihilated by fire and destroyed to the ground.

The ceramic material from excavations within the castle area belongs to the typical post-Byzantine and Ottoman categories known from a number of sites in mainland and insular Greece (Athens, Thebes-Boeotia, Cyclades etc). It also includes a variety of smoking-pipes, evidence for the new habit that spread throughout the Ottoman world from the 17th century onwards. A series of cesspits uncovered in the Sultana Negrin plot at 39–41, Kotsou street produced large numbers of almost intact vessels of good quality 16th century glazed pottery, along with earlier and later shards (figs. 1.32, 4b). This may serve as an indication for the flourishing economy and material culture of Eḡriboz during that period. Furthermore, the presence of a monochrome glazed bowl bearing the inscribed word ‘cheese’ in Hebrew along its bottom (fig. 5c), combined with the location of the plot near the present synagogue, raises interesting questions as to the identity, eating habits and the social standing of the inhabitants.¹⁹¹

A number of sculptural works of the Ottoman era are presently exhibited in the Karampampa collection.¹⁹² They include a number of religious inscriptions with elegant Arabic lettering, obviously originating from the city’s destroyed mosques¹⁹³; slabs with geometric or vegetal decoration from fountains; two hamam-basins; finally, a large number of Muslim gravestones from Eḡriboz cemeteries.

A major burial site lay in the area of the present metropolitan church of Agios Demetrios (fig. 1.21), a site with an apparently continuous funerary use.¹⁹⁴ Large Muslim cemeteries originally extended probably to the whole area between the urban enclosure and the suburbs, obviously occupying the empty space next to the moat, where Evliya Çelebi recorded the tombs of thousands of warriors that fell during the city’s conquest.¹⁹⁵ Indeed, a number of tombs investigated in the area outside the walls produced evidence of use during that period.¹⁹⁶

The tombstones of Eḡriboz present a remarkable variety, although they generally follow the same standard appearance of a low pillar.¹⁹⁷ They are cubical or cylindrical; plain, or decorated with linear

¹⁹⁰ At the Kotsou street and the Pesonton Opliton square (LAZARIDIS, Βυζαντινά 1971, 274–277), the Matsas plot at Angeli Goviou and Favierou streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 368–369), the Basileiou-Kontoula plot at Charonda and Frizi streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 316), the Ika plot at Agia Barbara square (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 499–507), the Technike Etaireia Dome plot at Trapezountiou and Isaiou streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973–74, 509–510), the Toulitsi-Loumi-Loumaki plot at Erotokritou and Olynthou streets (excavator: I. Vaxevanis), the Delivorias plot at Orionos street (excavator: I. Vaxevanis), and the Sultana Negrin plot at 39–41, Kotsou street (excavator: D. Kotriklas).

¹⁹¹ I would like to thank the excavator D. Kotriklas for sharing his finds, N. de Lange for reading the inscription and D. Jacoby for providing further information.

¹⁹² ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 63–64; see also ANDREIOMENOU, Εύβοια 151.

¹⁹³ ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 123–125, nrs. 51–53. Another one, with kufic lettering, has been dated to the pre-ottoman period. MILES, Byzantium and the Arabs 18, associated it to the 9th century Arab raids against the city. ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 111–112 nr. 38, dated it to the 12th–13th century and proposed that it originated either from the Seljuk emirates of Asia Minor or Fatimid Egypt and was transferred to Eḡriboz after the Ottoman conquest.

¹⁹⁴ GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1972, 366–367.

¹⁹⁵ FOUSARAS, Τα ‘Ευβοϊκά’ 163; KIEL, Little-known Ottoman Gravestones 320. For the location of the Ottoman cemeteries see ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 67–68.

¹⁹⁶ At the Xidis plot in Venizelou Street (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 314), and the Patsalis plot at Orionos and Stamouli streets (GEORGOPOULOU-MELADINI, Μεσαιωνικά 1973, 315–316).

¹⁹⁷ Ca. ninety five are currently exhibited at the Karampampa fortress, while a number of them are stored in the Ephorate’s labs. Forty-eight of them are published in ΛΙΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 64, 69–71, 73–125.

and vegetal motifs, or bearing relief Turkish inscriptions in the champlévé technique with invocations, epigrams and information concerning the deceased. Those richly adorned were probably commissioned to stone-carvers in the larger centres of the Empire, such as Thessaloniki or even Istanbul, with the plainer ones being locally manufactured. The majority ended upwards in a tongue where a separate piece of stone in the form of a turban would fit, being an indicator of male social status or occupation;¹⁹⁸ others, probably destined for females, have a conical or foliate ending. In this graphic way, they stand as ‘leaving representations’ of the city’s inhabitants.

The accompanying inscriptions are invaluable for the information they preserve. The names of the deceased, both male (Abdullah, Ahmed, Ali, Arif, Feyzi, Halil, Hakki, Hasan, Husein, Ibrahim, Ismail, Nefli, Mehmed, Mustafa Musti, Osman, Selim Tevfik, Yusuf), and female (Ayse, Antile, Emine, Hadice, Fatima, Naile, Rabia, Rukiye, Ziba), can lead to the genealogical study of prominent local families (such as the Kirbaçzâde and the Pasha) related to the imperial administration and known from written records.¹⁹⁹ The profession or title (such as vizier, imam, lieutenant, dervish, molla, imperial guard, janissary officer, soldier-landowner, various officers of the Eğriboz castle) shows the range of occupations or functionaries that existed in the city. The epigrams are stereotypical examples of popular poetry, found throughout the Empire. It is interesting to note that among those studied, only one date of death falls in the 16th century, two in the 17th century, with the majority pertaining to the 18th century and up to the Greek War of Independence.

Hebrew tombstones testify to the prosopography of the local community, which was enlivened in 1492 with the settlement of Iberian Jews. A number of inscribed epitaphs, their dates ranging from 1539 to 1849, has been removed to the synagogue at Kotsou street or remain in situ at the Jewish cemetery, which survives in its original location to the northeast of the city’s historic center.²⁰⁰ Jacobsohn²⁰¹ has distinguished two types of tombs, the ‘graduated sarcophagus’ belonging to romaniote, and the ‘box’ type linked to Iberian Jews. Out of the seven epitaphs that she attributed to romaniote Jews, five belong to men, all rabbis (Absalom Galimidi, Joseph Malti, Elya son of Abraham Saloniko, Elya Halevi, Asher Halevi). The remaining two belong to women, the one being again a daughter of a rabbi (Avraham Saloniko). Two more tombstones are exhibited at the Karampampa fortress: the first one, dated 1600, belongs to rabbi Samuel Hanin, and the second one, dated 1578, to Stamata wife of rabbi Eliakim Saloniko.²⁰² Whether these epitaphs can prove the co-existence or assimilation of the pre-existing romaniote Jews with the Iberian/sefardi newcomers remains an open question; it surely proves that their owners were members of the local elite, were regarded as exceptional by virtue of their learning, and obviously participated in community leadership.

CONCLUSIONS

A simplistic way to view medieval and post-medieval Chalcis would consider it as a small settlement confined within an ever-repaired enclosure, with its inhabitants surviving through ever-changing political conditions. Yet, closer study reveals a much different development.

¹⁹⁸ Ca. thirty eight head covers of various form and size are presented in the current Karampampa exhibition.

¹⁹⁹ KIEL, Little-known Ottoman Gravestones 320–326; LIAKOPOULOS, Οθωμανικές Επιγραφές 89, 103–105, 107, 130–133.

²⁰⁰ GIANNOPOULOS, Συμβολαί 188; H. JACOBSON, The Enigma of the Romaniote Tombs, in: Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider. Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998, ed. D. C. Smythe (*Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications* 8). Aldershot 2000, 119–121.

²⁰¹ JACOBSON, Enigma 120–124.

²⁰² GIANNOPOULOS, Συμβολαί 190–191. The tombstones were studied by the personnel of the Jewish Museum of Greece under the director Zanet Battinou (unpublished report, Archive of the 23rd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities).

The urban enclosure was indeed preserved throughout the city's history only because it was integrated each time within a wider space and arrangement according to the goals of a different political power and to a different social reality. The enclosure was originally built to serve a strong military middle Byzantine settlement, following a pattern that was common throughout the Empire both in plan and in the materials used. During the Lombard-Venetian rule it formed only a section of the overall fortification scheme: in the 13th century it defended the whole settlement, while further protection was provided by the *Castrum Negropontis*. In the 14th century it provided defense for the Lombard section of the city, in contrast to a secondary enclosure around the Venetian quarter. This is also corroborated by similar disposals in other large cities of the time, where local authorities co-existed with the colonists of foreign maritime powers, the best known example being Constantinople with the fortified Genoese suburb of Galata-Pera.²⁰³ The 15th century saw the dominance of Venice and the complete restructuring of the enclosure according to current defense practices. The Ottoman administration that succeeded Venice radically transformed the defenses of the city following the spirit of the day; the urban enclosure played once more a part in a radically different fortification scheme.

A constant feature in the history of medieval and early modern Chalcis is that the enemy always assaulted the city from the Euboean land front. Forces were transported through ships and camped in the plains surrounding the city. The sea walls were thus playing only a minor part, being a simple fence against rudimentary assaults with arrows from the board. The Boeotian coast was deemed a threatening point only when the cannons acquired a large range of fire, and were therefore capable to damage the city from the Karampampa hill. A fortress was erected then to guard against such liability.

As far as the inhabited area is concerned, although our conclusions should be cautious pending on future archaeological work, we can still support the view that the bulk of the Byzantine population resided within the walls. The earlier view of the surrounding area being dedicated only to cemeteries should be modified based on the Orionos bath complex, yet evidence is still far from adequate.

Regarding the Lombard-Venetian era, the main observation both from the historical and archaeological records is the peaceful transition of power from the Byzantine regime, without a clear division or break between the periods.²⁰⁴ Yet, the settlement within the walls followed a dynamic change, one we can induce from the written records with the Venetians establishing and creating their own 'city within the city'. We can also positively substantiate the population outgrowing the enclosed area. There were spaces with specific uses, such as the *Judeca* or the arsenal.

Furthermore, the fact that the excavated plots outside the walls revealed constructions of poor quality together with evidence for artisan activities, like the ceramic stilts used in pottery workshops, points to an image of a settlement where (some) craftsmen were located outside the enclosure, both for lack of space and the easier access to raw materials, such as wood. These could also be neighborhoods with people originating from various parts of Euboea and mainland Greece, which took refuge in the vicinity of strong walls.²⁰⁵ On the other hand, the discovery of good quality masonries both in the preserved and the excavated buildings within the walls show the extent of prosperity enjoyed during that period. This fact is corroborated by the evidence of objects such as ceramics, jewels, architectural sculpture, and wall-paintings.

The Ottoman city that succeeded Negroponte was a distinct break from the earlier settlement. New buildings were constructed upholding only to the basic grid of the settlement pattern, as

²⁰³ M. BALARD, *La Romanie Génoise (XIIe – début du XVe siècle), I–II (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 235 = Atti della società ligure di storia patria, n.s. 18/1–2)*. Rome 1978, 179–198; W. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbul*. Tübingen 1977, 320–323.

²⁰⁴ The same notion of continuity was also proposed for the island's countryside, see JACOBY, *Demographic Evolution* 137–138.

²⁰⁵ KODER, *Negroponte* 87.

detected by the wall gates. Densely populated, Eğriboz proved also a prospering city, perhaps even more than its predecessors. Although archaeological material of this period has not been thoroughly studied, a peak seems to have been reached in the 16th and early 17th century, as suggested by the ceramic material, the large-scale public works, and the concurrent image of Ottoman Greece. The same stands true of the later Ottoman times, when a number of -presently lost- urban mansions housed the great landowners of the island. The example of the still standing Paidon house clearly indicates a secular architecture of large aspirations, rather different in scale and character from contemporary vernacular peasant buildings, as the ones studied in nearby Boeotia.²⁰⁶ The population has again overgrown the enclosed settlement, with commercial life extending beyond the city's east-west axis (the present Kotsou street) to the market place outside the Upper Gate, where a clock tower would help organize and structure daily life. Quarters based on ethnic origin seem to have persisted until the end of the Ottoman rule, yet clear-cut distinctions are hard to establish.

The middle Byzantine Euripos was a provincial town and a naval base of the imperial fleet constantly in contact with the capital, a link substantiated by the imported pottery. At the same time, it was fully integrated and constituted a cultural centre of central Greece, as shown by the high quality of architectural sculpture and the quantity of ceramic finds. Within this framework we can safely assume that it was a city of a certain standing and it played its role as a regional centre in commercial and cultural affairs of Byzantine Greece. The Lombard and Venetian city was gradually turned into an international outpost that played a key-role in the Aegean politics of the time. In the Lombard period it is only logical to assume that among the previous inhabitants, one would also find westerners and the new feudal elite members residing in the capital of their state and thus providing the city with a typical medieval character. Yet, the Venetian element that gradually infiltrated the city created a material culture of large aspirations, evident from the ceramics to the weapons, from the wall-paintings to the Gothic and late Byzantine sculpture. It is a typical example of a colony, where the local element is allowed to flourish while integrated within the framework of Venetian rule and administration. In this respect, the development of Negroponte was similar to that of other cities in the Serenissima's colonies in Dalmatia and the Aegean.

The Ottoman administration transformed the city to a considerable regional centre, endowing it with large-scale fortifications and public works. Eğriboz followed the general conditions of the Empire with the 16th century being its golden age, a level reached only much later in the 18th century, when public works were restored and large properties rebuilt. The urban environment reflected the social stratification of the period, with the landowners occupying the focal points of the settlement within the walls and the public administrators residing in suburb mansions. The material culture exhibits good quality ceramic and sculptural production, destined to serve the needs of a flourishing provincial society of predominantly Muslim population.

Eğriboz came to its end, following largely the same pattern as Euripos and Negroponte before, that is, as a result of drastic changes brought about by broader historical circumstances. In this case, the turning point was the Greek War of Independence (1821). The walls served their purpose once more and protected their population until the city officially surrendered to the newly created Greek State in 1830. The old inhabitants gradually departed, being forced to sell their properties under a special protective regime, which resulted in the preservation of the urban fabric until the late 19th century.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁶ E. SIGALOS, *Housing in Medieval and Post-Medieval Greece (BAR International Series 1291)*. Oxford 2004, 88–111.

²⁰⁷ ΜΑΜΑΛΟΥΚΟΣ, *Πολεοδομικά ζητήματα* 312–313. The population's composition is accurately pictured in the catalogue of the property owners attached in the 1840 topographic plan, ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙΣ – ΓΙΚΑΣ, *πρώτο πολεοδομικό διάγραμμα* 277–291.