

The Manuscript, Contemporary Sources, Maps, and Views of Negropont

THE ANGIOLELLO MANUSCRIPT

MS Vicenza 413. Biblioteca Civica Bertoliana. (Formerly Gonzati 24.10.5 and also numbered G3.11.15 on the cardboard cover). 21.5 x 29.5cm. 16 double folios of thin, crisp, slightly greyish paper in two gatherings of 8.

All sheets are watermarked. The commonest mark is a sort of trident head without a handle that may appear in various parts of the page but usually near a corner, sometimes with the points up, sometimes with the points down. On folio 19–30, the watermark appears twice at the upper right of folio 30, and on folio 17–32 it appears only in the middle of folio 17, and not on 32. Folios 3–14, 4–13 and 5–12 have a more elaborate program of watermarks. There is a figure, most probably of a bearded man, facing left in a circular border 2.5 cm across on folios 4, 12 and 14, and inverted on 13. Folio 4-13 thus has two of the portrait watermarks. 13 and 14 combine this with a curious, rather anchor-shaped pendant, which also appears on folio 16. Folio 20 has a pendant with three rhomboidal leaves arranged in cloverleaf fashion, and 21, 22, 23, 24 and 31 have the same with the leaves uppermost. Almost all folios with


variants are paired with a trident watermark on the other folio of the pair.



All sheets



Folios 20–24, 31



Folio 13, 14, 16

The text is arranged on the manuscript folios, both recto and verso, with a wide left margin and almost no right margin, and paragraphing is indicated by bringing the first line over towards the left edge of the writing surface. At the top edge of the fold in both gatherings the paper has been damaged, so that the right-hand end of the top two or three lines on the verso face is usually missing. The loss commonly amounts to no more than five letters. There is also loss of a few letters at the right end of some lines on the recto face where normal usage has worn away the edge of the paper. The bottom of folio 32r is blank, as is the whole of 32v, so that we may be certain that what we have is the entire text of this copy. Line counts range from a maximum of 32 lines on folios 1r, 1v, and 30v, to a minimum of 25 lines on folio 14v. There is no apparent reason for the shortness of folio 14v, since the last line ends in mid-sentence, and the following catch-word is normal.

The text is quite different from the extracts that appear in *Historia Turchesca*, which clearly had available more of Angiolello's text after the arbitrary break on folio 32r of our manuscript.¹ Indeed, it may be that MS Vicenza 413 represents

1. For the relationship of the *Historia Turchesca* to the genuine work of Angiolello, see "The Content and Authorship of the *Historia Turchesca*", in the proceedings of the *550th Anniversary of the Istanbul University: International Byzantine and Ottoman Symposium (XVth Century)* held 30–31 May, 2003. İstanbul, 2004. pp. 213–23; <http://angiolello.net/Turchesca.pdf>

less than a third of the original. The copyist's hand suits a date of about the mid-sixteenth century and it seems entirely plausible that we have a family copy made by a descendant of the author, in the first or second generation after him.² The copyist appears to have been scrupulous in transcribing Angiolello's text as precisely as possible, but his ignorance of Turkish has led to some obvious errors. He reads T for F at folio 12^v.¹³ (Tener for Fener), and having once read Angiolello's 'f' as a long 's' in "Tefterdar" (defterdar = a member of the Ottoman finance ministry), he is consistent in transcribing it "Testerdar." (The 'T' for 'D' is of no consequence. The word is often written with a 'Ṭ' in early Arabic script manuscripts, although its orthography ought to have been stabilized by its Arabic origins. The so-called emphatic 'Ṭ' may more closely represent the sound of the word in Angiolello's time, and have lead him to use 'T' in his transcription of the name of the office in which he served). At no point do the copyist's errors obscure the fact that his original was written by someone who genuinely understood the Turkish language.

EDITIONS

Caporozzo = Caporozzo, A., *Di Gio. Maria Angiolello e di un suo inedito manoscritto*, (Vicenza: Staider 1881).

In 1881, the manuscript was transcribed by A. Capparozzo of the Biblioteca Civica Bertoliana, His transcription provides a very accurate record of the text, but it was printed as a presentation edition "per le faustissime nozze Lampertico-Balbi" and it is doubtful that even a hundred copies were run off on this occasion, so that the book is extremely rare.

2. I am deeply indebted to Mary Neff for her kindness in inspecting the manuscript in Vicenza for me in 1980. Her cautious judgement was that although the handwriting shows no clear diagnostic features, it seems certain that it was written between 1530 and 1580, and probably between 1540 and 1560.

Reinhard = Reinhard, Jean, *ANGIOLELLO, Historien des Ottomans et des Persans*. 1^{re} Edition Annotée. (Buenos Aires: 1913(?)).

Even rarer, but perhaps fortunately so, is the re-edition, dating from about 1913, by the curious and erratic scholar Jean Reinhard. Reinhard's edition, entitled *Angiolello. Historien des Ottomans et des Persans*, and published, undated, in Buenos Aires (the foot of the title page reads, "Buenos Aires – 386 Tacmari"). This is a very large step backwards from the 1881 edition. It bristles with errors and omissions where the Capparozzo text is correct and, as for the annotations, one can only record that Reinhard's ignorance is nearly total in matters of history, geography, cartography, Turkish and Greek, in short, in every study which might contribute to the understanding of the text. The defect of almost all work on Angiolello except for that of Franz Babinger has been ignorance of Turkish, but Reinhard carried it to extremes. The only accessible copy of Reinhard's edition appears to be the one at the University Library in Basel, and I am very grateful for the kindness of the librarian in providing me with facsimiles of this copy, but I cannot think it regrettable if no other copies exist.

Angiolello, Giovan Maria, *Viaggio di Negroponte*, ed. Cristina Bazzolo. *Testi Inediti o Rari, 1*. (Vicenza: Neri Pozza 1982).

This is a somewhat modernized rendering of the text, and like the Caporozzo edition, keeps close to the manuscript. The annotations are minimal,

Guérin Dalle Mese, Jeannine. *Il Sultano e il Profeta de Giovan Maria Angiolello*. (Milan: Serra e Riva 1985).

This is not so much an edition, as an attempt to string together all the texts attributable to Angiolello in chronological order so as to produce a sort of interpretative biography.

* * * *

In none of these editions, not even that of the over-enthusiastic Reinhard, has it been realized how uniquely important Angiolello is for the description of the siege of Negropont, for the picture of mainland Greece in the 1470s, and for the early history of the Ottoman dynasty and state. The Ottomanist Franz Babinger, however, says of Angiolello's work, "Le sue note, che attendono una soddisfacente edizione integrale, e soprattutto una illustrazione, consentono una eccellente visione della situazione ottomana di quegli anni, e specialmente della personalità e del carattere dello [Maometto II]. Esse rappresentano la fonte occidentale di gran lunga più importante ed esauriente sulle condizioni e gli avvenimenti dell'ultimo decennio di vita del Conquistatore."³

CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Historia Turchesca = Historia Turchesca, 1300–1514, publicatá, adnotatá, împreuna cuo introduce de Ian. Ursu, (Bucharest: 1909)

So much of Angiolello's *Memoir* is included in the early pages of the *Historia Turchesca* that the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris (Cod. mixt. 1238), identifies the work as, "Historia Turchesca di Gio. Maria Angiolello schiavo et altri schiavi dall'anno 1429 sino al 1513." It is easy to find large passages taken directly from Angiolello in the work, but the overall composition cannot be his. There are too many profound differences in style, content and outlook. The

3. Babinger, 1951, p. 496. See also the biographical notice of Angiolello in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*.

authorship has been somewhat in dispute since Ursu published his edition and declared it to be the work of Donado da Lezze on the basis of three personal statements in some of the later pages. Evidence against Angiolello's authorship is every bit as strong as that put forward by Ursu in favor of da Lezze, but the present unhappy convention is to treat the book as if it were a work by Angiolello.

The author of the *Historia Turchesca* seems not to know Turkish, Ottoman history or Ottoman geography nearly as well as Angiolello does; he indulges in empty pejorative and puerile descriptions of the origins of the Ottoman state where Angiolello gives an account that is astonishingly close to modern anthropological and historical understandings.⁴ Finally, he appears to know only some popular myths about the fall of Negropont, and gives an account that bears little relation to what Angiolello's memoir offers.⁵ The *Historia Turchesca* does not know the name of Mahmud Pasha, the real, effective conqueror of Negropont, while Angiolello not only knew that very well from his own experience, but shows himself to be rather a partisan of Mahmud in an account of the latter's fall from grace and eventual execution.⁶ Other arguments about authorship on both sides are summarized by di Lenna.⁷ On the whole, it is unfortunate that the habit of ascribing the *Historia Turchesca* to Angiolello has developed. It may well be that Ursu was actually correct in his attribution.

Rizzardo = Giacomo Rizzardo, *La Presa di Negroponte fatta dai Turchi ai Veneziani*. Ed. Emmanuele Cicogna, with 5 Appendices and notes. (Venice: Giambatista Merlo, 1844)

4. See <http://angiolello.net/Turchesca.pdf>

5. See the commentary on 3^v:27 and 6^r:20

6. See the commentary on 1^v:1

7. di Lenna 1924, pp. 44–55.

The short narrative of Giacomo Rizzardo, “Caso ruinoso della cittade di Negroponte inteso per mi Iacomo Rizzardo scrivano dello spettabil uomo Messer Lorenzo Contarini sopracomito di una galia grossa di fiandra,” is by far the best of the remaining accounts. Rizzardo was present on one of the galleys lying north of Negropont and witnessed the storming of the walls in the morning after Niccolo da Canale’s failure to act. He seems also to have had access to eyewitness accounts from some of the few survivors who escaped by one means or another. Rizzardo’s account of the sequence of events and the topography of Negropont agrees for the most part with that of Angiolello, but is sufficiently different to leave it clear that these two sources are quite independent of one another. He goes in for more vivid accounts of individual heroism than does Angiolello, and we may suspect that Angiolello knew how utterly ineffectual such demonstrations were if, indeed, they occurred at all. Rizzardo’s dating of events is insecure, and in many cases he leaves dates blank. The editor, in his notes, often attempts to fill out the blanks with information culled from later documents, some of which seem to follow Castellana (discussed next).

Castellana = Polidori, Filippo-Luigi, “Due Ritmi e una Narrazione in Prosa di autori contemporanei intorno alla presa di Negroponte.” *Archivio Storico Italiano: Appendices*, Vol. IX (1854). Pp. 399–440.

Frate Iacopo (*sic?* Iacomo, *infra*) dalla Castellana, wrote a short account of the loss of Negropont which was appended to other documents lamenting the failure of the powers of Christendom to take any adequate measures against the continuing expansion of the Ottoman empire. A copy of this narrative, edited by Filippo-Luigi Polidori is in volume 9 of the appendices to *Archivio Storico Italiano* published in 1854. Unfortunately, it refers to an inaccessible prior publication for the details of the manuscript, so that it is difficult to determine just when this account is supposed to have been written. The

preamble speaks of “la perdita nuova di Negroponte,” so it would appear that Castellana’s report is close to the event. He says in his final sentence, “Io frate Iacomo dalla Castellana vidi tutte queste cose, e scampai in sulla insula per sapere la lingua turchesca e grechesca.” (p. 440) A letter by Fra Giacomo Pugiese, included in the “Annali Veneti” of Malipiero, is so similar to the account of Castellana, though with discrepancies in such matters as the number of Turks killed on various occasions, that it might be taken as another version from the same hand. It seems probable that Fra Giacomo dalla Castellana and Fra Giacomo Pugiese are one and the same (cf. Polidori’s editorial notes to Castellana, pp. 401–2.)

These two sources were used by Johannes Koder in his important reconstruction of 15th century Negropont and its environs [Koder, 1973], but it will be seen that Angiolello’s account corresponds better with the exiguous physical remains of the mediaeval city and with some essential pieces of early evidence.

Malipiero = “Annali Veneti dall Anno 1457 al 1500 del Senatore Domenico Malipieri.” Ed. Tomasso Gar. *Archivio Storico Italiano*. Vol. 7, Part 1. (Florence: 1843)

This account has Malipiero’s own appreciation of the event, supported by letters, one of which may be a version of Castellana’s account.

Diario Ferrarese = “Diario Ferrarese dall’ anno 1409 sino al 1502.” Ed. 2, Guiseppe Pardi. *Raccolta degli Storici Italiani: Istituto Storico Italiano, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Vol. 24, Part 7. (1933)

A single paragraph on page 62 of this edition (Folio 223v, Muratori, 226) reads:

“Eodem millesimo, a dì ultimo di Luio, vene la nuova a Ferrara da Venetia come li Turchi haveano tolto a la

Signoria de Venecdia Negroponte, il perchè dicti Turchi ge sono stati a campo atorno bene cum trecento milia Turchi per terra et hanno havuto in mare bene 300 velle. Unde se dise che, intrati che furno dicti Turchi in Negroponte, amazorno tutti universalmente li Cristiani che ivi se ritrovorno, et maschi et femine, da otto anni in suso, et tutti per lo filo de la spada li mandorno: et questa nuova è mosto damnosa a tutti li Christiani. In ajuto de li qualli Turchi erano le galee de Zenovisi et de Fiorentini, chè altramente non l’haveriano havuto mai, il perchè è la più forte cossa che avesse Cristiani, et era fornito per anni 4. Et anche la Signoria di Venetia per aiutarlo havea in mare abene 200 galee, cioè fra galee, navi grosse et marani. Et cusì a dì XII de Luio del presente mese se perdete Negroponte.”

This notice is interesting for its support of the suspicion that Florentine interests, along with the expected Genoese interests, had a hand in bringing about the Turkish victory. It even suggests, nonsensically, that this Christian support of the siege was the critical element in the Turkish triumph. The Ottoman naval force, however, had very little to do with the actual siege and remained where it had originally called in, in the harbor of San Stefano south of the Straits of S. Marco. On the final day, the southern bridge of boats was removed and a squadron of warships sailed in to bombard the walls between the Arsenal and the Euripus bridge but Angiolello implies that this was a singular occurrence.

Sansovino, Francesco, “Lettera d’un Secretario del Sig. Sigismondo Malatesta delle cose fatte nella Morea per Mahomet Secondo.” in *Dell’ historia vniversale dell’origine et imperio de Tvrcchi. Parte prima[-terza] Con vna tavola copiosissima di tutte le cose piu notabili dell’opera.* (Venice 1560–1561), Ff. 132v–143v.

This is primarily an account of the Peloponnesian war of 1463–78 but, on folios 135v–36v, the author writes intelligently of

the siege of Negropont. Some of the details provided suggest very strongly that they are derived from Angioiello's memoir. It is of especial interest in that it also describes Nicolò da Canal's lunatic attempt to retake Negropont by a naval assault on the Incoronata gate just south of the Euripus after the Turkish navy had left the region. That attempt was one of the main charges against da Canal in the subsequent trial.

Meserve, Margaret, "News from Negroponte: Politics, Popular Opinion, and Information Exchange in the First Decade of the Italian Press." *Renaissance Quarterly* Vol. 59.2 (2006). Pp. 440–480.

This valuable study shows how the new technology of printing contributed to a widespread outpouring of reactions to the fall of Negropont: propaganda, self-justificatory mythology, and even operatic romance.⁸ The sources discussed here reflect the importance of an event that was noticed throughout western Europe. They offer an important insight into the literary culture of Italy at the time, but little in the way of historical evidence. Indeed, they tend to bury the actual facts of the siege in a layer of mythology so dense that it somewhat distorts the short historical introduction to the article.

8. The plot of Rossini's "L'assedio di Corinto" was adapted from an operatic story of the (fictional) daughter of Pollo Erizzo and her martyrdom at the hands of Mehmed II.

MAPS AND VIEWS

The cartography and quasi-cartographic illustrations of Negropont are characterised by a strong tendency to poorly disguised plagiarism or, at best, unacknowledged dependence on previous efforts. This habit goes on even into the present century when street plans of Chalkis continue to show roads which do not now exist and, from the look of the terrain, never did exist. Many of the commonest purported views of the city from the 16th through the 18th century are so absolutely fantastic that they offer no information at all, though they rarely reach the heights of the view by Jacques Chiraud, “Port d’Aulide en la Béocie,” 1730, which shows a handsome baroque customs wharf lined with well-kept 3-storey palaces.

There is regrettably little to be learned from most of the maps and views of Negropont drawn before the end of the 18th century. A large collection of them has been made available in an album of reproductions from the collection of Giannis Karakostas published by the Society for Euboean Studies⁹ and I shall refer to the numbered illustrations from this album below.

THE CAMOCIO MAP

Camocio = “[Negroponte]”, (The cartouche for the title is left blank) *Isole famose, porti, fortezze, e terre maritime sottoposte alla Ser.ma Sig.ria di Venezia, ad altri Principi Christiani, et al Sig.or Turco, novamente poste in luce.* (Venice, n. d., alla libreria del segno di S. Marco); (Karakostas, 52).

The most important of the earlier views of Negropont is the one (probably) drawn by Giovanni Francesco Camocio, which

9. Karakostas = Gkofas, Demetrios and Demetrios Triantafyllopoulos *Χαρακτικά της Εύβοιας: Συλλογή Γιάννη Κ. Καράκωστα.* (Athens: Εταιρεία Ευβοϊκών Σπουδών) 1999.

can be found conveniently reproduced in Jacoby, 2002, p. 564. This view originally appeared in a volume containing 88 folios dated anywhere from 1571 to 1574 and evidently published in 1574 by Camocio. Some of the maps, however, are by other cartographers, and many, including the Negropont map, are unsigned.¹⁰ On this map, several disputed features of the town are clear. The Porta del Tempio is shown at the north end of the town, close to the waterfront, just as the texts of Angiolello and Rizzardo indicate.¹¹ The bishopric, (Vescovado) is quite close to it along the northeast wall. The upper gate is called the Porta di Cristo as expected, and the gate near the Bourkos is identified as Porta Chamata,¹² and is closely associated with the location of the patriarchate (Patriarcado), south of the regions dominated by the Dominican priory (Ayia Paraskevi) which is identified by the name, San Domenego.

Although the artist has made a slight concession to his awareness that the place is actually in Ottoman hands, by putting Ottoman crescent emblems on three of the larger towers in the main circuit, and also on a tower on the island in the Euripus, all the other symbols and text labels depict a Christian environment. Numerous churches are identified both inside and outside the town, and in the few instances where we have any other evidence to check the identifications they appear correct. The plan appears to be a reworking of an earlier document, probably a 15th century drawing in the archives, that became a matter of particular interest following the victory of Lepanto in 1571. It is easy to imagine an enthusiastic populace believing, for the moment, that Venice

10. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1974, s. v. Camocio, pp. 289–90.

11. The name is associated with a district surrounding the church of S. Nicolò, which was assigned to the Augustinian Canons Regular of the Temple of the Lord in Jerusalem (= the Dome of the Rock).

12. This term—a variant of ‘casamatta’—indicates that the tower and gate in this location was filled in and reworked as a casemate for defensive cannon firing at near ground level.

might regain control of some major ports in Morea and the Aegean, some of which had been lost less than 50 years before. It is possible that the original of the Camocio plan may still be awaiting discovery in the Venetian state archives.

For all that this plan is vastly superior to anything else before 1687, and to many later efforts as well, it still has some obvious defects. The small fortification on the island, Castello del Ponte, is hugely exaggerated, and is given an entirely improbable character. The wall-towers are conventionally drawn, and cannot be used as an indication of either the number or the style of the actual towers of the Venetian or the Ottoman fortifications. Two of the towers are distinguished from the remainder by being square, rather than round, but this does not seem to match what little 19th century evidence we have. The “town hill” ridge¹³ is in no way indicated in the view, and the moat is accordingly shown filled with water. The long point of land that reaches out to form the narrow passage at the “Stretto di san Marco” has been conflated with the hill of Santa Marina, and the church of Santa Marina is placed at sea-level on a low-lying point of land, although there is no low-lying land on either the hill at the strait of San Marco or on Santa Marina hill, both of which promontories dip quite sharply into the sea.¹⁴ Further south along the coast the Camocio plan lacks any clear relation to the topography, although the

13. I have adopted the name used in Bakhuizen, 1958 for the long ridge that terminates inside the area of the old city, but I treat the Veli Baba (Dexameni) hill as distinct although it is on the ridge.

14. There is now a flat area on either side of the strait of San Marco where the supports of the high bridge are set, but this is modern fill. My identification of Santa Marina hill agrees with that of Bakhuizen, 1985, p. 2, fig.3; A. Sampson’s map in *City of Chalkis*, 1990, at page 224; Welter, 1955, p. 98 and others. The modern organization of the town is somewhat confusing in this matter, because the inner hill on the point of San Marco has been built over with a suburb that on some recent maps is named Agia Marina (although the central church in the suburb is Agios Markos) while the hill of Agia Marina on these maps now has a suburb named Agios Markos.

placename “Ponte della grecha” in the upper right side may refer to Kalogrítsa. This legend is clearly intended to mark the southern shore of the bay of Ayios Stephanos, because the spring and swamp of Arethusa (il Trocco) is drawn at the head of it. That means that the coast in this area has been drawn with one too many bays.

At the north end of town, the convent of S. Chiara is located about where we might expect, and so is the priory of S. Franceso and the church of SS. Apostoli, but many of the other features identified on the plan are not much help. There is a puzzling building, apparently non-religious, called “Gorgo Pluto” near the top left corner. On the assumption that “Gorgo” may carry the meaning of “abyss”, I have looked—unsuccessfully—for any reference to a hole in the ground in this general vicinity. It might have been the “Well of the Franks” mentioned by Evliya Çelebi.

Among the copies and derivatives of Camocio’s view are: Nicolo Valeggio, 1575 (Karakostas 4); D. Meissner, 1645 (Karakostas, 2); Alphonsus Lasor (Raffaele Savonarola?), 1713 (Karakostas 57).

OTHER MAPS AND VIEWS

d’ Avity, Pierre, sieur de Montmartin, (1573-1635). *Archontologia cosmica, das ist Beschreibung aller Kayserthumben Konigreichen vnd Republicken der gantzen Welt ... wie dieselbe in ihren Grantzen vnd Anmarckungen begrieffen ... wie auch von der alten vnd neuen Inwohnern Gebrauchen ...* Ed. (and Transl.?) Johann Ludwig Gottfried, with engravings by Matthaeus Merian. (Frankfurt am Main, 1638: W. Hoffmans Buchtruckerey). Authorship is often ascribed simply to Gottfried.

The best known later view probably originated as the work of the prolific and influential engraver Matthaeus Merian the elder, who appears to have taken the Camocio map, which is almost a bird’s eye view taken from a bit west of the fortress,

and redrawn it as a ground-level elevation seen from south of the fortress (Karakostas 53). I cannot be sure that the original of this view of Negropont is Merian's work, but everything argues for it. All the features of the town are rendered in a distinctly Germanic style; the principal towers are provided with steeply pitched tile roofs to keep off the snow. In the foreground, a point of land, which seems to hook round to the north very closely resembles Camocio's long point with the Santa Marina church on it, and Merian has placed something that looks like a north European parish church there too. It does not seem too strong to say that this view is of interest only as part of the history of mapmaking and engraving.

Copies and derivatives of the Merian view include: J. C. Wagner, ca. 1687, (Karakostas, 54), a direct copy in woodcut; Bernard Randolph, London, ca. 1690, (Karakostas, 55), (although this is clearly derived from the Merian view, the engraver has tried to suggest the rise of the land toward the Anō Porta, and has indicated quite clearly that the moat is dry for most of its length); Coronelli, 1690, (Karakostas, 41), for Coronelli, see further, below; Pierre van der Aa, 1729, (Karakostas, 58).

CORONELLI

Vicenzo-Maria (Padre Maestro) Coronelli, "cosmographo della Serenissima," one of whose creations appears among the derivatives of the Merian original, was something of a one-man printing industry. In the early 1680s, the Accademia Cosmographica degli Argonauti formed around him, probably at his instigation, and it had subscribers from most of the kingdoms of western Europe, including Poland. In a sort of prospectus, the Accademia promised to issue six assorted maps every month, along with any number of books, pamphlets, and other materials for the furtherance of geographical knowledge. Coronelli probably kept back stocks of all his most successful printings and, year by year, he would gather

up a selection and print yet another book. He managed, according to my hastily assembled list of titles, to get new books on Negropont out in 1686, 1687, 1688, 1690, 1695, 1697, 1700, and 1708. Any given imprint is likely to offer a thoroughly mixed lot of views, often seriously inconsistent with one another.¹⁵ At his worst, he simply reworks old materials, even when he must have had access to better information, but at his best he can provide details of value, such as the graphic description of the location “el Troco” on his map from the *Historia del Regno di Negroponte*,¹⁶ which provides a link between Angiolello’s “Turcoo” and “Trochós”.¹⁷ In the same work, however, he has one view of the Euripus castello with a single tower, a second with two towers, and a third with four. In *Morea, Negroponte, & Isole adiacenze* (Venice, ca. 1708) these three views follow one another immediately in an album made up almost entirely of engravings left over from earlier printings.

THE 1840 PLAN

City plan 1840 = Kokkinis, Spyros and Giannis Gkikas. 1974. “Τὸ πρῶτο πολεοδομικὸ διάγραμμα τοῦ «Κάστρου» τῆς Χαλκίδας καὶ κατάλογος τῶν κτισμάτων,” *AEM*. 19, pp. 277–291.

This city map and the accompanying list of properties within the fortress walls was discovered in an envelope of documents deposited in December, 1847 in the State Archives. It represents an early effort to rationalize the streets of the old town, an early plan, which did not look forward to the destruction of the mediaeval walls. Since no attempt to record the appearance

15. The author of the entry on Coronelli in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* remarks cautiously, “Difficile è giudicare il valore delle carte coronelliane.”

16. Coronelli, 1695; (cf. Karakostas, 38).

17. Ulrichs 1849, p. 482 (= Ulrichs 1863, p. 216); Bakhuizen 1985, p. 66n93 and p. 72n113.

of the walls was made at the time of their destruction in the 1890s, this is an unusually precious document.

EVLIYA ÇELEBI

Evliya Çelebi offers an detailed account of Ottoman Eğriboz in the *Seyahatname* (MS Istanbul, Bagdat Köşkü 308, folio 247b.6–249b.22), but it is confused enough to raise the possibility that Evliya had lost some of his notes and was working from memory. He rotates the entire site of the fortress by about 180 degrees. His account contains, nonetheless, a good deal of valuable information. He states that the bridge over the rapids of the Euripus, from Boeotia to the island Castello was first built in 1657 (Hijri year 1067). This may simply have been a repair, but it is not at all clear that Venetian Negropont had a bridge here in the last decades of the Venetian presence, when a permanent bridge would have been entirely a liability.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babinger, F. 1951. "Maometto II, il Conquistatore e l'Italia." *Rivista Storica Italiana* 63: 469–505.
- Bakhuizen, S. C. 1985. *Studies in the topography of Chalcis on Euboea : a discussion of the sources*. Leiden.
- Coronelli, V. 1695. *Historia del regno di Negroponte, e sue isole adiacenti*. Venice.
- Gkofas, D. and D. Triantafyllopoulos. 1999. Χαρακτικά της Εύβοιας: Συλλογή Γιάννη Κ. Καράκωστα. (Athens: Εταιρεία Ευβοϊκών Σπουδών).
- Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana. 1960-. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Rome
- Jacoby, D. "La Consolidation de la Domination de Venise dans la Ville de Négrepont (1205–1390)", in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV Secolo)*, edd., Ch. A.

- Maltezou and P. Schreiner. Venice. 151–87, reproduction of map on 564.
- Koder, J. 1973. *Negroponte: Untersuchungen und Siedlungsgeschichte der Insel Euböia während der Zeit der Venezianerherrschaft*. Vienna
- di Lenna, N. 1924. “Ricerche intorno allo storico G. Maria Angiolello (degli Anzolelli) patrizio Vicentino.” *Archivio Veneto Tridentino* 5: 1–65.
- Society of Euboean Studies. 1990. Διεθνὲς επιστημονικο συνέδριο «Ἡ Πόλη τῆς Χαλκίδας». (“*The City of Chalkis*”). Athens
- Ulrichs, H. N. 1849. “Beiträge zur Topographie von Euböea, aus den nachgelassenen Tagebüchern und Collectaneen von H. N. Ulrichs, herausgegeben von W. Henzen.” *Rheinisches Museum* 5 N. F.) 481–515.
- . 1963. *Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland II*. A re-edition of the above, by A Passow. Berlin.
- Welter, G. Ph. 1955. Χαλκίς, Ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τοῦ 1470 ed. G. P. Koulikóurdhi. Athens.