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A Resilient Landscape: The Land Walls of Constantinople and Their Surroundings

Despite the multitude of surviving architectural artifacts, the vast majority of which is represented by fortifications spread across the diversified lands of the former Byzantine Empire, little is known about the “hand” of their architects, or the practices of the master builders. In his essay for the Economic History of Byzantium, Charalambos Bouras interpreted the absence of builders’ names and master craftsmen as a feature of Byzantium, their contributions surpassed by the importance of donors’ names and those involved at other levels of the architectural project. This contribution touches upon one of Byzantine architecture’s most iconic monuments, the land walls of Constantinople, whose architects,
master builders and masons, as with other buildings, are unknown to us. This paper seeks to represent a humble tribute to Chorahompos Bouras’ contribution to our better understanding of Byzantine architecture.

The land walls of Constantinople displayed an architectural and functional resilience throughout Byzantine and Ottoman times. With their monumentality, substantially they contributed to the city’s prevailing mode of representation as a suspended urban ‘container’, both in the Byzantine and Ottoman periods. Nestled in an ostensibly strategic position, surrounded by an exceptional geographical setting, the city is typically rendered as tightly enclosed to the West by its monumental land walls, the sea walls encircling its shores and with little consideration for anything outside its walls or those of the Sycae (Galata) district, across the city. Whether observed from the waters of the Marmara Sea, from the Golden Horn, or from the Thracian countryside, until the more recent unregulated expansion of modern Istanbul the land wall of Constantinople visually and physically conveyed the limits of the urban space and its mighty defences. As a powerful monumental and symbolic landmark, it can be imagined that construction of the land walls in the 5th century must have not only changed the perception of the urban space now extended to the west by 1.5 km from the Constantinian walls, but that it must have also contributed to a radical alteration of the cityscape.

Following are some considerations on the interplay between the land walls and their surrounding landscape, and on some of the contemporary communities’ modes of adaptation to their construction. The main focus will be on the usage of space within and around the land walls since their construction, a subject rarely considered when examining the monument. Although the land walls stand as a key monument for the study of diachronic architecture, and represent a powerful historical palimpsest spanning across rivaling empires and preserving tangible signs of relations rather than disconnections, their construction must have also been perceived as a large-scale manipulation of the environment. Hence, it appears reasonable to focus on the temporal arc of the 5th century, when the defensive system’s project and construction took place and the monument was newly built.

Landscape and the construction of the land walls

The land wall stretched for circa 6.5 km from the sea of Marmara to the Golden Horn, forming one of the most elaborate defensive systems of Antiquity while also defining the extension of the largest metropolis of Late Antiquity. When observed from the countryside, the defensive


The monument was the object of a systematic architectural survey in the 1930s, B. Meyer-Plath – A. M. Schneider, Die Landmaurer von Konstantinopel (Denkmäler Antiker Architektur VI, VIII), 2 vols., Berlin 1943, with no subsequent comprehensive survey. For a recent study of the monument, N. Assunat-Ellenberger, Die Landmaurer von Konstantinopel-Istanbul: historisch-topographische und baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Millennium-Studien 18), Berlin 2007 with earlier bibliography. The Koç University-Stavros Niarchos Foundation for Late Antique and Byzantine

of Byzantium, From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century (DOS XXXIX), Washington, D.C. 2002, 2, 539-554, in part. 539.


See, for example a passage in, Procopius, Buildings, H. B. Dewing trans., (The Loeb Classical Library, Procopius VIII), Harvard University Press, 1954, iv, 2-3, 57. Other cities in Late Antiquity are represented as encircled by strong walls in coinage issues see, L. Grig, “Competing Capitals, Competing Representations: Late Antique Cityscapes in Words and Pictures”, L. Grig – G. Kelly (eds), Two Romes, Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity), Oxford 2012, 31-52.
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system comprised, from west to east, three architectural elements and two earth structures (Figs 1, 2). A wide ditch with internally buttressed walls was crossed by stone bridges corresponding to most of the 12 documented gates that led to an outer earth terrace, whose exact inclination has not been determined. An outer wall equipped with towers and gates was linked to the outer terrace as well as to an inner, more compact earth terrace. Lastly, an inner defensive line was marked by two-story towers and gates. This elaborate defensive system formed a barrier of at least 60 m in width, with an estimated difference in height of ca. 30 m between the bottom of the ditch and the inner wall towers’ parapets. It is therefore likely that, in order to accommodate these architectural and earth features on such a large scale, the general project was carefully planned and executed. More specifically, the terrain had to be progressively prepared, with earth removed from the ditch likely used to create the two earth terraces that are placed in front of the outer and inner walls. Although this form of terrain preparation does not compare with the typology of land retention terraces built in the city, it provides a valuable parameter for the assessment and calculation of the scale at which a large-scale construction project such as the land walls required major landscape manipulation.

Studies has recently begun a photographic documentation of the city walls, including the land walls.


10 Bouras, “Master Craftsmen, Craftsmen, and Building Activities in Byzantium”, op.cit. (n. 3), 542.

11 For a visual rendering of terraces in Constantinople, J. Crow – J.
negotiating space: horticulture and the land walls

A law dating to 413 in the Theodosian Code (15.1.51) represents the first written mention of the existence of a new circuit of walls in Constantinople12. Credit for the construction of the "novi muri" is given to the praetorian prefect Anthemius13. The edict also makes temporal references to the status of the construction project using the terms "extractus est" and "complete opere", built and completed, respectively. These references allow us to define a historical space for the completion of the work. However, opinions have differed with regard to the beginning of the construction and the length of the undertaking. J. Bardill recently addressed this issue and through a revision of the documentary evidence, as well as with a newly discovered inscription, concluded that "work must have started in 404 or 405, hence towards the end of the reign of Arcadius"14. Anthemius was appointed praetorian prefect in 405 and last documented in 414, therefore making it likely that the extensive construction site was active between 405 and 413, a span of eight years15. Bardill’s discussion was part of a larger study on the brickstamps from Byzantine Constantinople documented through archival research until 2001, with the land walls representing a site whose contemporary sampling of in situ material appeared complex in terms of the task; the results it may yield are promising but study has not been systematically conducted16. This is relevant also given the building technique of the land walls which, in its early phases, consisted of bands of brick courses spanning across the entire section of the wall and alternating regularly with bands of courses of ashlar stones with a rubble and mortar fill. Known sampling of brickstamps for the land wall is still rather unreliable and not corroborating. The absence of systematic surveys of the land wall, the scarce information published, and decades of debatable conservation interventions make it hard to define the contextualization of brickstamps within temporal actions, quantitative assessments, construction phases, repairs and modalities of reemployment17.

The law in the Theodosian code provides other valuable information about usage of the land walls and its surrounding space, information that has rarely been the

12 J. Bardill, Brickstamps of Constantinople, Oxford University Press, 2004, 122-125; the inscription in question was found in 1993 and “indicates that the original construction lasted for nine years”, 122.
13 Bardill, Brickstamps of Constantinople, op.cit. (n. 14), 122.
14 The bulk of Bardill’s material is represented by Ernst Mamboury’s unpublished collection of brickstamps along with material from the Saraçhane, Kalenderhane and other excavations, Bardill, Brickstamps of Constantinople, op.cit. (n. 14), vii-ix.
15 The absence of data for the land walls is now juxtaposed by newly processed data on the construction resources and manpower for the water supply system of Constantinople, largely using mortar analysis and brick sampling, R. Snyder, “Building the Longest Water Supply System: Large-scale Construction in Constantinople’s Hinterland”, Annual of Istanbul Studies / Istanbul Araştırmaları Yıllığı 5 (2016), 1-19.
object of discussion. In fact, the main regulatory order of the text focuses on the towers of “turre privi muri”, which are here assigned in perpetuity to those “through whose lands this wall was duly erected”. In return, the same individuals are asked to provide for repairs of the towers. The area of land used for the construction of the new wall was large, given the width and the length of the defensive system. Considering that the defensive system occupied a space whose width—that is, from the moat’s walls to the external access ramps to the inner wall’s towers—amounted to 60 m plus the inevitable buffer zone of at least 10 m on each side, the full width might be calculated at some 80 m (Fig. 2). This would have amounted to a total of circa 0.52 square kilometers.

It is not clear if and how modalities of land transfer took place, as the edict refers to the landholders as “demi-graverint”, removed or withdrawn. Is this an implicit acknowledgment of confiscation and/or displacement? Practices of confiscation and transfer are scarcely documented in Roman and Late Antique times, making it difficult to grasp them both in terms of dynamics and magnitude. However, lands affected by construction of the new fortification must have also fallen within the sphere of works related to public interest and public welfare, the “res publica,” both during the planning process and for the later usage. The law of the Codex might be understood as a regulatory act within the context of widespread, large-scale and spatially extended infrastructural works undertaken for the city. In the 5th century Constantinople was the subject of large-scale public projects that surpassed by far all other urban centers of the period.

A wealth of new information on another large-scale infrastructural activity carried out within Constantinople and its hinterland is emerging through a survey of the city’s water supply system. Data collected by J. Crow and his team over the course of extended field surveys have clarified that the main mechanism that carried the water supply for the Late Antique city consisted of a three-element system. This comprised two aqueducts, the second of which was organized in two distinct chronological phases along with a widespread network of open-air and underground cisterns.

---

18 I connect “buffer zone” to a space recognized in cultural heritage as a “zonal area that lies between two or more other areas” which in antiquity as well as in contemporary times recognizes the existence of a liminal space that enhances the function of a monument, UNESCO, Operational Guides for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO World Heritage Centre), Paris 2008, 103-107.


The chronology of the aqueduct’s first line, also known as the Valens line, is now attested to the mid-4th century and extended over a linear distance of circa 65 km\(^2\). By the early-mid 5th century the second Valens line was constructed over a 120 km linear distance, now calculated in recent topographical surveys as a channel line running over the remarkable distance of 426 to 564 km\(^2\). Laws from the 4th to the 6th centuries make reference to aspects of the administration of the water supply, to the regulation of water pipes and to the responsibilities of the landholders through whose lands the two aqueduct lines were built. A law dated to 440, when construction of the second Valens line was close to completion, and only a few decades after completion of the land walls, mentions the landholders’ obligation to keep a distance of at least 10 feet from the aqueduct line free from trees. It is likely that some of the lands affected by the passage of the water supply system might have still seen the active presence of their landholders. Earlier, in a mid-4th century law for the city of Rome, landholders through whose properties aqueducts passed were deemed responsible for the maintenance of the channels. The practice of allowing users to retain a physical presence on lands crossed by public infrastructure, and in return to accept some form of participation in the maintenance works, appears therefore plausible.

Satellite imaging, field surveying and other techniques were used to document the features of the agricultural landscape affected by the presence of the Anastasian wall, built some 65 km west of the land walls and in close physical dialogue with the water supply system, in its southern segment. There, the characterization of the landscape allowed the identification of probable medieval strip fields along with a Roman settlement and more modern traces of landscape usage. Two Byzantine-period boundary markers from the same area represent valuable testimony of the existence of extended pastoral and agricultural landownership inside and outside the defensive line.

The law referring to Constantinople’s land walls implicitly recognizes the fact that the monumental construction cutting through the peninsula must have crossed a conspicuous amount of privately owned lands, whose value was also due to their location in the immediate outskirts of the Constantinian walls. The same lands must have been removed, withdrawn (demigrare) from their legitimate users, who in return were given in

---

\(^{24}\) *Corpus Iuris Civilis, Codex Justinianus*, S. P. Scott trans., Cincinnati 1932, II.42.6, vol. 15, 195-196.
\(^{25}\) *Codex Theodosianus*, op.cit. (n. 12) 15.2.1, 430.
\(^{27}\) Crow – Turner, “Silivri and the Thracian hinterland of Istanbul: an historic landscape”, op.cit. (n. 26), 171 with earlier references.
perpetuity the right to utilize floors of the towers. This usage, which must have represented a valuable asset for the landholders and a partial form of compensation, was countered with responsibility for maintenance of the towers. It is reasonable to assume that the towers of the inner circuit wall were more suitable for private usage. In fact, some of the inner-circuit two-story towers show inner terrace-level chambers accessed from the city side by means of a single, large, brick-tiered archway. Overall these chambers did not communicate with the chambers above, and their lack of defensive qualities appears evident. Open-access staircases built on the inner face of the towers led to the towers’ upper chambers, the platform level and to the wall walk, contributing to a further physical isolation of the lower-level chambers.

Furthermore, most of the inner terrace-level chambers display brick vaulted systems substantially higher than those of the upper chambers and several of them were not always accessible from the city side. Their access instead was through a relatively small side

---

entrance, a sort of postern opening into the inner terrace. A. Van Millingen was first to note and record this detail, concluding that “the lower portion of the tower had evidently little to do directly with the defense of the city, but served mainly as a store-room or guard-house”\(^{-30}\). Crow, too, suggested that these towers were meant to “remain in private usage as compensation for the land expropriated for the Land Walls”\(^{-30}\).

Conservation work carried out by the Istanbul Municipality over the last two decades of the past century focused on six different stretches of the land walls, with Metin and Zeynep Ahunbay responsible for work on towers 2 through 5\(^{-31}\). Clearance of earth around the perimeter of tower 4 and from the inner wall allowed for a detailed architectural survey of the tower (Fig. 3, 4). The octagonal in plan tower had been usually dated to the reign of the emperor Romanos III (1028-1034), based on an inscription placed on its upper level that mentions its reconstruction following an earthquake\(^{-32}\). On the other hand, Schneider already had noted that what emerged from the ground of tower 4—that is, its lower level—was earlier in dating and most likely 5th-century\(^{-33}\). Excavation by Ahunbay exposed larger portions of the tower’s original building phase and brought to light in its entirety the lower chamber’s rectangular opening into the inner terrace. The postern, located to the south of the octagonal tower, measures 1.20 m in width, and is framed by molded marble lintels leading into a circular in plan chamber covered by a dome with concentric-brick courses\(^{-34}\).

The southern portion of the land walls reveals the presence of other ground-floor posterns. This area has not been the subject of the attentive work directed toward tower 4, and hence information is based on Meyer-Plath and Schneider’s architectural survey. As in the case of tower 4, single openings from ground-floor chambers into the inner terrace are present. These ground-floor chambers display no other means of access, and do not communicate with the tower’s upper-story chamber. The towers in question are all square in plan. Number 16, between the Golden Gate and the Xylokerkos gate, is pierced by a southern postern measuring circa 1.20 m, with a triple brick relieving arch and marked by marble lintels (Fig. 4, 5). Further north is tower 19, with a northern entrance. Beyond the Xylokerkos gate to the north are towers 25 with a southern postern and tower 26 with a northern postern. Tower 33, before the Pege gate, is square in plan and also has a southern entrance leading into a circular in plan high-vaulted chamber\(^{-35}\). Through the inner terrace into which these posterns communicated, it was possible to gain access to the outer terrace, as some towers in the outer walls were also equipped with lateral posterns\(^{-36}\). This arrangement allowed for limited and controlled movement of individuals, and likely of goods and tools, factors that would have made the spaces suitable for the storage of agricultural tools as well as for temporary stocking of produce.

Little archaeological or textual information is known about how the landscape was affected by construction of the land walls, and which types of cultivation presumably thrived in this area. Archaeobotany and horticultural investigations represent rare occurrences in urban archaeology, for the Byzantine period in particular. However, chapter 12.1 of the Geoponika, a collection of texts on agriculture amply used by elite proprietors and dedicated to the emperor Constantine VII (913-949), was examined by J. Koder and provides valuable information\(^{-37}\). The chapter in question was, like several other

\(^{-30}\) Van Millingen, Byzantine Constantinople. The Walls of the City and Adjoining Historical Sites, op.cit. (n. 28), 52.

\(^{-31}\) J. Crow, “The Infrastructure of a Great City: Earth, Walls and Water in Late Antique Constantinople”, op.cit. (n. 9), 264 (42).


\(^{-33}\) Van Millingen, Byzantine Constantinople. The Walls of the City and Adjoining Historical Sites, op.cit. (n. 28), 102-103. Ahunbay – Ahunbys, “Recent Work on the Land Walls of Istanbul: Tower 2 to 5”, op.cit. (n. 31), 237, figs 25-28, 30-31 where it is possible to observe that this is the best-preserved tower among those that were the subject of the conservation project.

\(^{-34}\) Meyer-Plath – Schneider, Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel, op.cit. (n. 8), 74-74, plan 1.

\(^{-35}\) M. Ahunbay, “Recent Work on the Land Walls of Istanbul: Tower 2 to 5”, op.cit. (n. 31), figs 26, 31.
parts of the *Geoponika*, largely based on the writings of the Late Antique *scholastikos* Cassianos Bassos\(^3\). It lists which vegetables are to be sown and what is to be planted on a month-by-month basis in the region of Constantinople. The chapter consists of a rather schematic yet detailed list of fresh produce with mention, for example, of a variety of greens as well as carrot, (white) cabbage, turnip, onion and many more\(^3\). Some of these vegetables, such as cabbage (*krambe*), could easily be stored in cold, dark basement spaces without requiring much further attention like curing or drying (Figs 6, 7)\(^4\). In his examination of the list, Koder questioned the absence of what at this time would have been common


Mediterranean-climate vegetables such as olives, broad beans, millet, gourds and others. Rather than an omission, this absence confirms that the text was specifically composed for the geo-climatic region of Constantinople, which does not afford a full-fledged Mediterranean climate. Furthermore, the chapter in the *Geoponika* also focuses on a range of fresh vegetables, which do not travel well over long distances and are meant to be consumed relatively soon after their harvest⁴¹. Koder rightly hypothesized that lands used for agriculture and vegetable gardens to feed the inhabitants of the city were spread throughout the little urbanized area between the Constantinian walls and the new land walls, and to the west of the new defensive system. This suggestion finds further corroboration in textual and architectural evidence for the private usage of several chambers in the land walls towers. The presence of widespread horticultural spaces inside the land walls, particularly along the southern section of the city walls, amply testifies to their usage through the Byzantine and Ottoman periods. Their contemporary survival makes this practice a resilient urban habit of the city.

In fact, for the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, accounts of the city’s horticultural spaces abound and are associated with the long history of monastic establishments⁴². While gardens represented a metaphor as well as the reality of a monastic setting, urban or otherwise, descriptions and representations of monasteries in Constantinople also include the presence of gardens’ perimeter walls as an important symbolic and spatial element⁴³. Beyond those walls, vegetable gardens, fruit

---

⁴¹ Koder, “Fresh vegetables for the capital”, op. cit. (n. 37), 51.


⁴³ Monastic gardens are also seen as sacred enclosures, V. Della
trees and vineyards defined monastic life for dietary, healing and spiritual purposes. While this information is largely attested in Byzantine sources from these periods, travelers from the west also recognized the abundance of walled monastic gardens inside Constantinople. The Castilian Ruy González de Clavijo, in the early years of the 15th century, marvelled at the mighty size of the city’s land walls and noted the presence of vast enclosures with fruit gardens and cornfields. Not too far from the land walls, Clavijo described the monastery of St. John of Stoudios, whose still functioning monastic community had vast gardens, fountains and more. Earlier, in the mid-12th century, Odo of Deuil, another western traveler, reported that vast cultivated lands by the land walls were producing for the inhabitants of the city.

Whereas monastic gardens prevail in the textual evidence of the Late Byzantine periods, horticultural spaces not necessarily part of monastic establishments might have existed in earlier periods along the land walls. This is also significant as it supports the suggestion that the city retained ample unbuilt areas between the former Constantinian walls and the new land walls. Together with the monastic gardens well documented for the later periods, the city must have afforded, particularly in its early days and in its immediate vicinity, agricultural estates – a form of structured land-tenure with more textual evidence for horticulture in the area of Stoudios and the land walls in the Middle Byzantine period.

---

44 R. González de Clavijo. Narrative of the Embassy to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-1406, K. H. Markham trans. (Hakluyt Society), London 1859, 46.
47 Koder, “Fresh vegetables for the capital”, op.cit. (n. 37), 53-54.

Fig. 7. Constantinople. Probable horticultural zones of the city in the 6th century.
organization linked to urban social classes and to economic management of the products. Landholders were also directly involved in selling the produce, which for economic reasons they were interested in offering at nearby markets, thereby cutting down on transportation costs, with urban centers like Constantinople representing a vital reference. The presence of agricultural estates within and near urban centers during Late Antiquity is well attested and, for the city of Constantinople, the visibility of its elite landowners is documented for this period too in the region of Bithynia.

One of the few names we may associate with areas around the land walls for earlier periods is that of Studios, consul of the East in 454 and founder of the monastic complex whose construction took place soon before his consular appointment (Fig. 4). Despite the remarkable architectural resilience of the basilical in plan monastic church, the central role the community played in subsequent centuries in Constantinopolitan religious affairs, and the inevitable interest it exerted on travelers such as Clavijo, little is known about the archaeology of the monastery and the estate. Only limited archaeological soundings were carried out by the Russian Archaeological Institute of Constantinople in 1907 and 1909, and by the German Archaeological Institute of Istanbul with the Ayasofya Museum in 1979, all of which were accompanied by limited published reports. In both instances, archaeological soundings that took place underneath the church – south and northern aisles, the former atrium and south of the narthex – revealed the presence of earlier architectural remains. A structure identified as a tower, spaces decorated with frescoes, and a water channel presumably feeding into the large-sized underground cistern led U. Peschlow to suggest the existence of a residential complex of the

---

Fig. 8. Constantinople. Detail of the southern portion of the land walls with surrounding gardens.

---


Imperial/Late Roman periods that was demolished in order to accommodate the monastic complex. As a detailed publication of the soundings will certainly shed more light on the archaeology of the site, a working hypothesis sees a well-structured suburban residential estate with annexed lands, which in the middle of the 5th century was replaced by a monastic complex. This might represent a rare Constantopolitan example, supported by archaeological evidence, of the transformation of a residential estate into a monastic community.

The area around the Studios monastery and the southern section of the land walls continues to show the presence of extended horticultural activities well into the Ottoman times. Of the numerous testimonies, work by Lechevalier is of particular relevance as it is based on meticulous on-site surveys carried out with technical instruments (Fig. 8). The measured plan of the city shows the extension of gardens outside and inside the land walls between the Golden Gate and the Xylokertkos gate, within the walls are the vegetable gardens of “Ismail Pacha” and “Horos” while homes for the gardeners are at the end of the land walls by the sea of Marmara. Horticulture, cemeteries and small sized-clusters of homes as well as monuments mark the landscape in this area of the land walls.

These days, a walk along the southern section of the land walls will reveal the presence of horticultural activities in the ditch, with landholders selling fresh produce on the outer and inner terraces in the shadows of one of the mightiest architectural achievements of Late Antiquity. We find a historically resilient dialog, which the rapidly shrinking orchards continue to maintain along the land walls, in what contributes to the survival and conservation of both tangible and intangible heritage.
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Τα χωριά των τείχη της Κωνσταντινούπολης, που ανεγέρθηκαν στις αρχές του 5ου αιώνα, αποτελεούν ένα από τα πιο αντιπροσωπευτικά μνημεία της αρχιτεκτονικής της ίστορης αρχαιότητας αλλά και της νέας
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ΑΛΕΣΑΝΔΡΑ ΡΙΚΙ
ΔΧΑΕ ΛΘ΄ (2018), 125-138
πρωτεύουσας. Ευρισκόμενα σε απόσταση περίπου ενά
μισι χιλιομέτρου από τη βεζυντινή της πόλης κατά μήκος
λίθων και πλίνθων, τα χερσαία τείχη συνέχισαν να
αποτελούν το σύνορο της πόλης σε όλη την ύπαρξη
κατά µήκος των τειχών, στην τάφρο και στην πλευρά προς την
κληρονοµιά της εξωτερικής περιφέρειας της οχύρωσης.
Από την άποψη της αρχιτεκτονικής τεκµηρίωσης, η
Η σχέση των µνηµειακών χερσαίων τειχών της Κων-
επάνω όροφο. Πρόκειται για έναν
Σχέδιο (Εικ. 8).
Η επιτόπια έρευνα κατά µήκος των χερσαίων τει-
στην εσωτερική όχυρωση, σηµειώνεται η απουσία
διατήρησε το τοπίο που τα προσδιόρισε επί αιώνες.
πρωτεύουσας, τον οποίο ο
θέτονε το πιο

ΞΙΛΗ ΑΘ (2018), 125-138
αλικτοριστήρια και πιο αστική
δύο άλλα και κατά την οθωµανική περίοδο (Εικ. 1-3).
Την ύπαρξη λαχανόκηπων στα πλατώµα-
κατά µήκος των τειχών, στην τάφρο και στην πλευρά προς την
εσωτερική οχύρωση, σηµειώνεται η απουσία

με την άποψη της αρχιτεκτονικής τεκµηρίωσης, η

πρώτη, δηλαδή µία τάφρο, πολλοί από τους οποίους περι-
συνδέεται µε τη χαρακτηριστική διχρωµία των εναλλασσόµενων
κυκλώµατα των νέων τείχων», δικα (15.1.51) και έχει χρονολογηθεί στο 413, κάνει συ-
πολιτική χρήση. Επιπλέον, σε

επιτόπια χαρακτηριστικής αστικής χρήσης που συνέδεσε µε τις αστικές καλλιεργήσεις που βρίσκο-

ρώνων, και ο χάρτης του
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στη δεκαετία του 1930 παραµένει ση

στην εσωτερική πλευρά της πόλης ως µνηµείο συνδέεται βέβαια και µε τη

πρωτεύουσας. Ευρισκόµενα σε απόσταση περίπου ενά

σαίων τειχών ως µνηµείο συνδέεται βέβαια και µε τη

πρωτεύουσας. Ευρισκόµενα σε απόσταση περίπου ενά