



HAL
open science

Citizenship in Medieval Ioannina

Brendan Patrick Claude Osswald

► **To cite this version:**

Brendan Patrick Claude Osswald. Citizenship in Medieval Ioannina. Citizenship in historical perspective, 2006. hal-02083107

HAL Id: hal-02083107

<https://univ-tlse2.hal.science/hal-02083107>

Submitted on 28 Mar 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Citizenship in historical perspective / edited by Steven G. Ellis, Guðmundur Hálfðanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs
(Transversal theme ; 1)



323.6 (21.)

1. Cittadinanza 2. Individuo e società I. Ellis, Steven II. Hálfðanarson, Guðmundur III. Isaacs, Ann Katherine

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-006164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Volumes published (2006)

I. Thematic Work Groups

- I. Public Power in Europe: Studies in Historical Transformations
- II. Power and Culture: Hegemony, Interaction and Dissent
- III. Religion, Ritual and Mythology. Aspects of Identity Formation in Europe
- IV. Professions and Social Identity. New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society
- V. Frontiers and Identities: Exploring the Research Area
- VI. Europe and the World in European Historiography

II. Transversal Theme

- I. Citizenship in Historical Perspective

III. Doctoral Dissertations

- I. F. Peyrou, La Comunidad de Ciudadanos. El Discurso Democrático-Republicano en España, 1840-1868

Cover: Ambrogio Lorenzetti (1285-1348 ca.), *The Effects of Good Government in the City and the Countryside*, fresco (central part), Palazzo Pubblico, Siena. © 1990. Photo Scala, Florence.



© Copyright 2006 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

info-plus@edizioniplus.it

www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

ISBN 88-8492-406-5

Manager

Claudia Napolitano

Editing

Francesca Petrucci

Informatic assistance

Michele Gasparello

Citizenship in Medieval Ioannina

BRENDAN OSSWALD

University of Toulouse II - Le Mirail

Ioannina est devenue après la chute de l'Empire byzantin en 1204 une des principales villes de l'Etat byzantin d'Epire, avant de devenir quasiment indépendante de 1319 à 1430, date de la conquête ottomane. Le problème de la citoyenneté s'y est posé avec acuité, dans la mesure où elle a d'une part continuellement été confrontée au problème des migrations, qu'il s'agisse de populations allogènes ou de réfugiés grecs, et où d'autre part son autonomie politique a posé le problème de la prise de décisions.

La tradition byzantine d'avant 1204 était très accueillante envers les allogènes soucieux de s'intégrer à la communauté byzantine orthodoxe. Ioannina poursuivit cette politique, à la notable exception des Albanais qui, en raison de leur nombre, de leurs différences culturelles et de l'ambition de leurs chefs, furent constamment refoulés. En revanche, la pression albanaise conduisit la ville à inviter des princes étrangers à la gouverner en tant que Despotes, afin qu'ils apportent avec eux une aide militaire et diplomatique. C'est ainsi qu'un prince serbe et trois princes italiens régnèrent sur elle de 1367 à 1430. Chacun de ces princes amena avec lui des troupes ainsi que des courtisans allogènes. Un certain nombre de nouveaux venus, Grecs ou allogènes, ont ainsi pu jouer un rôle politique majeur à Ioannina.

*Le pouvoir dans la ville était réparti entre plusieurs catégories de citoyens: la catégorie supérieure, celle des archontes constituait le Sénat. Le peuple pouvait occasionnellement se réunir en assemblée, mais cette assemblée entérinait en général les décisions des archontes. Enfin, la catégorie des *καστηνοί* est mal définie: il s'agissait à l'origine du nom donné aux habitants du *κάστρον*, mais on suppose que le terme prit un sens social et devint héréditaire, les habitants supposés originels se démarquant ainsi des nouveaux venus.*

Nos sources sont malheureusement peu loquaces et ne nous permettent pas de savoir précisément quel était contexte juridique de la citoyenneté, ni même si un règlement précis l'encadrerait. Le plus probable est que les circonstances troublées ont conduit le Despote et les habitants de Ioannina à agir de façon pragmatique, voire arbitraire.

Ioannina was a small Byzantine city until the Fourth Crusade, which provoked the collapse of the Byzantine Empire, replaced by a Latin Empire in Constantinople and three Greek rival empires in Nicaea, Trebizond and Epirus¹. A large number of refugees fleeing from the Latin invaders came to Epirus². Arta was then the official capital of Epirus, but Ioannina, which was a really small and insignificant city until 1204, quickly became as important as Arta and then, after the Turkish conquest, officially became the capital of Epirus – a status it still has today.

We chose Ioannina as the topic of this case study regarding citizenship for two main reasons. First, foreigners played a particularly strong role in the city during the late Middle Ages. Second, the history of the city is relatively well-known, especially when compared to Arta, the other main city of Epirus, thanks to two Greek Chronicles written in Ioannina, which give us a rich and vivid account of the historical events of these times, even if they unfortunately do not provide answers to all of our questions. These are the *Chronicle of Ioannina*, useful for the events between 1341 and 1400, and the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, useful for the events between 1375 and 1422³. We will make this study along two lines, looking first at the differences between local people and newcomers and, second, at differences between the classes of citizens.

LOCALS AND NEWCOMERS

The Byzantine Empire indeed preserved its Roman heritage accepting Caracalla's Edict of 212 a.D., and so citizenship was not the exclusive property of an ethnic or geographic group: all free men were citizens, so political rights were not the exclusive preserve of Greeks. Membership in the Byzantine élite was open to the other ethnic groups of the empire, and even to foreigners, although how the process of integration and naturalisation came about is still quite unclear⁴. As a matter of fact, throughout its long history, the absolute monarchy that was the Byzantine Empire needed the demographic and military support of newcomers, and since there was no participation of the middle class in the upper levels of politics, there was no opposition to the extension of the number of citizens. So, the one and only necessary and sufficient requirement to become a fully-integrated Byzantine citizen after the 6th century was to be an Orthodox Christian, a member of the Christian society that the Empire represented, a terrestrial image of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Fourth Crusade and the subsequent events forced the contemporary inhabitants of Ioannina to pose some questions: if Epirus is cut off from the rest of the Empire, what does Roman⁵ citizenship mean, and since the city is peopled by a large number of refugees, how should they be considered? It is difficult to know what ethnic characteristics the refugees of 1204 possessed. Most of them were probably Greek, since the Crusaders invaded areas largely peopled by Greeks, but the very fact that our sources do not mention their ethnicity but only their religion shows that they were still catalogued according to the classical Byzantine frame of mind. The first rulers of Epirus aimed at restoring the Byzantine Empire, so the refugees were granted the right to settle and to benefit from full citizenship. Michael Comnenos, founder of the State of Epirus, invited them and gave them space to settle inside the city of Ioannina. This decision had ideological aims, since Michael wanted to be seen as a rescuer of the Byzantine people⁶; but there were also political, economical and military aims, as he hoped it would help him organize his State and strengthen his army. Since his power was strong, his decision was effective. But not all of the original inhabitants of Ioannina liked this policy and when Michael's brother Theodore was defeated and captured by the Bulgarians in 1230, the inhabitants tried to expel the refugees⁷. Unfortunately, we do not know what happened then but the expulsion probably never was completed, because Michael's son, Michael II, took power and tried to follow the same general policy as his father, to whose memory he was very def-

erential. This crisis also showed the difference between the will of the State and the will of the city. The situation was about to become more complicated with the collapse of all the centralized political authorities in the Balkans and the greater autonomy of the city of Ioannina.

In 1261 the Empire of Nicaea took Constantinople back and restored the Byzantine Empire in its capital. This restoration did not make Epirus offer loyalty to the new Emperor, Michael Palaeologos, and the fragmentation of the former Byzantine space continued. When the Italian dynasty of the Orsini launched a coup, killed the last prince of the Comnenos dynasty and took power in Epirus, the city of Ioannina rallied behind the Byzantine Empire, and in 1319 and 1321 it received two chrysobulls (a kind of privilege) from the Emperor Andronicus II that gave it substantial autonomy⁸. It must be noted that Jews were granted the same privileges as the other inhabitants of Ioannina, and that they were perhaps living inside the walls of the city⁹. At the same time, the city was supposed to refuse to be led by a foreigner to the Empire, and landlords were supposed to refuse to sell their properties to foreigners. But later, in the 1340s, the Serbian and Albanian invasions brought about the collapse of Byzantine domination in the Balkans, and made these decisions of no consequence. None of the invaders put the city under its yoke, so that Ioannina became a kind of independent City-State comparable to the Italian ones, but the city was too weak to remain isolated from foreigners.

The various invasions highlighted the problems of nationalities in this period: our sources now describe the persons by their ethnicity, and ethnicity became a political problem. In the second half of the 14th century, Ioannina was proud to be a city entirely populated by Greeks. Its sovereigns, who held the title of Despots, made it a part of their political agenda to expel the Albanians from Epirus. Despot Nicephoros II (ca. 1355-1358) tried to win the support of the Greeks by promising to expel the Albanians from Epirus¹⁰. Then Despot Thomas Preljubović (1367-1384) held the title of *Ἀλβανιτόκτονος*, the “Albanian-slayer”¹¹. The Albanian conquest provoked a further influx of Greek refugees, and some aristocrats from Vagenetia, a rural region in the west of Ioannina also known as Thesprotia, found refuge in the city¹². But the fact is that from 1367 until the Turkish conquest in 1430, there was one Serbian despot and three Italian ones. In the time of Thomas Preljubović, some Serbian people went to the city, were given Greek properties and wives, and became members of the Despot’s council; but unfortunately the Chronicle of Ioannina, which talks about them, provides neither numbers nor names. However, the presence of Serbians displeased the people of Ioannina, who considered them to be *ξένοι* [“foreigners”] whereas they themselves were *τοπικοί* [“locals”]. They accused Despot Thomas of giving privileges to the former and mistreating the latter¹³. This hostility did not force all of the Serbians to leave Ioannina even after Thomas was murdered. His widow Maria Angelina stayed as *Basilissa* [title of the wife of the Despot] and married his successor Esau Buondelmonti. The latter then married Eudokia Balsić, who came from Serbia; this wedding shows the strength of the Serbian party inside Ioannina, since the Serbian state was far from being militarily influential in Epirus after its defeat at Kosovo Polje in 1389 and it could no longer be a useful ally. After Esau’s death in 1411, his Serbian widow was expelled, and probably some other Serbian people left the city with her, but Stephen Bouisavos, *πρωτοστράτωρ* [military officer] of Ioannina from 1411 to 1430, seems to have

been Serbian¹⁴. Then came the Italian Despots Esau Buondelmonti, Carlo I Tocco and Carlo II Tocco, who brought with them a small number of Italian people. For example Matteo Libardi came from Florence, at the time of Esau's rule¹⁵. Nevertheless, Albanians were never welcomed in Ioannina, and we have no indications that there were Albanians living inside the city, except as prisoners¹⁶. The Albanians of the clan of the Μαλακασαῖοι submitted to the rule of the city, but do not appear to have become citizens. After the Turks conquered Dryinopolis in 1418, some Albanian enemies of Ioannina sought refuge in the city. They all died quickly because of the Black Death, so we do not know what their status inside the city would have been had they lived¹⁷.

We can see that ethnicity was a familiar concept at the time, that the inhabitants of Ioannina were often inclined to protest about the newcomers, that the Greeks had some preconceived ideas about Albanians, Serbians and Western Latin people, sometimes even hatred, but we see no trace of a different status for the foreigners living inside the city. The military emergency obliged Ioannina to appeal to foreign princes, in the hope of military help, and the presence of foreign princes allowed foreigners to make their career in the city. So we can suppose that there was no particular legal status for the ξένοι. The immigrants' main problem was to be accepted inside the walls, and Albanians probably never succeeded in accomplishing this. But once inside, immigrants had to deal more with the hostility of the τοπικοί than with legal discrimination¹⁸. Obviously this hostility was less pronounced in the case of Greek immigrants, but it did exist: Michel Apsaras, Thomas Preljubović's favourite, did not come from Ioannina and was hated by its inhabitants¹⁹.

Finally, when the Turkish army threatened the city in 1430, the council, composed of Greek and Serbian people, decided to recognize Ottoman domination, and negotiated an agreement that reserved the city for Christians, while Turkish Muslims were forbidden to live inside the walls. The people of Ioannina were guaranteed the continuity of their laws and self-administration²⁰. This status lasted until 1611. In that year, after a rebellion, the Christians were expelled from the castle, which then became the preserve of the Turks²¹.

DIFFERENT CLASSES OF CITIZENS

Our various sources speak about differences between the ἄρχοντες, which means the "leaders", and the ἀρχόμενοι, which means the "led", or between the μεγάλοι, "the big", and the μικροί, "the small"²². That differentiation is quite close to the Italian one between the *popolo grasso* and the *popolo minuto*. The ἄρχοντες were the only ones who participated in the political life. There was an ἐκκλησία τοῦ δήμου, an assembly of the people, but it did not meet often, only at critical moments when there were important decisions to take, for example after the murder of Despot Thomas Preljubović or after the expulsion of Basilissa Eudokia Balsić²³. But in reality these assemblies always confirmed the decisions taken by the leading class of the ἄρχοντες. These met with or without the Despot: in the former case meetings were more informal, in the latter the assembly took the name of Senate, in Greek Σύγκλητος or Βουλή²⁴. The Senate was open to foreigners, since the foreign Despots always took with them some counsellors who had received properties and became powerful: Thomas Preljubović designated as archons some men of his Serbian company, while Esau Buondelmonti designated as archon the already mentioned Matteo Libardi²⁵.

However, the existence of the term *καστηρηνοί*, which means “the ones of the castle” should be noted here. Castle, in this context, meant a walled city. So originally the *καστηρηνοί* were the people living inside the walls, but quickly the term seems to have assumed a social meaning, that is it referred the people owning their house inside the walls. Theoretically closed since it was forbidden to sell a property to a foreigner, this social class was in reality open, as the *ἄρχοντες* coming with a foreign Despot managed to acquire such properties. They were still, in the beginning, considered as *ξένοι* and not as *καστηρηνοί*, but only by the so-called *τοπικοί*. Unfortunately it is impossible to be sure about the exact differences between the terms *καστηρηνοί* and *ἄρχοντες*, since the examples of the other Greek cities of the time show a large diversity of meaning for these two terms. It is also impossible to know whether the term *καστηρηνοί* is comparable to the term “bourgeois” or “borghese” that exists in Western Europe²⁶.

As to the aristocracy in Ioannina, we find the expressions *ἐπισημότατοι*, *εὐ γεγονότες* and *εὐγενεστέροι* in our sources, but very rarely and without any reference to the legal consequences of that status²⁷. The modifications of the Byzantine world actually upset the traditional aristocratic way of life: on the one hand the lack of communications perturbed the close connections that existed between aristocrats all over the Empire, and on the other a military career in Epirus was pursued, during the 14th and 15th century, mostly by foreigners, Serbians, Albanians, Italians and Turks²⁸. So we can assume that the new aristocracy was now the one of the *ἄρχοντες*, that is a mix of traditional Byzantine aristocracy, of foreign military officers and possibly of rich merchants²⁹. It would be a mistake to see the *ἄρχοντες* as nobles and the *καστηρηνοί* as bourgeois, as if they were two different social classes. Perhaps we should view the *ἄρχοντες* as a political élite around the Despot, and the *καστηρηνοί* as a different kind of élite, more numerous, but composed of indigenous families, so that the indigeneous *ἄρχοντες* were probably *καστηρηνοί* as well, while a foreign *ἄρχων* could never become *καστηρηνός*.

The pride of the *καστηρηνοί* was linked to the classical pride of the inhabitants of the medieval cities that we can find in Western Europe³⁰: the walls of the city constituted a military, psychological and probably juridical border, between the people of the outside and the ones who enjoyed, first, a better economic position (the houses inside the walls were more expensive since they were protected from invasions) and then the privileges of the city. Nevertheless, as stated above, some noble Greeks from the Despotate could come to Ioannina and enjoy their political rights³¹. There was a distinction between the citizenship of the city of Ioannina and the citizenship of the State that was the Despotate of Ioannina³², but pragmatism prompted the city to welcome newcomers easily, if it thought them to be useful and easily and quickly assimilated, that is, if they were Greek and, if possible, rich. Ultimately, Epirus remained in the Byzantine tradition of a State based on a capital: so that whoever held power in the capital held power in the whole State. Consequently, the inhabitants of Ioannina had a far greater political influence than other inhabitants; but as a corollary, some Greeks, if not all, from the Despotate as a whole, had the right to come, participate to political life, and stay. The Albanians, for reasons that we already outlined, were probably excluded from this citizenship of Ioannina, even when they submitted to the city, as in the case of the *Μαλακασαῖοι*.

Certainly, there were different classes of citizenship, but they were probably not closed: unfortunately we do not know whether the passage from one class to the other was legally regulated. Probably there were both a kind of informal process (for example when a merchant of foreign origin became a citizen), and an ostensibly official process, even if illegal, which took place when the foreign Despots gave privileges to their followers.

This arbitrary use of political power could assist in the integration of newcomers just as it might also lead to the expulsion of some citizens: Despot Thomas Preljubović drove many inhabitants of the city out of the Despotate³³. Alternatively, after Thomas was murdered in 1384, his favourite, Thomas Apsaras, was sent into exile with his sons, as was the widow of Despot Esau, Eudokia Balsić, with her sons, in 1411³⁴.

CONCLUSION

Citizenship in medieval Ioannina continued in the Byzantine tradition. The downfall of the Empire, the autonomy of Epirus – and, later, of the city – never prompted Ioannina to refuse citizenship to anybody except Albanians: hostility towards foreigners was due to the Greeks' fear of losing their ascendancy, but provided they were sure of retaining real power, the Greeks were never afraid to give the supreme office of Despot to foreigners, and consequently the élite was always open to newcomers. The Albanian exception, which perhaps did not exist since our sources are not sufficient to assert that no Albanian ever became a citizen, may be explained first by their numerical importance and their military aggressiveness which made them seem more likely to betray the city to the Albanian chiefs of clans, and, secondly, the cultural gap between the citizens of Ioannina and the Albanian clans, considered by the former as uncivilized, although they were Christian³⁵. In contrast, the Serbian people's political and cultural background facilitated their integration in Ioannina and elsewhere in the Byzantine world, and with the death of Kral Stefan Dušan in 1355 the bell tolled for a powerful Serbian empire³⁶.

So we can assert that every class of citizen, from the lowest to the highest, could assimilate foreigners, even if not every kind of foreigners. After the heroic period of the beginning of the 13th century, the State lost its universalistic ideology and our sources are more often critical than favourable to newcomers; thus it is clear that they were not welcomed in the name of human rights or Christian solidarity. But the general situation of the city, the demographic crisis that affected the entire Balkan Peninsula in this period especially because of the Black Death, the never-ending invasions and the consequent constant need for soldiers and wealth to pay them probably prompted the integration of newcomers. The right of residence and the status of *καστριηνός* were perhaps difficult to obtain for a newcomer but pragmatism rather than ideology or defined rules encouraged the people of the city in these difficult times to allow the people they thought useful to enter. Different classes of citizens according to non-social criteria appeared only in the time of the Ottoman Empire: inequality between Muslims and Dhimmis (Christians and Jews, 'protected' by the Muslim authority) was a part of the Muslim way of government, but this was close to the Byzantine tradition, where Orthodoxy was a basic element of citizenship, and the Christians were proud to be considered different from the Turks.

As regards to the Italian tradition of citizenship, we cannot say that it influenced Ioannina very much through the actions of its Italian Despots, but it is more likely that the latter found in Ioannina something that was very close to what they already knew in Italy. Indeed, the Roman roots were common to both countries, including generous grants of citizenship and the existence of a senatorial upper class. Ultimately East and West followed different paths, but the political fragmentation in post-Carolingian Italy finally found, *mutatis mutandis*, its equivalent in Greece after the Fourth Crusade. The geopolitical situation of Epirus led the city of Ioannina, some centuries after the Northern Italian ones, to welcome newcomers, and to take pride in being a ‘free city’.

NOTES

- ¹ About the general History of the Byzantine State of Epirus, see D. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros. A Contribution to the History of Greece in the Middle Ages 1267-1479*, Cambridge 1984, with an introduction that goes up to 1204.
- ² Demetrios Chomatenos says that half of the refugees from Constantinople went to Epirus; quoted by D. Nicol, *Refugees, mixed population and local patriotism in Epiros and Western Macedonia after the Fourth Crusade, Actes du XV^e Congrès International d’Etudes Byzantines*, I, Athens 1976, pp. 1-33. Some of them were of senatorial rank. The most famous is the former emperor Alexios III, bought by Michael I to his Latin capturers.
- ³ *Chronicle of Ioannina*: edited by L. Vranoussis, “Τὸ Χρονικὸν τῶν Ἰωαννίνων κατ’ ἀνέκδοτον δημώδη ἐπιτομὴν”, *Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου*, XII, 1962, pp. 57-119; offprint, Athens 1965; hereafter *Chron. Ioann.* - *Chronicle of the Tocco (Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia di anonimo). Prolegomeni, testo critico e traduzione*, edited by G. Schirò, CFHB, X, Rome 1975, hereafter *Chron. Tocco*.
- ⁴ Cf. *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, article ‘citizenship’.
- ⁵ The Byzantine thought of themselves as “Romans” (‘Ρωμαῖοι). Western scholars used the word “Byzantine” in this meaning for the first time in the 16th century. There is no solution of continuity between the Eastern Roman Empire and Byzantium, defined by Louis Bréhier as “romaine par ses traditions, hellénique par sa culture, orientale par ses méthodes de gouvernements”.
- ⁶ Ioannina in the times of Michael I is compared to Noah’s ark in a letter from John Apokaukos, Metropolitan of Naupaktos; see “Περὶ συνοικισμοῦ τῶν Ἰωαννίνων μετὰ τὴν φραγκικὴν κατακτησὴν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως”, *Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας Ἑλλάδος*, III, 1889-91, pp. 451-455.
- ⁷ We learn this from the same letter by John Apokaukos. We are not certain about the date of this letter; see K. Lambropoulos, *Ἰωάννης Ἀπόκαυκος. Συμβολὴ στὴν ἐρευνα τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ συγγραφικοῦ ἔργου του*, Athens 1988, pp. 298-299, n. 98.
- ⁸ *Chrysobulls of Emperor Andronikos II*, ed. by Miklosich-Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, V, pp. 77-84.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 83.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 4, ll. 28-32, p. 76.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 20, ll. 18-20 p. 89; this fact is confirmed by an epigraphic inscription which can be seen in the Byzantine museum of Ioannina, edited by L. Vranoussis in “Ἱστορικὰ καὶ τοπογραφικὰ τοῦ μεσαιωνικοῦ κάστρου τῶν Ἰωαννίνων”, *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδου*, IV, Athens, 1967-68, offprint Athens 1968, p. 502.
- ¹² *Chron. Ioann.* cit., § 8, p. 79.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, § 12, ll. 8-12, p. 83; §16, ll. 18-20, p. 85; §21, ll. 30-35, pp. 89-90; §22, ll. 28-34, p. 90. The Chronicle also uses the interesting word *ὑπερροία*, which means “from outside the borders”.
- ¹⁴ This character, cited in the *horismos* of S. Pacha (multiple editions, the most accessible being the one of Miklosich-Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, III, pp. 282-283.) and in the *Chron. Tocco* cit. (Ch. 5, §14, v. 1518; §17, v. 1592), is problematic. Some see him as a Serbian because of his name, some but few (*Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, n. 19769) as an Albanian because he leads the Albanian clan of the *Μαλακασαῖοι*. Actually, the latter fact is reported in an unclear passage of the *Chron. Tocco* cit. (Ch. 5, §14). Maybe he was leading the army of Ioannina and not only of the *Μαλακασαῖοι*. Even if he was leading only the latter, it would not be impossible that they received an officer from the city. However, the name seems far more Serbian than Albanian.
- ¹⁵ *Chron. Tocco* cit., Ch. 4, § 4, v. 1207. The Italian people who came to the Balkans with Carlo I Tocco settled mostly in the Ionian Islands, Etolocarnania or southern Epirus, not in Ioannina.

- ¹⁶ Both *Chron. Ioann.*, and *Chron. Tocco* show the great hostility of the people of Ioannina against the Albanians. But we can also find some sentences showing respect for them. The hostility was not directed against the Albanians as individuals but to the threat that they collectively represented.
- ¹⁷ *Chron. Tocco* cit., Ch. 12, §3. The asylum was actually not very friendly, as one can see in this free translation of the passage: “[The chief of the Zenebish clan] immediately fled to Ioannina. Because of the huge hostility that they had against him, [the people of Ioannina] made all of them prisoners and sent them in exile [i.e. kept them outside of the city]. You could see the elite of the Zenebish walking and begging in the quarter of the shoemakers, back from Ioannina, all with canes. The Despot showed himself magnanimous among them, as the archons of the castle of Ioannina did. They remembered all the bad things [that they had suffered from the Albanians], but when they saw the fury and the bad treatment [that the Albanians had suffered], they took them in affection and gave them charity. A strong pest, illness and disease, came to them, and all of them were exterminated wherever they went. The fury of God came upon them, they were damned. They ruled a lot, did unfair things and acted as fools. And God smashed and exterminated them”. So first the Albanians were kept outside of the city, and then they received the help of the leaders of the city. But this “affection” and “charity” does not seem to include the attribution of the citizenship.
- ¹⁸ We have no direct testimony of this fact for the city of Ioannina, but we have some for the city of Thessaloniki; cf. Nicephore Choumnos, “Θεσσαλονικεῦσι συμβουλευτικός, περί δικαιοσύνης” in *Anecdota Graeca*, edited by J. Boissonade, t. II, Paris 1830 – Hildesheim 1962), pp. 146-148, quoted by M. Kordosis, *Τὰ Βυζαντινὰ Γιάννενα*, Athens 2002, p. 146.
- ¹⁹ Although he is a Greek, he is perhaps put in the number of the ξένοι by the author of the *Chron. Ioann. cit.*, § 16, p. 86. It is anyway sure that he is not from Ioannina (maybe he is one of the nobles from Vagenetia); see A. Tourta, Νεκτάριος καὶ Θεοφάνης οἱ Ἀψαρᾶδες καὶ ἡ μονὴ τοῦ Προδρόμου στὸ Νησί τῶν Ἰωαννίνων, *Ἡπειρωτικὰ Χρωνικά*, XXII, 1980, p. 69.
- ²⁰ *Horismos* cit.; *Σύνοψις ἱστορίας τῶν Ὀθωμανῶν βασιλέων, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν ἕως τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Μουράτ, ἐν ἧ καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἰωαννίνων παράδοσις, καὶ ἐτέρων ἱστοριῶν*, in *Historia politica et patriarchica Constantinopoleos. Epirotica*, ed. Bekker, CSHB, Bonn 1849, p. 244; *Ἀποστασία Διονυσίου τοῦ κοινῶς λεγομένου Σκυλοσόφου, καὶ ἔξωσις τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τὸ κάστρον*, *ibid.*, p. 247: “The Turkish didn’t have the possibility to inhabit the castle”; see also Vranoussis, “Ἱστορικὰ καὶ τοπογραφικὰ” cit., p. 470.
- ²¹ *Ἀποστασία* cit., p. 252: “[The Christians] were thus expelled and built small houses outside, where they lived in humility and contempt”; see also Vranoussis, “Ἱστορικὰ καὶ τοπογραφικὰ” cit., p. 470.
- ²² Kordosis, *Γιάννενα* cit., p. 157.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 199.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 190.
- ²⁵ See *Chron. Ioann. cit.*, § 12, p. 83.
- ²⁶ Kordosis, *Γιάννενα* cit., p. 162.
- ²⁷ *Chron. Ioann. cit.*, § 8, l. 22, p. 79.
- ²⁸ The relative absence of the Greeks from the military career is characteristic of the late medieval Balkans.
- ²⁹ The melting of foreign military chiefs into the aristocracy was common in the Byzantine empire; we could just quote the Normand Roger family, who arrived with Bohemond of Taranto in 1085 and fought bravely against the Crusaders in 1204.
- ³⁰ The French expression says: *L’air de la ville rend libre*.
- ³¹ The noble refugees from Vagenetia took part in the decision of asking a Despot from the Serbian Emperor Symeon Uros (*Chron. Ioann. cit.*, § 8, ll. 23-28, p. 79). The author of the Chronicle does not consider them as *Ἰωαννίται*, but as *οἱ ἐξῶθεν* or *οἱ ἐξῶ* [those from outside], which means outside the walls, but not outside the Despotate.
- ³² This is the opinion of Kordosis, *Γιάννενα* cit., p. 119. This opposition between the city and the countryside around it is well-known in medieval Western Europe. In the case of Ioannina, we know it thanks to the expressions *οἱ ἐξῶθεν* or *οἱ ἐξῶ* used by the *Chronicle of Ioannina*. Nevertheless, this expression is linked to the case of the nobles of Vagenetia, who established themselves in the city and participated to political life; see n. 31. So if the psychological border is undeniable, we cannot define precisely what was the extent of the legal one. Probably the people of Ioannina did not have precise rules, and their practice was probably very pragmatic, to not say arbitrary.
- ³³ *Chron. Ioann. cit.*, §21, p. 89; §22, p. 90; §26-27, p. 93.
- ³⁴ About Thomas Apsaras, see *Chron. Ioann. cit.*, §29, p. 95. About Eudokia Balsić, see *Chron. Tocco* cit., Ch. IV, §9-10, Vranoussis, “Ἱστορικὰ καὶ τοπογραφικὰ” cit., p. 510.
- ³⁵ The differences between Albanians and Greek in Epirus are explicitly expressed in a text from the Byzantine court; see *Ἀνωτόμου Πανηγυρικός εἰς Μανουῆλ καὶ Ἰωάννην Ἡ’ τοὺς Παλαιολόγους*, ed. I. Vogiatzidis in *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ*

Πελοποννησιακά, τ. III, Athens 1926, p. 197; passage reproduced in I. Vogiatzidis, “Συμβολή εἰς τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἠπείρου”, *Ἡπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, I, 1926, p. 79.

- ³⁶ M. Bartusis, *The Settlement of Serbs in Macedonia*, in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, H. Ahrweiler - A.E. Laiou (eds.), Harvard 1998, p. 15.

Andronikos II, *Chrysobulls for Ioannina*, ed. Miklosich-Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, V, pp. 77-84.

Ἀνωνύμου Πανηγυρικός εἰς Μανουὴλ καὶ Ἰωάννην Ἡ' τοὺς Παλαιολόγους, ed. I. Vogiatzidis in *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, ed. S. Lampros, t. III, Athens, 1926, pp. 132-199; passage reproduced in I. Vogiatzidis, “Συμβολή εἰς τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἠπείρου”, *Ἡπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, I (1926), p.79.

Apokaukos John, letter published in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Περὶ συνοικισμοῦ τῶν Ἰωαννίνων μετὰ τὴν φραγκικὴν κατακτησὶν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, *Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας Ἑλλάδος*, III (1889-91), pp. 451-455.

Ἀποστασία Διονυσίου τοῦ κοινῶς λεγομένου Σκυλοσόφου, καὶ ἔξωσις τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τὸ κάστρον, in *Historia politica et patriarchica Constantinopoleos. Epirotica*, ed. Bekker, *CSHB*, Bonn 1849, pp. 247-252.

Chronicle of Ioannina, in “Τὸ Χρονικὸν τῶν Ἰωαννίνων κατ' ἀνέκδοτον δημῶδη ἐπιτομήν”, ed. L. Vranoussis, “Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου”, XII, 1962, pp. 57-119; offprint, Athens 1965.

Chronicle of the Tocco, in *Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia di anonimo. Prolegomeni, testo critico e traduzione*, ed. G. Schirò, *CFHB*, X, Rome, 1975.

Miklosich-Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*.

Sinan Pacha, *Horismos*, multiple editions, the most accessible being the one of Miklosich-Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, III, pp. 282-283.

Σύνοψις ἱστορίας τῶν Ὀθωμανῶν βασιλέων, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν ἕως τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Μουράτ, ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἰωαννίνων παράδοσις, καὶ ἑτέρων ἱστοριῶν, in *Historia politica et patriarchica Constantinopoleos. Epirotica*, ed. Bekker, *CSHB*, Bonn 1849, pp. 240-246.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium.

Bartusis M., *The Settlement of Serbs in Macedonia*, in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, Ahrweiler H. - Laiou A. E (eds.), Harvard 1998, pp. 151-159.

Kordosis M., *Τὰ Βυζαντινὰ Γιάννενα*, Athens 2002.

Lambropoulos K., *Ἰωάννης Απόκαυκος. Συμβολή στην ἔρευνα τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ συγγραφικοῦ ἔργου του*, Athens 1988.

Nicol D., *The Despotate of Epiros. A Contribution to the History of Greece in the Middle Ages 1267-1479*, Cambridge 1984.

Nicol D., *Refugees, mixed population and local patriotism in Epiros and Western Macedonia after the Fourth Crusade*, *Actes du XV^e Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines*, I, Athens 1976, pp. 1-33.

Vranoussis L., *Ἱστορικά καὶ τοπογραφικά τοῦ μεσαιωνικοῦ κάστρου τῶν Ἰωαννίνων, Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὁρλάνδον*, IV, Athen 1967-68, offprint Athens 1968, p. 502.

