

The Ethnic Composition of Medieval Epirus

Brendan Osswald

▶ **To cite this version:**

Brendan Osswald. The Ethnic Composition of Medieval Epirus. S.G.Ellis; L.Klusakova. Imagining frontiers, contesting identities, Pisa University Press, 2007, 978-88-8492-466-7. hal-02083128

HAL Id: hal-02083128
https://univ-tlse2.hal.science/hal-02083128

Submitted on 27 Jun 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.

The Ethnic Composition of Medieval Epirus[1]

Brendan Osswald
University of Toulouse II - Le Mirail

Abstract

Medieval Epirus was the melting pot of many migratory influxes, whether Slav, Vlach, Jewish, Albanian or Italian. Some Greek refugees also found asylum in this province during hard times. The best documented period is that from 1200 onwards. During the last three centuries of the middle ages, we see a sense of coexistence developing between the various nationalities which was not always pacific. Ideas of nationality, however, were different then from now, and we may also observe that the different military conflicts of the period were not ethnic ones. The Greeks despised some of the other groups, but this was mainly for social reasons. At the least, we may say that armies and aristocracies – those fields which we know best, thanks to our sources – were predominantly mixed.

L'Epire, région du nord-ouest de la Grèce fut pendant le Moyen Age une province reculée de l'Empire Byzantin. Elle reçut à cette période plusieurs vagues d'immigration qui ont considérablement influé sur sa société.

Nous connaissons peu les temps les plus anciens, et notamment les rapports entre la population grecque et les Slaves installés massivement à la fin du VIe siècle. Il est néanmoins certain que vers 1200, date à partir de laquelle nos sources deviennent plus nombreuses, les Slaves étaient totalement assimilés. Les Vlaques ou Aroumains ont quant à eux une origine obscure. Ils apparurent au Xe siècle et possèdent encore aujourd'hui une culture propre. Plusieurs communautés juives, de rite romaniote, dont l'origine est mal connue, sont attestées.

Après 1204, la chute de Constantinople amena l'effondrement de l'Empire Byzantin, et la province vécut alors de façon autonome jusqu'au XVe siècle. Cette autonomie n'empêcha ni les invasions ni les mouvements migratoires. C'est ainsi que l'Epire accueillit tout d'abord un grand nombre de réfugiés grecs de Constantinople, qui se fixèrent de préférence à Ioannina. Puis au XIVe siècle l'expansion de l'empire serbe de Stefan Dušan amena de nombreux Serbes à s'installer en Epire, tandis que dans le même temps eut lieu une importante immigration albanaise. Les Italiens étaient eux aussi présents, en particuliers les Vénitiens et les Napolitains.

Cette cohabitation ne fut pas sans poser problème. Les différents groupes ethniques avaient des spécialisations socio-professionnelles différentes, et les lignes de tension sociales ont ainsi pu recouvrir les distinctions ethniques. De plus, de nombreuses guerres entre chefs serbes, albanais et italiens pourraient faire croire à des guerres interethniques. Pourtant, les bandes armées étaient largement mixtes, indépendamment de la nationalité de leur chef.

En théorie, pour les Byzantins, le seul critère discriminant entre les individus était le critère religieux. Pourtant, on s'aperçoit qu'à la fin du Moyen Age, le maintien de la stabilité sociale, plus que de l'orthodoxie, semble être le critère le plus important aux yeux des élites intellectuelles dont émanent nos sources. C'est ainsi que le mépris affiché des Albanais et des Aroumains repose plus sur le sentiment de supériorité des urbains sur les ruraux, nomades de surcroît, que sur une hiérarchisation des peuples sur critères ethniques. Il en effet impossible d'observer en Epire l'émergence d'un sentiment national grec, et non plus byzantin, à mettre en relation avec celui observé à Mystra et à Constantinople à la même époque.

> *Τοσοῦτον δ'ἀπολέλοιπεν ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν περὶ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὥσθ' οἱ ταύτης μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν, καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκεν μηκέτι τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἕλληνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.*
>
> [So far has our city surpassed the rest of mankind in thought and speech, that her pupils have become the teachers of others, and she has brought it about that the name 'Greek' no longer connotes the race but the mental attitude, and men are called 'Greeks' when they share our education rather than merely our common blood][2].
> Isocrates, *Panegyric*, §50

Introduction

The Byzantine Empire was not a nation-state. The traditional form of state in the Byzantine mentality was the multi-ethnic empire, whether this was the Roman, Arab or Turkish Empire. The word *ἔθνος* is used in the Bible to name the Gentiles, that is the pagans. But in Byzantine terminology, it means a population that is outside the Byzantine Empire, and/or outside Christendom. For example, the Metropolitan of Naupaktos, John Apokaukos, speaks about the Latin invaders as *ἔθνη*[3]. So the word in our sources that denotes 'ethnicity' is *γένος*. This idea of *γένος*, and so of ethnicity, was to some extent based on ethnic elements, but the cultural and linguistic background of a person was of course the best indicator of someone's ethnicity. Consequently, by dint of learning the Greek language, anybody could enter the administrative, ecclesiastical or military hierarchy. So the process of social advancement was indeed also one of cultural assimilation. The history of Byzantium provides examples of a large number of initially non-Greek speakers, for instance Armenians, who came to serve the state at its highest levels. There were even some Normans, that is foreigners to the Empire, who came as invaders in the 11th century and became members of the Byzantine aristocracy, for example the families Roger or Petraliphas.

The universalist (at least until 1204) Byzantine Empire had a feeling of cultural, more than racial, superiority[4]. Everyone, through adoption of the Orthodox Christian faith, could become civilized, and belong to the *Οἰκουμένη*, a term which means *stricto sensu* the '*inhabited land*', and which in reality denotes the '*civilized land*'. The Slavic barbarian states of Serbia, Bulgaria or Rus', for example, were considered as parts of the *Οἰκουμένη*, even if they were not parts of the Byzantine Empire[5]. There was thus a hierarchical conception of peoples: the non-Orthodox, whether they were Latin Catholics or Arab Muslims, were at the bottom, then came the Orthodox barbarian independent states who were, in theory according to Byzantine ideology, subject to the Empire, then those Orthodox but barbarian populations living within the Empire, and then, at the top, the Orthodox, Greek-speaking Byzantine elite. Byzantine eschatology considered that, sooner or later, the non-Orthodox would adopt the Orthodox faith, and that the Orthodox would then all submit to the Byzantine Emperor, so that at the end of the world, order would rule in the Kingdom of Men, which would then be ready to become the Kingdom of God. It should be noticed that Byzantine ideology considered that, since only God could decide the end of time, the various populations should submit themselves to the Emperor, a belief that explains the relative non-expansionist policy of the Empire throughout its history[6]. From the same point of view, there was no policy of enforced hellenization of the barbarian populations of the Empire.

This hierarchy, considered as provisional by the Byzantines, prompts two remarks. First, the difference was quite thin between those Orthodox barbarian populations who were living within and without the Empire, both because its borders were often changing, and because Byzantine ideology viewed the independent states as only temporarily detached parts of the Empire. Second, the place of language in this Christian civilization is ambiguous, since knowledge of the Greek language was essential to enter the elite, while on the other hand, the Orthodox non-Greek-speaking populations were considered, and considered themselves, as a part of the *Οἰκουμένη* or of the Empire. Being the *lingua franca*, the language of the administration and of the elite, Greek was not really a way to distinguish ethnicity, since large parts of the barbarian populations had learnt Greek. This is why the Byzantine sources, before 1204, rarely mention the Greek people as Greek, preferring, as for all the subjects of the Byzantine Empire, the word 'Romans' ('*Ρωμαῖοι*). The word 'Greeks' (*Ἕλληνες*) meant the ancient pagan Greeks and only rarely the Greeks of the medieval period. Paradoxically the only ethnic groups that had a visibility were the minorities, such as Armenians or Bulgarians for example. The situation changed after 1204, as we shall see later.

In order to conclude this brief survey of the terminology, let us say that the distinction that could be made nowadays between ethnicity as the cultural background of a person, and nationality as the fact of belonging to a state, is anachronistic for this period, since the relationship between an individual or community and the state was totally different from what it is now.

Inside this generic framework, the specific case of Epirus may be considered as exemplary, not of Byzantine ideology, but of the material application of this ideology in a

province that was not protected by the powerful walls of Constantinople, but was open to an immigration that was rarely pacific, and even more rarely wanted and desired. The population of Greece and especially of Epirus, just as the population of every given territory, is a mix of various waves of migrants. We can reasonably accept that the majority of the population of Epirus ca. 500 A.D. was Greek or at least Hellenized, but out of the 36 Greek names of fortresses mentioned in Epirus by Procopius in the 6th century, only two have been identified: the other 34 had disappeared[7]. This is an indication of the magnitude of the upheavals that occurred in Epirus after the time of Procopius. Our study will consequently aim to make an inventory of the incoming populations, and, for each one of them, to study the way they were seen by the local population, the way they saw themselves and, eventually, the way they were assimilated.

The slavic invasions before 1000 a.d.

The first major arrival of foreigners in Epirus occurred from the late 6th until the 9th century, when the *limes* of the Danube was penetrated at many times by the Avars and the Slavic tribes. These invasions touched the whole Balkan peninsula as far as the Peloponnese. The Slavic tribes settled in the whole peninsula, but their invasions also had consequences for all the territories of the western Balkans, because, even if they stayed politically Byzantine, they had no connection with the Byzantine administration: so our sources are meagre for these regions, and it is difficult to know what happened in these territories. For this reason, we do not know which territories were under Slavic occupation nor the intensity of their settlement. We know that the province of Epirus Nova (from the mountains of Acroceronia to the city of Dyrrachion) was invaded in 548, but there was probably no settlement, since there is almost no evidence of Slavic toponyms[8]. The province of Epirus Vetus, which interests us, was invaded in 587 and in 614-616[9], but the situation is quite unclear. Possibly this province was covered by *sklavenies*, Slavic enclaves independent of Byzantium, but this remains hypothetical, since the *sklavenies* are reported only in the central and eastern parts of the Balkans[10]. In the 9th and 10th centuries, Epirus was part of the first Bulgarian Empire, with Ohrid as a capital, but we are still unaware of the extent of Slavic settlement in the area. In the late 12th century and first half of 13th century, the second Bulgarian Empire, with Tirnovo as its capital, included part of Macedonia, where many Bulgarians and Vlachs settled. But it never included Epirus. The defeat of the Bulgarians in 1241 by the Mongols put an end to their expansionism in the Balkans and they never again had any influence in Epirus.

It is thus quite difficult to evaluate the extent of Slavic settlement in Epirus. We have no literary sources before the beginning of the 13th century. The only element in our possession is the fact that out of the 450 toponyms of Epirus and the Ionian Islands, 180 are of Slavic origin, and located mostly inland[11]. As a matter of fact, the toponyms are, as is well known, a dangerous tool since they cannot be used as evidence for the nationality of the inhabitants. For instance, Albanian migrations in the 14th century

brought to Epirus the Slavic toponym of Preveza[12]. However, the city of Vonditza in Acarnania had a Bulgarian name already in the early 13th century, which allows us to conclude that there was a previous Bulgarian presence[13]. Generally, linguistic analysis of the Slavic toponyms of Epirus shows that they are quite ancient, and they thus seem to be anterior to the Albanian and Serbian invasions of the late middle ages[14].

The only sure thing is that the Greek clerics, John Apokaukos and George Bardanes, writing around 1220, considered Grevena in western Macedonia a barbaric Bulgarian-speaking place and Vonditza in Acarnania Greek-speaking[15]. No other source speaks of Slavs in Epirus before the Serbian expansion of the 14th century: the presence of a peasant called Vladimir in the region of Ioannina in 1319 is meagre evidence which does not allow any conclusion[16]. So, we know that during the *saecula obscura* Epirus was occupied by Slavic elements and we can reasonably suppose that some of them settled permanently, and we are almost sure that they were totally assimilated by the eve of the 13th century, if not before.

The Vlachs

As already stated, the Slavic invasions rendered problematic the relationship between Constantinople and the western Balkans. This is why the Albanians and the Vlachs appear in the sources only in the 10-11th centuries, after the re-establishment of Byzantine authority, and consequently why it is difficult to be sure about the ethnogenesis of these two populations. In any case, this is not the place to discuss it[17].

The first mention of the Vlachs, a Latinophone minority that still exists in Greece and Albania, can be dated to the 10th century, when the word "*Βλάχοι*" first appears[18]. This population was perfectly Orthodox: they fought for various Orthodox states, but felt no allegiance to Byzantium, and they often fought as allies of the two Bulgarian empires in the 10th and late 12th centuries. Many of them were settled in Thessaly, where their number was large enough to give their name to the province, which is frequently called during the late middle ages the "*Great Vlachia*" or the "*Vlachia which is in Greece*". After the conquest of Thessaly by the state of Epirus in the 1210s, the Vlachs became the elite troops of the Epirote army against the Latin Crusaders as well as against the armies of Nicaea, a rival state to Byzantium. But Thessaly displayed a strong particularism, due to the presence of the Vlach element, and became independent in 1267/68 when the state of Epirus was divided between the two sons of the late Despot of Epirus, Michael II. However, they never ruled it, ceding power to Greek, Latin or Serbian leaders, a fact which shows that there was no Vlach nationalism in Thessaly.

In Epirus, the Vlachs are nowadays present in the chain of the Pindos, mostly around Metsovo, and they were already present there in the middle ages. They are first mentioned in Epirus in the last quarter of the 11th century[19]. Their presence is also attested in Etolia, which is probably the "*Little Vlachia*", spoken about by Sphrantzes, while the ancient region of Dolopia, crossed by the river Achelôos, was called "*Upper Vlachia*"[20]. In 1221, John Apokaukos, metropolitan of Naupaktos, received a complaint against a

Vlach named Constantine Aurelian, who was accused of raping a Greek girl and attacking her father[21]. Then, in 1228, he had to judge the case of a Greek landlord charged with the accidental manslaughter of his insolent Vlach peasant[22]. The episode took place in "*Vlachia*", but probably in this text the word does not mean Thessaly, which was not in the territory of the Metropolis of Naupaktos, but in a territory peopled by the Vlach, possibly in Etolia[23] or in the mountains of Pindos[24]. A century later, the privilege of Andronikos II of 1321 for the Metropolis of Ioannina provides evidence for the existence of some Vlach communities in the area of Ioannina describing their various duties and exemptions[25].

Vlachs possibly peopled the mountains of the Zagori, but this question does not have a clear datable answer. The Zagori is quoted for the first time in a privilege of 1319 by the same Andronikos II, without mention of Vlachs living there. Nowadays there appears in this region a clear preponderance of Vlach toponyms in the north and east, close to Thessaly, while Albanian toponyms are present in the west and south. It must be noted that the two zones are not mutually exclusive[26]. Unfortunately, it is impossible to put a date on these toponyms: both Albanian and Vlach ones may be post-medieval, so it is impossible to determine absolutely if the people of the Zagori mentioned in 1399 and 1411 as soldiers of Ioannina were Albanians, Vlachs, or Greeks[27]. In any case, the impression given is that, in the region of Zagori, there was a peaceful sharing out of the land between Vlachs and Albanians. This cohabitation and sometimes alliance of the two populations who shared more or less the same way of life is attested in later periods, but we can imagine that it began in the middle ages. Indeed, in 1379, the Albanian army that attacked Ioannina was helped by some Vlachs[28]. Then we find the well-known tasteful expressions of "*boulgaroalbanitoblachos*" or "*serbalbanitoboulgaroblachos*" in texts written by Greek writers of course[29]. These expressions may be the result of mixed marriages as well as of confusion among authors. The confusion lasted until recently, since Albanians have often been confused with the Vlachs by contemporary scholars[30].

On the other hand, the cohabitation of the Vlachs with the Greeks is another attested fact. This cohabitation was not always peaceful. As we saw from our sources, everyday conflicts between Greeks and Vlachs were probably frequent. The hostility against the Vlachs may be inferred in Greek sources external to Epirus[31]. Our judicial sources of course record only the litigious relationships, but they seem to be quite representative of the mutual hostility between the sedentary land-owning Greeks and the exploited Vlachs with their semi-nomadic way of life. However, our sources show that the Vlachs of Epirus were well-integrated, despite their disadvantage, in the political, social and economical system dominated by the Greeks. The documents of 1228 and 1321 show Vlachs in rural areas working the lands owned by the Greeks of the city. In the privilege of 1321, one group of Vlachs is exempted from military service, a fact which implies that the other Vlachs mentioned in this document participated in the army of Ioannina. In any case, there is no trace of any rebellion of the Vlachs against the Greeks in Epirus. Symptomatically, they are not present in the privilege of Andronikos II for the city of Ioannina in 1319, which presents the status of the population of Ioannina.

As inhabitants of the countryside, they had no right to be considered and mentioned as citizens of the city, without consideration for their ethnicity. Reciprocally, they are mentioned in the privilege of 1321, not because they are Vlachs, but because they are peasants who had submitted to their landlord the Metropolis. So the major factor in regard to discrimination against the Vlachs seems to have been their social status.

The Jews

We know little about the Jews in Epirus, but the fact is that they were present in Arta, Achelôos, Naupaktos, Parga and Ioannina[32]. The origins of these communities is quite unclear[33], but possibly may date from the beginning of our era, since Philon of Alexandria, writing about 40 A. D., states that there were Jewish communities in Etolia[34], while Paul is known to have spent a winter in Nikopolis[35]. The communities of Epirus were Romaniotes, which means that they were neither Sephardim nor Ashkenazim, having their specific traditions and rites based on the Greek language[36].

The three communities of Arta, Achelôos and Naupaktos are recorded for the first time in the 1160s or 1170s in the *Itinerary* of Benjamin of Tudela, who says that there were one hundred Jews in Arta, ten in Achelôos, none in Anatoliko and one hundred in Naupaktos; and he gives the names of the rabbis of each one[37]. Unfortunately, we have no sure information about them until the end of the middle ages[38].

We know a little more about the Jews of Ioannina. We can only suppose that they were present in the city almost from its foundation: the city is mentioned as a bishopric for the first time in 879, while an uncertain testimony attributes the foundation of a synagogue to the end of the 9th century[39]. The first sure references are the two privileges given to the city by Emperor Andronikos II in 1319 and 1321. The first one confers on them the same rights as the other inhabitants[40], while the second informs us that the Metropolis of Ioannina "possessed" three of them, but we do not know how they arrived at that condition, nor what their exact status was[41]. Unfortunately, we have no idea about the number of the Jews in Ioannina, and we do not know whether they were living inside or outside the walls of the city[42]. There were not probably many of them, however, since our Greek sources do not mention them thereafter until the end of the middle ages. They were nevertheless still present in the city in 1432, as we know from a Jewish source[43].

At last, in the Venetian harbour of Parga a Jewish community is mentioned in 1496[44]. In any case, the attested Jewish communities in Epirus are located, unsurprisingly, in the political and commercial centres, Arta, Ioannina and Naupaktos being the biggest agglomerations, points of political power, which had wealthy elites and security-providing fortifications.

There are few attested references to the destiny of Jewish communities in the middle ages. All of them are from Ottoman times, which is better documented[45], but there is no reason to suppose an interruption in the existence of these communities. We could say more about the situation of the Jews in the Balkans in these times, but this has already been done: what-

ever laws may have been enacted in Thessaloniki and Constantinople or in Serbia, one cannot say whether they were enforced in the remote and ill-controlled province of Epirus[46].

The influx of Greek refugees after 1204

Before the 4th Crusade, Epirus was an obscure and forgotten region in the Byzantine world. But the fall of Constantinople to the Franks on 13 April 1204 and the subsequent creation of the state of Epirus by Michael I Komnenos Angelos Doukas (1205-ca.1215) made it a destination for a lot of Greeks who wished to escape Latin rule, to join the struggle against it, or who more simply wished to find conditions of stability. So our sources mention this influx of refugees, coming from Constantinople. Demetrios Chomatenos, archbishop of Ohrid, says that half at least of the refugees from Constantinople found asylum in Epirus. The most famous is the former Byzantine Emperor Alexis III. But we can also find a Theodore Makrembolites, who fled Constantinople for Corfu, a Theodore Demnites who escaped Anatolia for the region of Achelôos in Epirus, and a monk who left Hosios Loukas near Thebes and came to Naupaktos close to Metropolitan John Apokaukos[47]. Theodoros Chamaretos, a Greek lord in the Peloponnese, fled to Epirus, and wrote to the father of his wife that she could come and join him, since Epirus "was full of countless refugees from the Peloponnese, many of them persons of rank and wealth, and the lady would certainly find herself among friends and compatriots"[48]. This influx of Greek refugees continued throughout the century: even after 1261 and the restoration of Constantinople by the Emperor of Nicaea, Michael VIII Palaeologos, Epirus and Thessaly welcomed political or religious refugees fleeing from the Byzantine court, for example in the 1270s the opponents of the ecclesiastical policy of Emperor Michael.

The most noble of the refugees, coming from Constantinople or from other places, seem to have found a place in Ioannina, where the castle[49] was created specially for them by Michael I[50]. This city, quoted by John Apokaukos as a *πολίδιον*, that is a "small city", became a new Noah's Ark for the refugees. Their installation there seems to have caused some problems, since in 1232, after the capture of Michael's brother and successor, Theodore (1215-1230), by the Bulgarians, the local inhabitants tried to expel them from the site that had been allowed to them by Michel I, and guaranteed by Theodore[51]. They finally failed in this purpose, and the colonization of Ioannina finally constituted a real success: even if the official capital of the state of Epirus remained in Arta, Ioannina quickly became the equivalent of Arta in terms of population, economical impact and political influence.

The Greek population of Ioannina nevertheless was and remained different from the rest of the Greeks of Epirus, and notably from Arta. A large part of them originating from Constantinople, the refugees were disdainful of Epirus. During the 13th century, therefore, the inhabitants of the city, or at least its elite, supported the traditional Byzantine imperial ideology, incarnated by the Komnenos Angelos Doukas dynasty, which in the times of its ascendancy came close to recapturing Constantinople from the Latins,

and restoring the Empire. Ioannina and Arta therefore followed the same policy from the birth of the state of Epirus: they both took up the struggle against the Latin invaders. But after the rapid expansion of Theodore, who quickly subdued Thessaly, Macedonia and western Thrace, and was crowned emperor in Thessaloniki, his new capital, in 1227, the defeat of Klokotnica in 1230 by the Bulgarians ruined his hopes of restoring the Empire. In Arta, which did not care for Theodore's imperial dreams, Michael II, son of Michael I, took power and Epirus, including Ioannina, became independent from the empire of Thessaloniki, which disappeared in 1246, falling to the Nicene army. In 1259, after the battle of Pelagonia, the armies of Nicea invaded Epirus, but they faced the staunch resistance of the population, as well as of Arta and Ioannina.

In the 14th century, nevertheless, Ioannina and Arta no longer united for the sake of the state of Epirus, which was now seen by Ioannina as an obstacle to the unity of the Empire, which had been restored by the Nicenes in 1261 when they recaptured Constantinople. In 1318, Thomas Komnenos Doukas (ca. 1297-1318) was assassinated by his nephew Nicholas Orsini, who took power in Arta. Ioannina refused to accept this coup and negotiated its reunion with the Empire. In the 1320s, Emperor Andronikos II gave Ioannina to John Orsini, brother and successor of Nicholas, who held it as an imperial governor. Later, in 1337, after the death of John, Andronikos III invaded Epirus and annexed it to the Empire. The next year, a revolt occurred in Arta, which submitted only in 1340, and rebelled again in 1342, while Ioannina in this period remained faithful to Byzantium.

The death of Andronikos III in 1341 precipitated the Byzantine civil war (1341-1354), provoking the Serbian invasion led by Stefan Dušan, and the subsequent collapse of Imperial domination in the Balkan peninsula. So the relationship with the Empire became a secondary matter; but as we shall see, the cities of Ioannina and Arta continued to respond differently in regard to the new problem faced by Epirus, that of Serbian expansion and Albanian immigration.

Albanian immigrations into Epirus (14th -15th centuries)

The Albanians appear in the sources in the 11th century[52], but this does not mean that they were newcomers in the Balkans, since they may be heirs of the ancient Illyrians[53]. In any case, although their original territory is still not precisely known, we can be certain that there existed no large Albanian population in Epirus: their heartland in the 11th and 12th centuries was the small territory of Arbanon[54], between the Rivers Devolli and Shkumbi. Despite an increasing Catholic influence in the north, the Albanians of Epirus Nova were perfectly Orthodox and perfectly integrated into the Byzantine Empire before 1204: Byzantine administration was present in Dyrrachion, the capital of Byzantine Albania. The principality of Arbanon was autonomous, but loyal to the Byzantine Empire. Byzantium and the Albanians, indeed, had common interests at this time: they were both threatened by the expansion of the Latins in the West and of the second Bulgarian Empire in the East. The Albanians were also beneficiaries of the trade

road that was the Via Egnatia, which brought them wealth and benefits from the more developed Byzantine civilization[55].

So after 1204, the Albanians naturally followed the successor of the Byzantine Empire that was the Greek state of Epirus[56]. Faithful allies, they helped the Greeks to take back Dyrrachion from the Latins, and then to capture the Latin emperor of Constantinople, Henry of Courtenay, in the territory of Arbanon[57]. In 1252, Prince Golem of Arbanon submitted to the empire of Nicaea[58], but this did not last, since, in 1257/58, the Albanians rebelled again and rejoined the party of Michael II, ruler of Epirus[59]. In the same period, the Italians from Naples took the coastal zone from Dyrrachion to Valona and started to colonize Albania. This was the provisional end of contacts between Albanians and the Greeks of Epirus. There is no evidence that Albanians came southwards to Epirus in this period.

For various reasons, some elements of the Albanian population, which was probably sedentary initially, then began, in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, to emigrate[60]. One reason was the continuous wars in the region, arising from its strategic position, between the Epirotes, the Byzantines, the Angevins, the Serbs, the Venetians and finally the Turks, during the last three medieval centuries. Another was the colonial exploitation of Albania by the Angevins and then the Venetians, which prompted Albanian lords to expropriate their peasantry: in consequence they emigrated southwards into Greece, but also into Dalmatia and Italy[61]. The Catholic hierarchy also played a role, trying to convert the Orthodox to the Latin rite, and likewise prompting some to emigrate[62]. Another reason is the Albanians' military role in all the armies of the peninsula, which allowed them to spread throughout the Balkans, to receive lands from their employers, and finally to rule for themselves the territories they were conquering for the others[63]. A last reason is the Black Death of 1347, and the general demographic crisis in 14th-century Greece, which left vacant land the Albanians, who were less affected than other peoples since they lived in the highlands whereas the epidemic affected mostly the coastal zones[64].

The Albanians arrived in Epirus from the north, but also from Thessaly[65], where some clans had settled in the first decade of the 14th century, perhaps employed by the Byzantines in their war against the Catalan Company[66]. In 1334, the three clans of the Malakasaioi, Boua and Mesaritai were reported in Thessaly[67]. It is interesting to note that these three clans would later be present in Epirus. In 1337, the Albanians of Epirus Nova invaded the area of Berat and appeared for the first time in Epirus, seizing the fortresses of Skrepario, Timoro and Klisoura[68]. But the Turkish mercenaries of the Byzantine army defeated them, forcing them to retire. During the same campaign, the Byzantine army also subdued the separatist state of Epirus, which became then, for a short time, part of the Byzantine Empire. In 1341, the Byzantine civil war began, and this time a new Albanian invasion was successful in seizing Pogoniani and Livisda[69]. Almost simultaneously, in 1342, the Byzantine governor of Thessaly invaded southern Epirus so as to end the revolt of Arta[70]. He probably employed the Albanians of Thessaly, who were installed in the area of Phanari, close to the border of Epirus, and who were his allies[71]. This is why the next decades saw Albanians installed in the north and

south, with the city of Ioannina still free from Albanian domination, but exposed to their attacks on both sides.

Since the *Chronicle of Ioannina* does not mention any influx of Albanians after Serbian Kral Stefan Dušan's death, this immigration peaked between 1341 and 1355, that is, during the conquests of the latter. But even if the Serbs had employed Albanian mercenaries giving them titles, properties and privileges, Albanian migration had commenced half a century before, and some Albanians were already in Epirus before the Serbian conquest, while the conquerors probably installed there other Albanian vassals, incorporated into their army after the conquest of Albania. The proportion of each category is unfortunately impossible to determine. Consequently, the Albanian migrations are not the consequence of the Serbian conquests: both phenomena, of course linked between them, are consequences of Greek weakness, in the political, military and demographic fields, a weakness that interior reasons, mostly the second Byzantine civil war of 1341-1347 and the Black Death, can largely explain.

After the death of Kral Dušan in 1355, Nicephore II, son of the last Despot of Epirus, took power in Thessaly and Epirus, and fought against the Albanians, trying to expel them from Epirus[72]. But he was defeated and killed by them in 1359 at the battle of Achelôos[73]. Symeon, heir of Kral Dušan, seized back Thessaly and Epirus. But governing Thessaly was a hard enough task for him, and, as the *Chronicle of Ioannina* says, he left Epirus to the Albanians. In the early 1360s, Epirus indeed was divided between Albanian clans: the clan of Peter Liosha held Arta, the clan of Muriki Boua Spata[74] held Etoloacarnania, with Angelokastron as capital, and their leaders held the Byzantine titles of Despots from Symeon[75]. Only the city of Ioannina was still governed by Greeks[76]. In the north and west of this city, the clans of the Malakasaioi and of the Mazarakaioi held a territory which cannot be precisely defined[77]. Then, the clan of the Zenebisaioi held the north-west of Ioannina, including Dryinopolis, Bela and Vagenetia[78]. Ioannina was the only city that did not fall under Albanian domination.

This resistance by Ioannina must be placed in the specific context of this city, which was, as previously stated, the centre of the Byzantine imperial ideology. It is therefore logical that the city should make every effort to evade the clutches of the, allegedly barbarous, Albanian population. With the specific aim of resistance, they successively offered power to three foreign Despots, Thomas Preljubović (1367-1384), Esaü Bondelmonti (1385-1411) and Carlo Tocco (1411-1429), who all used the Ottoman alliance to defend the city. The first despot adopted a really harsh attitude toward the Albanians, who attacked the city almost every year. He wanted to be called "Ἀλβανιτοκτόνος", that is "the Albanian-slayer", and tortured his Albanian prisoners in order to terrorize his enemies[79]. Then, Esaü Buondelmonti, even though twice defeated by the Albanians[80] generally managed to avoid war with them, even making an alliance in 1410 with them against his own nephew, Carlo Tocco, the Italian Count of Cephalonia[81]. Finally, the latter brought about the end of the rule of the Albanian clan leaders in Epirus. During the first decade of the 15th century, he achieved the conquest of the Albanian territories of Etolia-Acarnania. In 1411 he was chosen as Despot of Ioannina, managing to

seize Arta in 1416, while in 1418 the Zenevisaioi were conquered by the Ottomans.

This Albanian political collapse in Epirus led some of them to seek another territory, mostly in the Venetian island of Corfu, or in the Peloponnese, where some of them were installed by Carlo Tocco in his territories of Elide[82]. Others migrated to the Greek Despotate of Mystra or the Venetian territories of Coron and Modon[83]. For example, after the fall of Argyrokastron, the chief of the Zenebisaioi clan fled to Corfu, some of his people remained and others fled to the Peloponnesus[84]. Another interesting case is the fate of the Boua clan, which is well known and probably representative of the Albanian migrations. Attested in Thessaly in 1334, they ruled Etoloacarnania and the region of Arta from the 1360s until 1416. They are then attested in 1423 in the Venetian territories of the Peloponnesus[85]. The Venetians installed them in 1473 in Zakynthos, and after the conquest of that island by the Turks in 1479 they settled in Italy.

In any case, the emigrations from Epirus after the conquests of Carlo Tocco were not, as has sometimes been said, the product of a massive expulsion of Albanians by the Tocco[86], but influenced by the attractions of the almost deserted lands of the Peloponnese to the Albanian shepherds, led by chiefs who sought elsewhere opportunities which had disappeared in Epirus. Carlo Tocco, once he obtained the submission of Albanian clans, had no reason to expel them. His army, from the beginning of his conquests, was composed mainly of Albanians[87]. So was the army of Ioannina before he ruled the city[88]. Some had helped him during his conquest and were rewarded with lands held in fee[89]. And if we find traces of the installation of Albanians in the Peloponnese by Carlo, it was not because he wanted to force them to leave Epirus, but because he needed them as soldiers in the Peloponnese[90].

As a matter of fact, many Albanians remained in Epirus, since the *Anonymous Panegyric of Emperors Manuel and John VIII Paleologos* states that around 1428, the Albanians were still occupying the inland parts of Epirus, while the Greeks controlled only the coast and the two cities of Arta and Ioannina[91]. The assertions of the *Panegyric*, written far from Epirus, must be taken cautiously, but they surely indicate the reality of landed settlement there. 14th-century Albanian immigration was far more important than the Serbian or Italian ones. Indeed, we know that the Boua clan present in the Peloponnese in 1423 numbered about one or two thousand people. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know how many clansmen left Epirus for the Peloponnese and how many remained. It is also impossible to know how large the other clans were; but we may be sure that several thousand Albanians were installed in Epirus before the Turkish period[92]. Their presence was massive, as our sources say, and their assimilation was problematic, as is shown both by the survival down the centuries of the Albanian language and by the descriptions and accounts given by our sources.

The latter, indeed, largely describe the cultural gap between the two populations. Albanian social organization was still archaic, based on the *katund*, an aggregate of 50-100 families. The clan was then formed by several *katund*, four in the case of the Boua in 1423 in the Peloponnesus[93]. They were semi-nomads, shepherds and soldiers, that is

raiders[94], whereas the Greeks were sedentary, and had a political and economical system based on the city. They did not share the Greek language, and thus the prestigious Byzantine cultural heritage. This dichotomy between Greeks and Albanians is very apparent in sources such as the *Anonymous Panegyric of Emperors Manuel and John VIII Paleologos*, which clearly describes the cities of Arta and Ioannina as peopled by Greeks, while the Albanians occupy the rest of Epirus. It also explains that the latter have a barbarous mode of existence:

> This people indeed is nomadic, has a rough life and is deprived from cities, fortresses, hamlets, fields or vineyards, only having mountains and plains[95].

The author of the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, probably a Greek from Ioannina[96], also emphasizes this cultural gap:

> They thought that in Ioannina there were Albanians
> Pig-keepers of their kind, and that they would submit to them;
> But there were Roman archons and courageous soldiers[97].

Actually the *Chronicle of the Tocco* multiplies the contemptuous comments about Albanian customs and Albanians generally[98], frequently recounting their ignorance[99] (underlined by words like *ἀμάθητοι, "the ones who did not learn", ἀπαιδευσία, "lack of education", ἀγνωσία, "lack of knowledge", χονδρότητα, "roughness", παχύτητα, "coarseness"*) and their vulgar language[100] and lack of morality[101] (underlined by words as *λείξευροι, λείξουροι, "greedy", σκληροί, "cruel", κακόγνωμοι, "bad-tempered", ἐπίορκοι, "perjurers", κλέπται, "thieves"*), all of which characteristics were supposedly the consequence of their "*Albanian nature*"[102].

The same source offers more positive descriptions on some Albanians, or at least does not use such pejorative terms. This is the case of course when they are allied to Carlo Tocco[103], but also, for example, of Gjin Boua Spata, despot of Arta, who often made war against Ioannina and against Carlo Tocco[104]. These descriptions however do not gainsay the fact that, for the most part, the *Chronicle* proclaims an inveterate hostility between the two populations[105]. The *Chronicle of Ioannina*, although less aggressive, recounts the *δυστροπία* [peevishness] and the *κακογνωμία* [bad-temperedness] of the Albanians[106].

Nevertheless, we should not forget that these sources (and other sources speaking of Albanians in the rest of the Byzantine world) describe just part of the reality. As previously stated, the city of Ioannina was able to use the Albanians as soldiers. But they were equally used for economic purposes. One of the first acts of Thomas Preljubović after his victory in 1380 was to register the territories of the Albanian tribes, in order to organize their taxation[107]. We may reasonably suppose that the Albanians, who had the same way of life as the Vlachs mentioned in the privileges of 1319 and 1321, were economically exploited just as they were later to be in the Peloponnese. Some examples illustrate the competition between the various states hoping to welcome the Albanians into their territories[108]. The Greek elite registers mainly disgust at these peoples, but it rarely mentions the countervailing economic interest in their presence on these lands which would otherwise have remained uninhabited.

On the other hand, these sources – proud of their Hellenism and dismissive of the Albanians for their lack of education – come from a very specific milieu. Mystra was the centre of the revival of Greek national feeling in the 14th and mainly 15th centuries, led by intellectuals such as George Plethon or Bessarion. Ioannina was led by an elite descended from Constantinople refugees after 1204. The *Chronicle of the Tocco* was also very probably an opus commissioned as propaganda by Carlo Tocco, in order to convince the Greeks of Arta to join the state of the Tocco after the end of Albanian domination. Indeed, we have no evidence as to whether the people of Arta were as obsessed by Hellenism as the people of Ioannina, nor is there any trace of rebellion against the Albanians. By contrast, after the death in 1399 of the Albanian Despot of Arta, Gjin Boua Spata, and the coup by a poorly-documented adventurer called Bogoes, the people of Arta revolted, expelled Bogoes and granted power to Muriki Spata, grandson of the late Gjin Spata[109]. Particularly significant is the fact that they did not, as far as we know, seek help from the city of Ioannina, nor renewed unity with it. The death of Muriki Spata in 1414, during a particularly vicious war against Ioannina, sparked second insurrection. The legal heir, his brother Yaqub Spata, who had become a Muslim, claimed the succession but was expelled by the city's *archons*[110]. When he returned with Ottoman soldiers, the population rebelled, imprisoned the *archons* and opened the doors to Yaqub. Unfortunately, we cannot identify the nationality of the *archons* or the population. Probably, they were both ethnically mixed. The significant point is that, in order to save the city's independence, the people of Arta were ready to ally with the Ottoman Turks, just as had the people of Ioannina before. This symmetry puts into perspective the violence of Albanian campaigning against Ioannina, since the soldiers of this latter city behaved in a comparable manner when invading the territory of Arta or capturing Albanians[111].

We must consequently suppose that the 'ethnic' grid of analysis is insufficient to explain the attitudes of the populations in this period. More than their 'national' or 'ethnic' interests, the citizens of Arta valued chiefly their city's local interests, since the coexistence of the two cities, of similar demographic, political and economic importance, in the same state, would have surely been problematic, no doubt leading to the domination of Ioannina over Arta. It would perhaps have compromised economic and political relationships with the maritime powers of Venice and Dubrovnik[112], while Ioannina was always more closely connected with the continental areas of Macedonia and Thessaly. Defence of these interests was efficiently assured by loyalty to an Albanian lineage, synonymous with a mighty military capacity.

This loyalty should surprise us even less if we bear in mind that the Albanian leaders, while wielding authority in Epirus, tried to become Byzantine. They legally adopted the Byzantine titles of Despot and of Sebastocrator, which the Greeks of Ioannina were sometimes ready to recognize[113]. They tried to live in cities and to maintain a court, in the Byzantine manner. Generally, the city of Arta – relatively unknown during the period of Albanian domination – had seemingly changed little: the attested activities of Arta as a commercial centre, as well as the remains of the Byzantine churches used by the Albanian lords[114], demonstrate that Albanian rule was not a synonymous with

destruction, a return to barbarism and the end of Byzantine civilization. In an amusing passage in the account of his travel to Jerusalem, the Italian pilgrim, Nicolai Marthoni, relates that in 1395, after a stay in Lefkas where he heard about Albanian raids on the island, his boat was damaged and had to drop anchor close to Preveza. Nicolai was of course scared, "*because there were Albanians*", but he and the other passengers were finally granted hospitality for three days, until the boat could be repaired[115].

The Albanians of Epirus were truly Orthodox, ready to fight for Orthodoxy against the Latins or Turks[116]. Some Greeks were hostile to the Slavs and to the Albanians, whom they dismissed as ignorant, but others were conscious that they were good Christians and anxious to uphold Byzantine tradition. For example, Arta, in 1367, had become the see of the Metropolis of Naupaktos, since the Napoletans did not want him to stay in Naupaktos and Lefkas. This shows that the Patriarchate of Constantinople was not afraid to honour a city held by the Albanians[117]. The Metropolitan Matthew, named in 1367, received in 1382 the see of Ioannina, but because of bad relations with the Despot, Thomas Preljubović, later returned to Arta[118]. The editor of the *Chronicle of Ioannina*, aware of the continuous destruction caused by the Albanians, nonetheless blames Thomas Preljubović for his anti-Albanian policy, ascribing to badness his self-styled epithet, the "Albanian-slayer"[119]. He compares the alliance made by Thomas with the Turks with the Albanians' determined struggle against the Muslim invaders[120]. Even if he supports the struggle of his city against them, for instance when he describes the siege of 1379[121], he symptomatically refrains from criticizing the Albanians as a people.

Of our two major sources, the first, the *Chronicle of Ioannina*, hostile to Thomas Preljubović, is more tolerant of his Albanian enemies, while the second, the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, hostile to the Albanians, is obviously propaganda aimed at justifying the destruction of the political power of the Albanian clans. The image of the Albanians in Epirus and of their relationship with the Greeks as outlined in our sources should therefore be approached with caution.

The Serbian presence (14th-15th century)

While the Byzantine civil war continued, the Kingdom of Serbia began its expansion southwards. Stefan Dušan achieved the complete submission of Albania and Macedonia between 1343 and 1345, seized Epirus in a violent campaign between 1345 and 1347, and finally captured Thessaly in 1348[122]. We know little about Serbian rule in Epirus until 1367. The city of Ioannina probably submitted without fighting. In 1355, Kral Stefan Dušan died and his empire collapsed. Our main source, the *Chronicle of Ioannina*, says that Thessaly and Epirus were then victims respectively of the Serbs and the Albanians[123]. We can thus suppose that the Serbian presence in Epirus was uneventful compared with other provinces of the Serbian empire, while the Albanian presence was by contrast very strong.

After Stefan Dušan's death, his son Stefan Uroš ruled Serbia, but his brother Symeon, governor of Epirus, was proclaimed Emperor at Kastoria, and departed from Greece

with his troops in order to capture Serbia. Nicephore II, as previously mentioned, then took power in Thessaly and Epirus, and logically made an alliance with Stefan Uroš, negotiating a wedding with his aunt, against Symeon[124]. But after his death, Symeon Uroš, who failed to conquer Serbia, returned south, and recovered the territories of Nicephore, that is Thessaly and Epirus, but unable to conquer Epirus, as we saw, left it to the Albanians. It should however be noted that in theory Epirus remained under his sovereignty. This was true also of Ioannina, which was independent of Albanian authority but recognized the authority of Symeon, but not of the Byzantine emperor of Constantinople: in 1367, its inhabitants sent an embassy to the Serbian Emperor of Thessaly, Symeon, requesting a ruler for the city and military assistance against the Albanians. Symeon sent his relative, Thomas Preljubović, who brought troops and ruled the city as a Despot until 1384[125]. But we should not speak of a 'Serbocracy' in Ioannina during the reign of Thomas, who was Greek by his mother, and the Greeks called him to power[126]. Moreover, he saw himself as a Byzantine prince, just as Stefan Dušan had thought to regenerate the old Byzantine Empire.

There is no mention of a settlement in the time of Kral Dušan, but we know that, during the reign of Thomas, some Serbians settled in Epirus. A first group is the Serbian nobles who accompanied Thomas and discharged important functions in Ioannina. When the plague struck the city in 1368, Thomas – favouring the Serbs so as to consolidate his own power – obliged widows to marry his Serbian followers, who by this means acquired the houses and goods, as well as the widows, of the dead Greeks[127]. His troops constituted the second group. Unfortunately we cannot know how many soldiers he brought[128], nor how many were Serbs[129]. It is thus difficult to evaluate the Serbian settlement in Ioannina in the time of Despot Thomas[130].

In 1384, Despot Thomas was murdered, but the *Chronicle of Ioannina* does not mention the Serbs' expulsion, and, as a matter of fact, they remained a presence among the city's elite: the next Despot, Esaü Buondelmonti, married in 1402 a Serbian lady, Evdokia Balsić[131]. When Esaü died, in 1411, his widow became regent in the name of their son George, but this regency proved short lived because of her tyrannical manners and her projected remarriage to someone from Serbia. Evdokia was sent into exile with her son, but again many of the Serbian community survived this revolution: the *πρωτοστράτωρ*, or chief of the troops, of Ioannina from 1411 to 1430 was called Stephanos Bouisavos, probably a Serbian name[132]. The Serbian soldiers also maintained a presence in Epirus for a while, since the army of Carlo I Tocco, duke of Cephalonia, was partly Serbian in the late 1390s.

The attitude to the Serbs of the Greek majority of Epirus is ambivalent. In 1358, three years after the end of Serbian rule, Nicephore II, Despot of Epirus, born in Epirus, married a Serbian lady, probably with the agreement of his Greek subjects. In 1367, the inhabitants of Ioannina asked for a Serbian Despot, and 1402, the Despot of Ioannina, Esaü Buondelmonti, probably also with his subjects' agreement, married a Serbian lady, while the city later supplied troops to an apparently Serbian individual. All these points seem to demonstrate that the Greek population was not especially hostile to the Serbs. On the other hand, the assassination of Thomas Preljubović, the revolution against Ev-

dokia Balsić, and the hostility of the editors both of the *Chronicle of Ioannina* and the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, both to these two and their Serbian entourage seems to show the opposite, that the Greeks disliked the Serbs, seeing them not simply as foreigners to the city, but also despising their nationality[133].

However, it should be noted that neither chronicle makes general remarks against "the Serbs" as a people, such as are made, for example, about the Turks or Albanians, but only against those Serbs in the entourage of Preljubović and Balsić who happened also to be Serbs[134]. Consequently, we should not see as ethnic a hostility that was chiefly political. For example, the *Chronicle of Ioannina* records that some Serbians fled from the entourage of Thomas, whom they feared with the same intensity as the Greeks, while Thomas's most influential councillor was the Greek, Michael Apsaras, against whom the Chronicle's redactor uses really harsh words. This Apsaras was, according to the *Chronicle*, the only person to be banished after Thomas's death, while nothing is said about the exile of other Serbs[135]. Moreover, the most positive character of the *Chronicle of Ioannina* is the Serbian *basilissa*, Maria Angelina, wife then widow of Thomas, who is revered by the author, while her brother, John Uroš Palaeologos is considered as a valuable and legitimate imperial authority[136]. Regarding the character of Thomas Preljubović, his nationality is never explicitly mentioned, and even less mentioned as an explanation for his turpitude.

Neither is the nationality of Evdokia Balsić an issue in the *Chronicle of the Tocco*[137]. The fourth chapter, which speaks about her rule as regent for her son, and is usually cited as evidence for the Ioanninan's hostility to the Serbs, clearly ascribes the revolution against the *basilissa* to mainly political causes: the author describes the autocratic character of her government, her cruelty to the inhabitants, and finally her decision to find a husband in Serbia. This latter detail is, to a certain extent, a mark of xenophobia; but it could, perhaps more operatively, be seen as a political comment: in accordance with a grant of 1319, the Ioanninans had developed traditions of self-government, and in 1367 and 1385 they chose themselves whom they wanted as their Despot. The project of Evdokia Balsić to contract a second wedding with a foreigner was interpreted as an attempt to choose, without the city's agreement, a new Despot[138], an autocratic decision that the inhabitants of Ioannina refused to accept. In the other side, Carlo Tocco appeared as a valuable political challenger. He was then largely and efficiently involved in the struggle against the Albanians in Etoloacarnania, and had promised the Ioanninans that he would liberate Epirus from the Albanians[139], while the Serbs were no longer seen as a militarily significant power. The reasons for the choice of Carlo Tocco presented by the *Chronicle of the Tocco* were indeed mostly political: the tyranny of Evdokia Balsić and the diplomatic activity of Carlo[140].

Thus, according to our two main sources, the Serbs were not hated as an ethnic group. The Serbian colony of Ioannina was not numerically very important and probably did not remain apart from the rest of the population. As regards the countryside, the absence of Serbian toponyms supports the hypothesis that the Serbs in Epirus, who were mostly soldiers, did not people villages. The case of Epirus seems thus to confirm the analysis made by Mark Bartusis about the Serbs in Macedonia:

> I think that of all the foreign peoples the Byzantines encountered in the late period, the Serbs were the easiest to assimilate. Unlike almost all other peoples the Byzantines encountered, they already had the "correct" religion, and the correct form of that religion. Ethnically speaking, the border between Byzantium and Serbia was always fluid and indistinct. Furthermore, there was a desire on the part of the Serbs to appropriate Byzantine culture in all its aspects; they looked up to the Byzantines culturally. Unlike Latins, Muslims and even the Bulgarians, the Serbs had fewer political, cultural, and historical traditions that might hinder assimilation. Quickly enough they adopted the Byzantines' political ideology, administrative forms, titles, clothing, artistic styles, and sometimes even their language. And unlike Vlachs and Cumans and other tribal and semi-tribal peoples, hundreds of years of cultural tutelage made it easier for the Byzantine, in turn, to accept the Serbs. According to Nikephoros Gregoras, Stephen Dušan, "having proclaimed himself emperor of the Romans, exchanged barbarian ways for Roman manners". I would suggest that the majority of Serbs who came to Byzantine Macedonia did just that, and that it was not difficult for them to do so[141].

The Italians

The Italian contacts between Epirus and Italy were ancient and strong, since Italy, or at least part of it, was a province of the Byzantine Empire until the mid-10th century. The relationship then continued at different levels, one of the most important being the artistic links between them. But, focusing on the Italians who settled in Epirus, we must first mention the Normans, who, after their installation in Sicily and southern Italy, quickly tried to invade the Balkan Peninsula, capturing Ioannina in 1082[142]. Some of them passed to the service of the Byzantine emperor and were integrated into the Byzantine aristocracy, since the cultural gap between Greeks and Latins was still thin enough. That is why Theodora Petraliphas, wife of Despot Michael II and descendant of Peter of Alifa, Norman chief of the expedition of 1082, was not considered a foreigner, and after her death she was revered as Saint Theodora, and became protector of the city of Arta[143].

The Normans again attacked the region in the late 12th century: in 1185, the Ionian Islands were annexed, while Ioannina was pillaged. Later, Manfred Staufen, king of Sicily and heir of the Normans, landed in 1257 and took several places on the mainland, and then his Angevin successors alternatively took and lost different strongholds on the coast, mainly in the north, at Valona and Butrinto, and in the south, almost all Etolia and Acarnania (Naupaktos, Vonitsa, Angelokastron and Agrinio). The Angevins finally failed to annex Epirus, but their vassal, Nicholas Orsini, count of Cephalonia, became the first Italian to rule Epirus. Nephew of Despot Thomas Comnenos, whom he murdered, he became Despot in 1318, but he was to lose power as he had taken it: his brother John assassinated him and became Despot in 1323, ruling until his death in 1336/37. But if the father of Nicholas and John was Italian, their mother was Greek and they lived in Greece all their lives, so were familiar with Byzantine traditions and easily assimilated: they became Orthodox, renouncing their loyalty to the Kingdom of Naples. Our sources do not mention any massive Italian immigration in Epirus during their rule.

The case of Carlo Tocco and his successors is better documented, and we know more about the Italians who followed them into Epirus. Carlo was also count of Cephalonia, and his county was the base for expansion on the mainland, which he undertook in order to stop Albanian raids on his island of Lefkas. Because of his successes against the Albanians, Ioannina chose him as the city's Despot, and he then became master of all Epirus. But he and his successors never solved the political links with the Kingdom of Naples. Their state nevertheless was not wholly under Italian domination, and there was no massive immigration. The authority of the Tocco was not uniform all over Epirus. In Ioannina, a city which called them to be their Despots, and in the north of Epirus, the Tocco were not really powerful and we know of few Italians in this region. In Etolia and Acarnania, which they conquered militarily, their authority was stronger: many Italians came and settled there. They were relatives of the dynasty, military officers, aristocrats who received properties, but also administrators, notaries, and merchants. They constituted a kind of elite built up by the Tocco to help them organize their state. Italian soldiers, whose number is impossible to determine, are also reported among the Tocco troops, but also among those of the Albanian Despot of Arta, Gjin Spata[144]. There is, by contrast, no trace of Italian peasant settlement. The progressive Ottoman conquest and the subsequent destruction of the Tocco State (Ioannina in 1430, Arta in 1449, Angelokastron in 1460, Vonitsa in 1479) perhaps prompted an exodus of their servants. Unfortunately, we know little about their matrimonial habits, nor whether they stayed in Epirus[145].

The Venetians dominated commerce, exchanging merchandise in the different harbours of the Ionian Islands and of Epirus. At least as early as the time of Emperor Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180), they had the right to travel for commercial purposes in Epirus and to have specific buildings in some unknown towns of Epirus: these rights were confirmed by Michael I of Epirus in 1210[146]. Despite their sometimes difficult relationship with the political authorities of Epirus, their activity continued throughout the middle ages, and even beyond. Their need for security nevertheless led them to seize some strongholds (some of them former Angevin ones) such as Butrinto (1386), Parga (1401) and Naupaktos (1407). They shaped the economy of the region, but probably rarely ventured to the mainland. A lot of Greeks and Albanians emigrated to Italy through their territories, but there was no migratory movement from Venice to Epirus, except to the Venetian strongholds.

The Italian powers were therefore visible in Epirus, mostly in the last three medieval centuries, and many Italians went there to make a career in this territory that was seen as something like a colony, but not in sufficient numbers to influence permanently the demographic composition of Epirus.

Conclusion

As is clear from the above, our sources offer a tableau of obscure zones. They are nonetheless sufficient to show that the different non-Greek immigrants to Epirus, despite the hostility they encountered not only as migrants, but also as invaders, found a place

in this region and were finally more or less accepted by the Greeks. The Slavs of the high middle ages, the group we know least, were finally assimilated, in a quite obscure process: they seemingly had already disappeared as a distinct group when our sources become more precise in the beginning the 13th century. Such an assimilation of the Slavs occurred in other parts of the Empire during the classical period, even if some Slavic "islands" remained, for instance in the Peloponnese until the late Byzantine period.

Then other ethnic groups, Vlachs, Albanians, Serbs, Italians, appeared in Epirus. Despite the fact that these influxes provoked a reaction of worry and rejection, it must be noted that the presence of these despised populations generally filled the vacuums in Epirotic society. The nomad Vlachs and Albanians had the economical function of rearing cattle and cultivating lands abandoned due to the general demographic crisis. Vlachs and Albanians were also used as soldiers by all of the belligerents of the Balkan Peninsula. The rule of Serbian, Italian and Albanian political leaders was the result of the vacuum created by the successive disappearances of the Despotate of Epirus and of Byzantine authority between 1335 and 1345.

This immigration nevertheless did not make Epirus a peaceful and prosperous province but, after the mid-14th century, it was a land of perpetual conflicts, a mosaic of populations who stayed remained and seemingly isolated from each other. The Byzantine melting pot which had hitherto prevailed apparently now worked less easily. The crisis of the Byzantine political system resulted in the crisis of Byzantine ideology. By his bad conduct, Gjin Zenebish, according to the anonymous writer of the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, "*showed his Albanian nature*". This opinion may be compared with the conceptions of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), a theorist of modern nationalism, according to which culture is the continuation of nature[147]. One might suppose, therefore, that the traditional Byzantine model of the civilization and integration of barbarians was now over in Epirus, and that this must be linked to the emergence of Greek national feeling in the 14th and 15th centuries. But should we speak about such a feeling in Epirus?

First, the intellectual climate of Constantinople or Mystra differed, in that the word 'Greek' is absent from our two main sources, which continue using the traditional word 'Roman'. Second, the idea of Greek unity is also absent: the *Chronicle of Ioannina* never contests the validity of the Serbian domination of Symeon nor does it even mention the struggle of Byzantine Emperor, Manuel II, against the Ottomans. The *Chronicle of the Tocco* evokes the idea of Roman unity, but only for the Romans of Epirus[148]. The lordship of the foreigner, Carlo Tocco, is never contested, even when he was at war with the Greeks of Mystra[149]. The world view of the Greeks of Epirus after the mid-14th century was in reality limited to Epirus. They were seemingly uninterested in the rest of the Byzantine world[150]. Third, the dichotomy between the Greeks and the other populations was a reality, but this must again be qualified, since political preoccupations, as was noted, dominated the portrayal in our sources of the Serbs and Albanians. The image of the Albanians as a people in the *Chronicle of the Tocco* is openly xenophobic, but it should be seen as traditional Byzantine xenophobia which had little to do

with the birth of Greek patriotism: it was based on the *topos* of ignorance among foreigners who were ruled purely by their emotions[151]. The same author, in the same text, sometimes balanced this xenophobia by considerations of their shared Christianity[152]. But the *Chronicle of the Tocco* is not a philosophical treatise. More than a reflection on differences between peoples, it reflects mainly the contempt, not of Greeks for non-Greeks, but of the supposedly civilized, including Italians and Serbs, for the savage, that is Albanians and Turks. The Albanians had a quite different way of life and social status, similar to that of the Vlachs. So, rather than the emergence of Greek patriotism, we should perhaps see here only the new face of an old dichotomy, that between city and the country, between the sedentary and nomadic worlds[153]. The lines of demarcation were thus probably more social than ethnic.

It is rather difficult to know about matrimonial practices among the common people, but the leading class at least, the class we know best thanks to our sources, shows us a melting pot of nationalities and religions, with the Greeks participating in the phenomenon[154]. Our sources are mainly narrative and do not allow us to establish any statistically valid data, in particular about the mass of the population outside high society, but, in the actual state of our knowledge, there is no reason to think that other classes, at every level of the society, had a different attitude. For instance, it is more than probable that Albanian and Vlach shepherds also practised mixed marriages. There was probably no frontier, except social or religious ones, which could not be crossed. Every individual was undoubtedly a member of a group, but these groups were not socially coherent nor closed to contacts with other groups. This ethnic mixture of course did not alter the Greek character of the majority population, due to the strength of Greek culture[155]. But Greek culture itself was influenced by this influx, as shown for instance by Albanian borrowings in the Greek dialect of Epirus[156].

The deconstruction of the image of the nationalities in late medieval Epirus must thus lead us to question our sources, the political interests that they were serving and the social stereotypes they convey. The Greeks of Epirus were not influenced by the theoretical debates of the Byzantine elite, and their opinions differed according to the city in which they lived, their social status, and their personal political options. A history of mentalities should, therefore, not extend to all the late medieval Greeks the schemes implied by some partial and partisan sources.

Notes

[1] This chapter was compiled thanks to a fellowship of the Ecole française d'Athènes. The middle ages are taken as between 500 and 1500 A.D. By "Epirus", is meant the territory of the ancient Roman province of Epirus Vetus, i.e. the territory bound in the west by the Ionian sea, in the south by the gulf of Patras, in the east by the Pindos chain (including cities like Naupaktos and Metsovo) and in the north by the mountains of Acroceronia (including territories now included in Albania, like Himara, Gjirokaster and the Albanian part of Zagori). These boundaries are based on historical sources and were adopted for the medieval period by P. Soustal and J. Koder in the third part of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* dedicated to Epirus: *Nikopolis und Kephallenia* (Vienna 1981) [thereafter *TIB* III]. This is not the place

to discuss the pertinence of these boundaries to the middle ages, but we think that they are more than acceptable. In any case, the present borders between Greece and Albania appeared only in 1913, but in saying this, no support for irredentism on either side is implied.

[2] *Greek orators, III: Isocrates,* trans. S. Usher, Warminster 1990.

[3] For instance, see J. Apokaukos, *Περί συνοικισμού των Ιωαννίνων μετά την φραγκικήν κατακτησίν της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, in "Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας Ἑλλάδος", 1889-91, III, pp. 451-455.

[4] A. Ducellier, *Le drame de Byzance*, Paris 1976, pp. 161 ff.

[5] L. Mavrommatis, *Σημειώσεις για την εικόνα του άλλου στο Βυζάντιο*, in "Σύμμεικτα", 1996, X, p. 238. About the notion of *Οἰκουμένη*, see E. Chrysos (ed.), *Το Βυζάντιο ως οικουμένη*, Athens 2005.

[6] Ducellier, *Le Drame* cit., pp. 110-111, 177-181; Id., *La notion d'Europe à Byzance des origines au XIIIème siècle. Quelques réflexions*, in "Byzantinoslavica", 1994, LV, pp. 1-3.

[7] J. Koder, *Προβλήματα τῆς σλαβικῆς ἐπίκοισης καὶ τοπονυμίας στὴ Μεσαιωνικὴ Ἤπειρο*, in "Ἠπειρωτικὰ Χρόνικα", 1982, XXIV, p. 16.

[8] *Ibid*., p. 18.

[9] *Ibid*., pp. 18-19.

[10] Kh. Frasheri, *Les Albanais et Byzance aux VIe-XIe siècles*, in Ch. Gasparis (ed.), *Οι Αλβανοί στο Μεσαιώνα*, Athens 1998, p. 49.

[11] Koder, *Προβλήματα* cit., p. 9, figures based on the *TIB* III.

[12] *Ibid*., p. 25.

[13] *Epirotica saeculi XIII*, ed. V.G. Vassilievski, in "Византиский Временник", 1896, III, n. 5, p. 249, ll. 3-4; n. 6, p. 250, ll. 33-34; H. Grégoire, *Deux étymologies: Vonditza et Vardar*, in "Byzantion", 1952, XXII, pp. 265-271; D. Nicol, *Refugees, mixed population and local patriotism in Epiros and Western Macedonia after the Fourth Crusade*, in XV[e] Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines, I, Athens 1976, p. 23.

[14] Koder, *Προβλήματα* cit., pp. 12-13. However, P. Xhufi writes in *The ethnic situation in Epirus during the Middle Ages*, in "Studia Albanica", 1994, XXXI, p. 44: "The Slav migrations of the 6th-7th centuries [...] left little traces in Epirus".

[15] *Epirotica saeculi XIII* cit., n. 6, p. 252, ll. 3-6; n. 10, p. 257, ll. 2-3, 13-14; Nicol, *Refugees* cit., p. 23.

[16] F. Miklosich, J. Muller, *Acta et Diplomatica graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, Vienna 1860-1890, t. V, p. 85. Vladimir is mentioned in the chrysobull of Emperor Andronikos II Palaeologos to the Metropolis of Ioannina in 1321, without any mention of nationality, while in this document the Jews and Vlachs are always designated by their nationality. He may be a recent immigrant or hold the name of an ancestor but without any Slavic cultural background.

[17] Different opinions and theories may be found in the following works: R.-J. Lœnertz, *Aux origines du despotat d'Epire et de la principauté d'Achaïe*, in "Byzantion", 1973, XLIII, pp. 368-370; P.Ş. Năsturel, *Les Valaques Balcaniques Xe-XIIIe siècles. Mouvements de population et colonisation dans la Romanie grecque et latine*, in "Byzantinische Forschungen", 1979, VII, pp. 89-112; N. Trifon, *Les Aroumains, un peuple qui s'en va*, Paris 2005; A. Lazarou, *Βαλκάνια και Βλάχοι*, Athens 1993; Id., *Latinité hellénique et sa survivance*, in "Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά", 1998-1999, XXXIII, pp. 9-48; T. Winnifrith, *The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan people*, London 1987, especially pp. 53-55.

[18] *Ioannis Scylitzae synopsis historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB, Berlin 1973, section 11, l. 28; G.C. Soulis, *Βλαχία – Μεγάλη Βλαχία – Η ἐν Ἑλλάδι Βλαχία. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Ἱστορικὴν Γεωγραφίαν τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Θεσσαλίας*, in *Ἱέρας Ἀντωνίου Κεραμοπούλλου,* Athens 1953, pp. 489-497.

[19] *Kekaumenos, Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris De officiis regiis libellus,* ed. V. G. Vassilievski, V. Jernstedt, Petersburg 1896, p. 74, l. 23; *Cecaumeni consilia et narrationes*, ed. G.G. Litavrin, Moscow 1972, p. 270; Soustal, *TIB* III cit., p. 56.

[20] *Georgios Sphrantzes*, ed. R. Maisano, CFHB, XXIX, p. 172; *Scholia in Thucydidem ad optimos codices collata*, ed. K. Hude, Leipzig-Teubner 1927, Book 2, chapter 102, section 2, l. 3; Soulis, *Βλαχία.* cit., p. 494; see also V.D. Psimouli, *Σούλι και Σουλιώτες*, Athens 1998, p. 36 about the Vlachs close to the river Acheloos.

[21] J. Bees (ed.), *Unedierte Schriftstücke aus der Kanzlei des Johannes Apokaukos des Metropoliten von Naupaktos (in Aetolien)*, in "Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher", 1976, XXI, n. 5, p. 61, l. 22 corrected on p. 171; K. Lampropoulos, *Ἰωάννης Ἀπόκαυκος. Συμβολὴ στην ἔρευνα τοῦ βιοῦ καὶ τοῦ συγγραφικοὺ ἔργου τοῦ*, Athens 1988, n. 12 p. 271; Năsturel, *Valaques Balcaniques* cit., pp. 94-95, 98-99.

[22] *Ἰωάννης Ἀπόκαυκος καὶ Νικήτας Χωνιάτης*, in *Τεσσαρακονταετηρὶς τῆς καθηγεσίας Κ. Κόντου, Φιλολογικαὶ διατριβαί,* Athens 1909, pp. 373-382; Lampropoulos, *Ἀπόκαυκος* cit., n. 21, p. 281.

[23] Năsturel, *Valaques Balcaniques* cit., p. 110.

[24] Lampropoulos, *Ἀπόκαυκος* cit., p. 281, n. 58.

[25] Miklosich, Muller, *Acta et Diplomatica* cit., t. V, pp. 84-87.

[26] K. Oikonomou, *Τοπονυμικό της περιόχης Ζαγόριου*, Ioannina 1991, map 9, p. 975.

[27] *Chronicle of Ioannina*, [thereafter *Chron. Ioann*. cit.], p. 100, §39, l. 9; *Chronicle of the Tocco*, [thereafter *Chron. Tocco* cit.], v. 1513.

[28] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 88, §20, ll. 11-12.

[29] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., §41; J. Katrapes, *Εἰς τὸν φιλοσόφοις φιλόσοφον καὶ ῥητορικώτατον Νεόφυτον ἀνακρεόντειοι,*in ed. P. Matranga, *Anecdota Graeca*, Rome 1850, pp. 676-677; G.C. Soulis, *Περὶ τῶν μεσαιωνικῶν Ἀλβανικῶν φύλων τῶν Μαλακασίων, Μπουΐων, καὶ Μεσαρίτων*, in "Επετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν", 1953, XXIII, p. 216; Năsturel, *Valaques Balcaniques* cit., p. 111.

[30] Soulis, *Ἀλβανικῶν φύλων* cit., pp. 213-16.

[31] *Kekaumenos* cit., p. 74, ll. 4sq.

[32] They were also present in the islands of Corfu and Lefkas.

[33] K.A. Tsiligiannis, *Η εβραϊκή κοινότητα της Άρτας*, (ed. Κεντρικό Ισραηλιτικό Συμβούλιο Ελλάδας), 2005, p. 9, says that the Jews of Arta came in the 10th century from the Peloponnese, without quoting convincing sources.

[34] L. Cohn, S. Reiter (eds.), *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, Berlin 1915, repr. 1962, t. VI, p. 172, section 281, l. 8.

[35] *Epistle to Titus*, 3, 12.

[36] R. Dalven, *The Jews of Ioannina*, Philadelphia 1990, pp. xi-xii. Nowadays, Ioannina is one of the last two Romaniote communities of Greece. The other ones progressively became Sephardim because of the influx from Spain after 1492, or were destroyed by the Holocaust.

[37] A. Asher (ed.), *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, London 1840, t. I, p. 46; see also, M.N. Adler (ed.), *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, London 1907; trans. J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire (641-1204),* (= Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, XXX), Athens 1939, p. 229 (cf. p. 233 note on §b). The names of the Rabbis are: Shelahiah and Heracles in Arta, Shabbetai in Achelôos, Guri, Shalom and Abraham in Naupaktos. About the question whether Benjamin of Tudela speaks about Arta or Lefkas, see Tsiligiannis, *κοινότητα της Άρτας.* cit., pp. 229-233, n. 14. The main historical argument against the hypothesis of Arta is the fact that the city is far from the shore and naval traffic. This argument should be rejected since Arta, thanks to the navigability of the river Arachtos, was in these times a well-known and well-frequented place of trade. About the identification of *Kifto* with Naupaktos, see P.Ph. Christopoulos, *Η ἑβραϊκὴ κοινότης Ναυπάκτου*, in "Επετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν", 1969, I, pp. 278-283. Probably, when Benjamin of Tudela speaks of "one hundred Jews", we should understand "one hundred Jews and their families", cf. Tsiligiannis, *Κοινότητα της Άρτας.* cit., p. 10.

[38] The information about the community of Arta during the medieval period given by Tsiligiannis, *Κοινότητα της Άρτας.* cit., p. 10, must be taken with circumspection.

[39] M. Kordoses, *Τὰ Βυζαντινά Γιάννενα*, in "Ιστορικογεωγραφικά", 2001-2002, IX, offprint Athens 2002, p. 39. According to oral tradition (I. Matsas, *Γιαννιωτικά ἑβραϊκά τραγούδια*, in "Ἠπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία", 1953, II, p. 587, n. 2) the Jews went to Ioannina as early as 70 A.D. after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem. This is of course purely imaginary since the town of Ioannina did not then exist. According to P. Aravantinos (*Χρονογραφία τῆς Ἠπείρου,* t. II, p. 214, n. 2), and after him D. Salamankas (*Τὸ Κάστρο*, in "Ἠπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία", 1954, III, p. 351), a synagogue destroyed at the end of the 18th century bore an inscription attributing its foundation to the last years of the 9th century. There is unfortunately no way to verify this information.

[40] Miklosich, Muller*, Acta et Diplomatica* cit, t. V, p. 83; reproduced and translated by S. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium 1204-1453*, University of Alabama 1985, doc. n. 36, pp. 243-244. N. Bees, *Übersicht über die Geschichte des Judentums von Janina (Epirus)*, in "Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher"*,* 1921, II, pp. 159-177; P. Charanis, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Palaeologi*, in "Speculum", 1947, XXII, pp. 75-77; D. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros 1267-1479. A Contribution to the History of Greece in the middle ages,* Cambridge 1984, p. 86; Bowman, *Jews 1204-1453* cit., pp. 25-26, 73-74. About the analysis made by the latter of this document and the meaning of the word *ἐποίκος*, cf. P. Charanis, *On the social structure and economic organization of the Byzantine Empire in the 13th century and later*, in "Byzantinoslavica", 1951, XII, p. 120).

[41] Miklosich, Muller, *Acta et Diplomatica* cit, t. V, p. 86; Bowman, *Jews 1204-1453* cit., doc. n. 43, pp. 248-249. Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit.*,* p. 88. They were "the children of Lamerês [Namer], David and Samarias [Shemarya]".

[42] Kordoses (*Γιάννενα* cit., p. 149) thinks that they were living inside, while C. Constantinides (*Οἱ Ἀπαρχές τῆς οἰκονομικῆς καὶ πνευματικῆς ἀνάπτυξης τῶν Ἰωαννίνων (13ος-15ος αἰ.)*, Ioannina 2006, p. 17) does not. In Thessaloniki they remained outside the walls. According to Aravantinos (*Χρονογραφία* cit.*,* I, p. 240) and D. Salamankas (*Κάστρο.* cit.), the Jewish community was located outside the walls in the early 14th century. The Old synagogue, which still stands in Justinian Street, is included inside the Ottoman walls, which cover almost, but not exactly, the same surface as the Byzantine ones (Kordoses *Γιάννενα* cit., pp. 320-321; K. Tsouris, *Η βυζαντινὴ ὀχύρωση τῶν Ἰωαννίνων*, in "Ηπειρωτικὰ Χρονικά", 1983, XXV, pp. 152-153), but its date of foundation is unknown, since it saw many modifications. Dalven (*Jews of Ioannina* cit., p. 71), states that it originated in Byzantine times.

[43] Manuscript Heb. 35 conserved in the Houghton Library in Harvard was possessed in 1432 by the brothers Shabbetai and Menahem; cf. Bowman, *Jews 1204-1453* cit., p. 122, n. 64.

[44] Bowman, *Jews 1204-1453* cit., doc. n. 150, p. 326; *ibid*., pp. 74-75.

[45] Dalven, *Jews of Ioannina* cit.*,* pp. 17 ff.

[46] For the general conditions of the Jews in the Byzantine and then Serbian empire, see Dalven, *Jews of Ioannina* cit., pp. 8 ff. For doubts about the application in Epirus of the special taxation of the Jews by the Emperor of Thessaloniki, Theodore Angelos, see Bowman, *Jews 1204-1453* cit., p. 73.

[47] Examples given by Nicol, *Refugees* cit., p. 17.

[48] Quoted by Nicol, *Refugees* cit., pp. 17-18.

[49] In this context, a castle is a walled city.

[50] Constantinides, *Ἀπαρχές* cit., pp. 10-12. Apokaukos, *Περὶ συνοικισμοῦ* cit.

[51] J. Apokaukos, *ibid*.

[52] Around 1040 according to A. Ducellier, (*L'Arbanon et les Albanais au XIe siècle*, in "Travaux et Mémoires", 1968, III, pp. 353-368); *Nouvel essai de mise au point sur l'apparition du peuple albanais dans les sources historiques byzantines,* in "Studia Albanica", 1972, IX, pp. 299-306); around 1080 according to Era Vranoussi, (*Οἱ ὅροι «Ἀλβανοί» καὶ «Ἀρβανῖται» καὶ ἡ πρώτη μνεία τοῦ ὁμονύμου λαοῦ τῆς Βαλκανικῆς εἰς τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ ΙΑ' αἰῶνος*, in "Σύμμεικτα", 1970, II, p. 207-254; *Les termes Ἀλβανοί et Ἀρβανῖται et la première mention des Albanais dans les sources du XIème siècle*, in *Actes du IIe congrès international des études du sud-est européen, Athènes 7-13 mai 1970,* t. II, Athens 1972, pp. 387-396).

[53] The Illyrians disappear from the sources at the end of the antiquity, and the Albanians appear in the 11th century. The eventual identity of Albanians and Illyrians became a political matter in the 19th and 20th centuries because of the common claim by the Balkan people of the right of the first occupant. The following scholars write that the Albanians are the heirs of the Illyrians: S. Anamali, *Les Illyriens et la genèse des Albanais*, in *De la civilisation haute-médiévale albanaise*, Tirana 1971; A. Ducellier, *Les Albanais du XIe au XIIIe siècle: nomades ou sédentaires ?*, in "Byzantinische Forschungen", 1979, VII, pp. 23-24; *Conférence nationale sur la formation du peuple albanais, de sa langue et de sa culture*, in "Studia Albanica", 1982, XIX, t. 2. The following scholars have a different opinion: V. Popović, *L'Albanie pendant la Basse Antiquité*, in M. Garašanin, *Les Illyriens et les Albanais*, Belgrade 1988, pp. 277-278, followed by S. Hill, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Albania*, in T. Winnifrith, *Perspectives on Albania*, London 1992, pp. 51-52.

[54] Ducellier, *L'Arbanon et les Albanais* cit., in "Travaux" cit., 1968, III, pp. 353-368.

[55] *Ibid*.

[56] D. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford 1957, pp. 48-49.

[57] *Akropolites*, ed. A. Heisenberg, Leipzig 1903 t. I, p. 26, ll. 2-9; *Robertus Antissiodorensis, Chronici Continuatio*, *MGH*, XXVI, Hanover 1882, p. 282, particularly ll. 11-16.

[58] *Akropolites*, p. 91, ll. 11-16.

[59] *Akropolites*, p. 142, ll. 20-22.

[60] Ducellier, *Nomades ou sédentaires* cit., pp. 23-36.

[61] B. Krekić, *Albanians in the Adriatic Cities: Observations on some Ragusan, Venetian and Dalmatian sources for the History of the Albanians in the Late Middle Ages*, in Gasparis, *Οι Αλβανοί* cit., pp. 209-233.

[62] Ducellier, *Nomades ou sédentaires* cit., p. 29; *Aux frontières de la romanité et de l'orthodoxie au Moyen Age: le cas de l'Albanie,* in *L'Histoire à Nice: Actes du Colloque international "Entre l'Occident et l'Orient" (Antibes – Juan les Pins, 29-31 octobre 1981),* pp. 3-4 in the reed. by Variorum Reprints.

[63] P. Magdalino, *Between Romaniae: Thessaly and Epirus in the Later Middle Ages*, in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, London 1989, pp. 103-104; Psimouli, *Σούλι* cit., p. 32.

[64] Psimouli *Σούλι* cit., Athens 1998, p. 38.

[65] L. Vranoussis, *Τὸ Δεσποτάτο τῆς Ἠπείρου, Ἕνα σημαντικὸ κεφάλαιο τῆς ἱστορίας μας θέμα Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου*, in "Νέα Εστία", 1990, CXXVIII, pp. 1367-1368; Psimouli, *Σούλι* cit., p. 36.

[66] P. Magdalino, *ibid.* The links between the Albanians and the Byzantine general Syrgiannes Paleologos are well-known. See Psimouli *Σούλι* cit., p. 30.

[67] J. Cantacuzenus, *CFHB*, I, 474, 9ff.

[68] Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 495-497.

[69] Cantacuzenus, II, p. 81.

[70] Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 127.

[71] Psimouli *Σούλι* cit., p. 34.

[72] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 76, §4, ll. 30-32.

[73] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 76-77, §4, ll. 35-40, with a wrong date, corrected by Mihaljčić, R., *Битка код Ахелоја* [The battle of Acheloos], in "Зборник философског факултета", 1970, XI, Belgrade, pp. 271-6; translated in Greek by K. Sotiriou, in "Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν", 1971-72, III, pp. 365-71.

[74] The Albanian clans were unstable. They bore the name of their leader, but intermarriage between leading families sometimes complicates clan identification. Muriki Boua Spata was probably the descendent of both the clans of Boua and Spata who were at war in the early 15th century, cf. *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1033-1044.

[75] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 79, §8, ll. 1-15.

[76] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 79, §8, ll. 16-18.

[77] The Mazarakaioi were probably close to Parga and Photiki (*Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1492-1499) while the Malakasaioi held Katounai, a place located by P. Soustal (*TIB* III, p. 175) in the north-west of Ioannina.

[78] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 92, §25, ll. 10-13.

[79] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., pp. 88-90, § 20-21. The Byzantine Museum in Ioannina still owns an inscription giving to Thomas the title of Ἀλβανιτοκτόνος.

[80] In 1389 and 1399: cf. *Chron. Ioann*. cit., pp. 96-97, §35 and 100, §39.

[81] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 98, §35, ll. 33-35, *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 700-737. Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 173.

[82] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 3659, 3670.

[83] For Albanian immigration into the lands of the Despotate of Mystra, which began as early as 1350, see E.L. Vranoussi, *Deux documents byzantins inédits sur la présence albanaise dans le Péloponnèse au XVe siècle*, in Gasparis, Οι Αλβανοί cit., Athens 1998, pp. 293-294, with relative bibliography.

[84] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 3274-3303. Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 189.

[85] C.N. Sathas, *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, 9 vols, Paris 1880-96, vol. I, n° 90, pp. 150-151; A. Ducellier, *Les Albanais dans les colonies vénitiennes au XVe siècle*, "Studi Veneziani", 1968, X, pp. 55, 60-61.

[86] A. Boutsikas, *Η φραγκοκρατία στην Ηλεία*, Athens 1985, p. 143.

[87] *Chron. Tocco* cit., v. 137.

[88] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 100, § 35, ll. 6-7; *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1511-1514.

[89] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 818-823, v. 1040.

[90] Cf. n. 82.

[91] *Ἀνονύμου πανηγυρικός εἰς Μανουὴλ καὶ Ἰωάννην Η' Παλαιολόγους,* ed. by I. Vogiatzidis, in S. Lampros (ed.), *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, t. III, Athens, 1926, p. 194, ll. 14-16; ll. 29-30. The passage is reproduced in I. Vogiatzidis, *Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἠπείρου*, "Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά", 1926, I, pp. 72-80.

[92] The later expansion of the Ottoman Empire into both Albania and Epirus facilitated the continuation of Albanian immigration, since there were no borders. This is, however, beyond the scope of this article.

[93] Ducellier *Colonies vénitiennes* cit., pp. 60-61.

[94] M.C. Bartusis, *Brigandage in the Late Byzantine Empire*, in "Byzantion", 1981, LI, pp. 386-409, especially the conclusion.

[95] *Ἀνονύμου πανηγυρικός*, cit., p. 194, ll. 27-29. Some other considerations about the Albanians, their economical activities and the reasons of their installation in the Peloponnese may be found in this text.

[96] M. Preka, *Η εθνικότητα στο Χρονικό των Τόκκο*, in *Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συμποσίου για το Δεσποτάτο της Ηπείρου (Άρτα, 27 – 31 Μαΐου 1990)*, dir. E. Chrysos, p. 303; A.P. Každan (*Some notes on the "Chronicle of the Tocco*, in *Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di Studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi,* Milan 1982, p. 170) hypothesizes that the author was of Italian origin.

[97] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1424-1426.

[98] See Th. Sansaridou-Hendrickx, *The World View of the Anonymous Author of the Chronicle of the Tocco: the antagonists as groups*, in "Βυζαντιακά", 2001, XXI, p. 231.

[99] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 195, 1178, 1786, 1797.

[100] *Ibid*., vv. 1779, 1782.

[101] *Ibid*., vv. 194, 1179, 1180.

[102] *Ibid*., v. 1784.

[103] Sansaridou-Hendrickx, *World View* cit., pp. 230-231.

[104] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 50-53.

[105] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1184-1189.

[106] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 76, §4, ll. 27-28.

[107] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 92, §25, ll. 11-12: "*καὶ τὸν τόπον αναγράφει*".

[108] Ducellier, *Colonies vénitiennes* cit., pp. 56-57.

[109] We know little about the character of Bogoes. The *Chronicle of Ioannina* says that he was "serbo-albanito-bulgaro-vlach" and that he treated the inhabitants of the city badly. The latter called on the Venetians for help, and finally managed to expel him. He then disappears from history. Cf. *Chron. Ioann.* cit*.,* p. 101, §41; *Chron. Tocco* cit., p. 234, §15. Schirò, p. 35, n. 2.; S.N. Asonitis, *Το Νότιο Ιόνιο κατά τον Όψιμο Μεσαίωνα. Κομητεία Κεφαλληνίας, Δουκάτο Λευκάδας, Αιτωλοακαρνανία,* Athens 2005, p. 154-155.

[110] The *archons* were the leaders of a city.

[111] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1020-1021, 2537-2538. A. Ducellier, *Οἱ Ἀλβανοί στὴν Ἑλλάδα (13ος-15ος αἰ). Η μετανάστευση μίας κοινοτητάς*, Athens 1994, p. 27.

[112] Ragusan documents provide clear evidence about economic relationships between Dubrovnik and Arta during the times of the Albanian domination on the city. Cf. B. Krekic, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au Moyen-Âge*, n. 441, 443, 448 (1393), 528, 529 (1406); A. Ducellier, *Aux frontières de la Romanie: Arta et Sainte-Maure à la fin du Moyen-Âge*, in "Travaux et Mémoires", VIII, pp. 113-124. The Albanian leaders of Epirus often had good relationships also with Venice: Gjin Zenevesi, lord of Argyrokastron, had received Venetian citizenship (Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 164), while Sterina, daughter of Sgouros Boua Spata, lord of Angelokastron, had married the Venetian noble Francesco Foscari (Ch. Maltezou, *Προσωπογραφικά βυζαντινῆς Πελοποννήσου καὶ ξενοκρατούμενου ἑλληνικού χώρου μὲ ἀφορμὴ τὸν φάκελο Foscari τῆς Βενετίας*, "Σύμμεικτα", 1983, V, p. 3).

[113] Peter Liosha and Gjin Boua Spata had acquired this title from the Serbian Emperor, Symeon. The *Chronicle of Ioannina* (§8, 15, 16, 41), the source that tells us how they were styled, uses the word "despot" for them, and there is no reason to detect irony in this. The *Chronicle of the Tocco* says that Gjin Spata had received his title "from the Albanian people" (v. 51), which is, of course, false. It nevertheless later calls him despot (p. 232, title of the §14). Gjin Zenevesi is recorded as Sebastocrator in a Venetian document of 1st May 1387 (J. Valentini, *Acta Albaniae Veneta Saeculorum XIV et XV,* 24 vols, Palermo - Milan - Rome, 1967-1977, vol. II, 44, n. 328, quoted by S.N. Asonitis, *The regimen Corphoy and the Albanians*, in Ch. Gasparis (ed.), *Οι Αλβάνοι* cit., Athens 1998, p. 274, n. 28), and in another one of 26 April 1419 (Sathas cit., III, n. 751, pp. 198-199; F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, 3 volumes, Paris - The Hague; 1958-1961, vol. II, n. 1736; Valentini cit., II, 10, n. 2320, pp. 118-119).

[114] Gjin Spata used the Church of Pantanassa, built close to Arta by Michael II in the middle of the 13th century; see P.L. Vokotopoulos, *Ἀνασκαφὴ Παντανάσσης Φιλιππιάδος, 1976*, in "Ἀρχαιολογικὰ Ἀνάλεκτα ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν", 1977, X, pp. 162-163, 166, 168; G. Tochais, *Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1978*, in "Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique", 1979, CIII, pp. 569 and 573.

[115] N. Marthono, *Liber Peregrinationis ad loca Sancta*, ed. L. Le Grand, in "Revue de l'Orient Latin", 1895, III, p. 665.

[116] *Chron. Ioann.* cit*.,* p. 86, §17, ll. 16-23; pp. 99-100, §38; R.-J., Lœnertz, *Hospitaliers et Navarrais en Grèce (1376-1383). Regestes et documents*, in "Orientalia Christiana Periodica", 1956, XXII, pp. 319-60; reed. in "*Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*", I, *Storia e Letteratura, Raccolta di Studi e Testi*, n. 118, Rome 1970, pp. 329-69.

[117] J. Darrouzès, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople,* I: *Les Actes des Patriarches*, fascicule V: *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, Paris 1977, n. 2530.

[118] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 93, §26, 27.

[119] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 89, §20, ll. 18-21.

[120] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* especially p. 92, §24, and 93, §27.

[121] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* pp. 87-88, § 18-19.

[122] Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit.*,* pp. 128-129.

[123] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 76, §4, ll. 24-28.

[124] Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 135.

[125] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* pp. 79-80, §8-9. About this character, see Ch. Matanov, *The phenomenon Thomas Preljubović*, in *Συμποσίο για το Δεσποτάτο της Ηπείρου* cit., pp. 63-68, with specific bibliography. The *Chronicle of Ioannina* (p. 82, §11, l. 33) speaks of him as a Despot immediately after his accession to power. There is thus no reason to write that he took his title only in 1382 from the Emperor Manuel II Palaiologus, as does L. Vranoussis (*Δεσποτάτο τῆς Ἠπείρου* cit., p. 1376).

[126] L. Vranoussis, *Δεσποτάτο τῆς Ἠπείρου* cit., pp. 1366-1367. The author nevertheless perhaps goes too far when he says that Thomas should not be called Preljubović. If Thomas indeed used the Greek name Komnenos, it was for political reasons, and he never abandoned his Serbian one, since, as Vranoussis himself writes, he was signing "Θωμᾶς δεσπότης Κομνηνὸς ὁ Πρεάλιμπος". The only Serbian element in the government of Thomas is the title of "jupan" given to some of his favourites; see *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 91, §23, ll. 15-16.

[127] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 83, §12, ll. 6-12.

[128] *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* p. 80, §9, ll. 21-22. The demotic version of the Chronicle gives the figure of 15,000 soldiers, but this version is later than the classical one and less trustworthy.

[129] The army gathered by Symeon in 1355 was composed of Greeks, Albanians and Serbs, see *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 76, §4, ll. 5-7.

[130] M. Bartusis, studying the Serbian settlement in Macedonia which was far closer and more linked to Serbia, estimates their number at 5,000, mostly soldiers (H. Ahrweiler, A.E. Laiou (eds.), *The Settlement of Serbs in Macedonia*, in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 156).

[131] See *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, [thereafter *PLP*], n. 6230. This lady was not born in Ioannina but was the half-sister of Mrkša Zarković, Serbian lord of Valona. See. K. Jireček, *Die Witwe und die Söhne des Despoten Esau von Epirus*, in "Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher", 1920, I, pp. 1-16, and G. Schiro, *Evdokia Balšić Vasilissa di Gianina*, in "Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta", 1964, VIII, 2 (= Mélanges G. Ostrogorsky, II), pp. 383-91.

[132] This individual is quoted in the *horismos* of Sinan Pacha (multiple editions, the most accessible being the one of Miklosich, Muller*, Acta et Diplomatica* cit, III, pp. 282-283) and in the *Chron. Tocco* cit. (vv. 1518 and 1592). Verse 1516 of the *Chron. Tocco* cit. clearly says that he was leading the army of Ioannina and not only of the Malakasaioi and of the Zagorites. This function is confirmed to him by Carlo Tocco with the title of *πρωτοστράτωρ* (*ibid*., vv. 1592-1593; Kordoses *Ιάννενα* cit., p. 234). It seems probable, from an onomastic and political point of view, that he was a Serb, an opinion shared by D. Nicol (*Despotate 1984* cit., p. 203) and M. Kordoses, (*Ιάννενα* cit.*,* p. 148). G. Schirò, (*Chron. Tocco* cit., p. 127), and after him the *PLP* (vol. VIII, n. 19769) and A. Rigo (*Lo Horismòs di Sinân Pascià, la presa di Ioannina (1430) e la "lettera" del sultano Murâd II*, in "Θησαυρίσματα", 1998, XXVIII, p. 64) have a different opinion and say he is an Albanian from the clan of the Malakasaioi.

[133] Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 175. Preka, *Εθνικότητα* cit., pp. 306 and 307.

[134] In the *Chron. Ioann.* cit.*,* the Serbs are viewed dismissively by the author, but never as a people and always, explicitly (p. 81, §10, ll. 40-41) or implicitly (p. 83, §12, l. 10; p. 91, §23, l. 25; p. 96, §33, ll. 7-8), because they belong to the entourage of Thomas. In the *Chron. Tocco* cit., the words "Serbia" and

Serb" appear only in four, maybe five passages. In these passages, their Serbian nationality is noted only informatively: the only adverse comments are on Evdokia and her followers.

[135] *Chron. Ioann*. cit., p. 81, §10, p. 86, §16, p. 94, §29.

[136] For Maria Angelina, see *Chron. Ioann.* cit., p. 86, §16; p. 94, §28; p. 94, §29; p. 95, §31; p. 98, §36. For John Uroš Palaeologos, *ibid*., p. 94, §28, 29, p. 95, §31. It is worth saying that in 1385, this person was no longer an emperor and had become a monk under the name of Joasaph. He is therefore called by the *Chronicle* "the basileus Joasaph", but his former imperial title is given to him only in a honorific way, as is also the case in another document from Thessaly (see Lœnertz, *Notes sur le règne de Manuel II à Thessalonique – 1381/82-1387*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 1957, L, p. 391). The *Chronicle* does not mention the fact that he is no longer an effective emperor, nor does it contest the legitimacy of any but one Serb sovereign holding the title of Emperor, that is Stefan Dušan, the most powerful of them. This apparent paradox should not astonish us, since Symeon and his son John were his heirs, and therefore the continuators of the political tradition, while Stefan was, in the beginning, a rebel against the Byzantine Empire. The denigration of rebels is a *topos* of medieval Christian political literacy, based on the *Epistle to the Romans*.

[137] *Chron. Tocco* cit., chapter IV, particularly the hostile portrait in verses 1190-1201. This person is also present, without allusion to her nationality, in the Oxford manuscript of the *Chron. Ioann.* cit., fragmentally edited by L. Vranoussis, *Ἱστορικὰ καὶ τοπογραφικὰ τοῦ μεσαιωνικοῦ κάστρου τῶν Ἰωαννίνων*, in *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον*, Athens 1967-68, vol. IV, pp. 439-515, also available as offprint, Athens 1968, pp. 510-511.

[138] The weddings were indeed a way to acquire legitimacy. The author of the *Chronicle of Ioannina* states that Thomas Preljubović ruled as the husband of Maria Angeline, daughter of *basileus* Symeon; see *Chron. Ioann.* cit., p. 86, §16, ll. 25-26, and p. 94, §28, ll. 10-11, which calls Maria "*φυσικὴ κυρία*". After the assassination of Thomas, a council reuniting Joasaph, Maria "*and the elite of the archons*" decided that Esaü Buondelmonti would marry Maria and become Despot. (*Chron. Ioann.* cit., p. 94, §29, ll. 3-6).

[139] *Chron. Tocco* cit., vv. 1391-1392.

[140] Nicol, *Despotate 1984* cit., p. 175, makes another analysis: "The clear message transmitted by the people of Ioannina was that they disliked the Serbs almost as much as they loathed the Albanians, and that if they must have a foreign master they would prefer an Italian".

[141] Bartusis, *Serbs in Macedonia* cit., p. 159.

[142] *TIB* III cit., pp. 165-166.

[143] Job Monachus, *Life of Saint-Theodora of Arta*, *Patrologia Graeca*, CXXVII, cols. 903-8; D. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford 1957, pp. 215-216.

[144] Marthono, *Liber peregrinationis* cit., p. 665.

[145] Some families stayed in the Ionian islands, but the latter were lost to Venetian but not Ottoman domination.

[146] *Promissio* of Michael I Doukas of Epirus, ed. G.L.F. Tafel and G.M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehungen auf Byzanz und die Levante*, vol. II, p. 119, act n. 224.

[147] J.G. Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, 1784.

[148] *Chron. Tocco* cit., v. 3030.

[149] *Chron. Tocco* cit., chapter XIV, *passim*. A. Ilieva, *The image of the Morea (Frankish and Byzantine) in the Mentality of the Gianniotes: The Author of the Tocco Chronicle*, in *Συμπόσιο για το Δεσποτάτο της Ηπείρου* cit., pp. 308-312.

[150] See Každan, *Some Notes* cit., p. 174; Sansaridou-Hendrickx, *World View* cit., pp. 232-233, and M. Preka, *Εθνικότητα* cit., p. 306, who writes that the domination of Carlo Tocco was a first step to national unity.

[151] Ducellier, *Drame* cit., pp. 161-171.

[152] *Ibid*., pp. 176-177.

[153] Ducellier, *Drame* cit., pp. 96-99; H. Ahrweiler, *Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner: The Case of the Nomads*, in *Internal Diaspora* cit., pp. 1-15.

[154] Năsturel, *Valaques Balcaniques*, p. 111.

[155] Ducellier, *Οἱ Ἀλβανοί* cit., pp. 50-51.

[156] K. Oikonomou, *Η ἀλβανικὴ γλωσσικὴ ἐπίδραση στὰ ἠπειρωτικὰ ἰδιώματα*, Ioannina 1997. This study is synchronic since there is no way to date precisely the appearance of Albanian loan words.

Bibliography

Ahrweiler H., *L'idéologie politique de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris 1975.

Id., Laiou E. (eds.), *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, Harvard 1998.

Chrysos E. (ed.), *Το Βυζάντιο ως οικουμένη,* international congress, Athens 2005.

Ducellier A., *L'Albanie entre Byzance et Venise, X°-XV° siècles,* Variorum Reprints, London 1987. [The major part of the articles by this author quoted in these pages can be found in this volume].

Id., *Οἱ Ἀλβανοί στὴν Ελλάδα (13ος-15ος αἰ). Η μετανάστευση μίας κοινοτητάς*, Athens 1994.

Gasparis Ch. (ed.), *Οι Αλβανοί στο Μεσαιώνα*, international congress, Athens 1998.

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

Sansaridou-Hendrickx Th., *The World View of the Anonymous Author of the Chronicle of the Tocco: the antagonists as groups*, in "Βυζαντιακά", 2001, XXI, pp. 193-242.

Soulis G.C., *The Serbs and Byzantium during the reign of Tsar Stephen Dušan (1331-1355) and his successors*, Dumbarton Oaks Washington D. C. 1984.