

Identities, Locality and Otherness in Epirus during the Late Ottoman period

Elias G. Skoulidas

This paper focuses on *Epirus* as a historiographical example for the study of local history using the terms *locality* and *otherness*; a different approach to the intellectuals' public discourse. We are interested in the discourse of the people who describe themselves as *Epirotes* (*Ηπειρώτες*) and their perception of *Epirus* and its land.¹

By *constructing* paradigms, local history acquires a different content, influencing a general history. Local history investigates as its major goals the partialization of the general, as well as the relations and the ways of experiencing the systems under which it is subsumed.² In the period discussed here, local history is based on lived relations, locality. In our historiographical example local history seeks to be linked with national history and the narrative is inscribed in a genre of *national teleology*.³

The period examined largely coincides with that of the reforms (*tanzimat*) in the Ottoman Empire, as well as of the formation of national movements in the Balkans. It should be noted from the outset that *Epirus* did not exist as a unity or as a province during that period. Following the division of the Ottoman Empire, we refer mainly to the *elviye-i selase* (or the three sandjaks of Ioannina, Delvino and Avlona) in the beginning and later to the vilayet of Yanya.⁴

Epirote identity was formed mainly in the nineteenth century, under the influence of the ideas of ethnicity. The founding of the *Ηπειρωτικός Φιλεκπαιδευτικός Σύλλογος* (*Epirote Phileducational Society*) in Constantinople in 1861 played a significant role in the process.⁵ The *Epirote* intellectuals, as they defined themselves, lived, worked and were active either in the vilayet of Yanya or in the capital of the Empire (Istanbul/Constantinople), or in the new national centre (Athens) or the diaspora communities (e.g. in Alexandria). Frequently, networks of communication existed among them, the detection of which allows us to study relations and not simply to write their personal biographies. These networks became increasingly stronger during the period from just prior to the Constitution of Young Turks to the Balkan Wars.

The term *locality* is used here in accordance with the theories of, inter alia, Arjun Appadurai,⁶ Nadia Lovell,⁷ Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson.⁸ We perceive the relation of the people – in our case the intellectuals – with the place as a relation of identity. Place derives from a combination of the physical landscape and the human cultural presence. Fredrik Barth, in his approach to collective identities focusing on the borders, has contributed to our understanding of identities as a dynamic process.⁹

Theoretical discussion on locality has arisen relatively recently, within the context of globalization during the post-Cold War era.¹⁰ The term *locality* is very rich in definitions and relations. It constitutes a unity, but on a smaller scale with regard to demographic data.¹¹ To be a member of a certain locality includes the notion of faith, of loyalty to one place, a faith

¹ For the *production* of historiography about *Epirus* see Δρούλια – Κόντη 1984; Βακατσάς – Κολιός – Σκουλίδας 1998; Κόντη 1999α; Κόντη 1999β.

² See Ασδραχάς 1995, 179-182.

³ See Ασδραχάς 1996, 433-434.

⁴ See Κοκολάκης 2003.

⁵ For the formation of the identity of Epirotes, inter alia, see Γάγαρης 1895, 23-34; Λέσιος, 1899 [=1898], 7-8; Βασιλειάδης, 1904, 13-26.

⁶ See Appadurai 1995.

⁷ See Lovell 1998.

⁸ See Gupta - Ferguson 1997.

⁹ See Barth 1969, 9-38.

¹⁰ See Low – Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003, 1.

¹¹ See Morley 2000, 2-6; Νούτσος 2002.

that can be expressed in written or oral discourse, through narration of a common origin, ancestral-genealogical myths, religion and manifestations of worship.¹² Territoriality is a convenient starting point but it has proved to be inadequate. Appadurai talks about *diasporic (dispersal) public spheres*.¹³

It is a commonplace that the sense of *belonging* can be used in multiple descriptions. Locality may also impinge on the *imagined community*, whose members agree on a common origin, even if they do not agree on what this is. Furthermore, it is a collective memory which constitutes an identity over and above individual experiences and a nostalgic disposition for a specific place. It is also an expression of sentiments for the place; it is a symbolic locality. Its borders may be inside the society and the culture itself.¹⁴

Locality is understood also as discourse and as topos. We should pay particular attention to the *production of locality*, that is to the social mechanisms which produce and reproduce identities. The view that there are differences in the *perception* of the local *vis-à-vis* the general echoes a conservative conception and emanates romanticism in the interaction between social relations and identities. Whatever differences are encountered are rather the outcome of a regime of production.¹⁵ In later periods the *production* of identity too may be a result of collective action.¹⁶

In this context we try to detect the Epirote intellectuals' discourse relating to place. The first who wrote on this issue (in 1819) was Athanassios Stageirites, Professor of the Greek Language at the Academy of Eastern Languages in Vienna. He wasn't from *Epirus* but we mention him because he was the first one who, in real terms, focused on *Epirus*. He entitled his book *Ηπειρωτικά* [On Epirus]. He perceived *Epirus* as a unity, despite the different dominant powers (Ottoman, Venetian, French, Ali Pasha, etc.) to which it had been *subject* over the centuries. The concept of territoriality is implicated in his geographical description of Epirus. He is interested in the mountains, the lakes, the rivers, the ports, the capes and the islands of *Epirus*, as well as the towns. He tries to set the northern frontiers of Epirus (approximately the *Keraunia* mountain range or the Himarra mountains), beyond which is *Greek Illyria*.¹⁷

Stageirites also deals with the problems of *belonging*, and supports the idea of *continuity*. The subtitle of his work is *Ιστορία και Γεωγραφία της Ηπείρου παλαιά τε και νέα* [History and Geography of Epirus old and new]. He writes about the ancient forty-two *έθνη* (*ethne*, which actually means tribes), and in his *New Geography* Epirus is territorially part of Albania: *Η κάτω Αλβανία είναι η Ήπειρος με μητρόπολιν τα Ιωάννινα* [Lower Albania is Epirus with metropolis Ioannina], just to show the new realities in the Ottoman period.¹⁸ At the same time, Epirus is part of Greece, the geography of which has yet to be written. In his attempt to give the Epirotes a symbol, Stageirites decided to write the *Βίος του Πύρρον* [Life of Pyrrhus] because *Ηπειρώτην δε άλλον δεν έχομεν ... εις την τάξιν των ενδόξων* [We have no other Epirote ... in the class of the glorious].

The first Epirote, in fact, who makes reference to his homeland is Athanassios Psallidas. His description and comments are saved by his disciple, Kosmas Thesprotos. According to Psallidas, Epirus is identified with Albania, which is made of the ancient districts of *Epirus* and *Illyricon* (Ancient and New Epirus)¹⁹. In this case, too, locality is originally related to

¹² See Lovell 1998, 1-8.

¹³ See Appadurai 1996.

¹⁴ For understanding the relation of nationalism and locality, see inter alia Peleikis 2001; Confino-Skaria 2002; Robbins 2009.

¹⁵ See Appadurai 1995· Hardt - Negri 2000.

¹⁶ For a later completion of his theory see also the interview Appadurai 2008.

¹⁷ See Σταγειρίτης 1819, 3-5.

¹⁸ See Σταγειρίτης 1819, 371-372.

¹⁹ See Θεσπρωτός – Ψαλλίδης 1964, 49-71.

geography but incorporates, at the same time, people, languages, religions, and the character of both Greeks and Albanians. Psallidas, also, refers to the culture in Ioannina, as well as the ancient monuments of the area, which is mostly connected with the symbolic locality. Kosmas Thesprotos, on the other hand, provides us with information on the customs and manners of the Albanians.²⁰

Two other early efforts to write about *Epirus* were those of Dimitrios Semitelos *Epiroteicorum Liber Primus*, in 1854,²¹ and Alexios Pallis *Μελέται επί της αρχαίας χωρογραφίας και Ιστορίας της Ηπείρου* [Studies on the ancient chorography and history of Epirus], in 1858.²² They both mention in their deliberation their desire to preserve whatever they can from the ancient past of Epirus, because according to them most of the sources had been lost. Both authors inscribe Epirus in the *national ideal* and for both, in terms of *belonging*, *Epirus is part of Greece* or a *Greek province*.

In 1909, Th. Havellas published his *Ιστορία της Ηπείρου και Αλβανίας* [History of Epirus and Albania], although he was actually a *γείτονας Αιτωλός* [neighbouring Aitolian]. He believes that the *Epirote nation* was without written history [*ανιστόρητο το Ηπειρωτικό έθνος*], as the intellectuals of Epirus wrote very little, and gave recently the pretext for a discussion in the Italian parliament.²³ In his mind-set, the *Ηπειρωτικόν έθνος* [Epirote nation] is akin to the ancient tribes. For him territorialism is limited to geographical description and references to the landscape, topography and provenance of the name. The real interest is in the subtitle of his work *από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι του 1830 μ.Χ* [from most ancient times till 1830 A.D.]. The concept of *continuity* is present, and the *ανιστόρητο του Ηπειρωτικού* [lack of written history on Epirus] is registered *ως σπουδαιότητα έλλειψις εις την όλην ιστοριαν του Ελληνικού έθνους* [as a most significant omission in the whole history of the Greek nation].²⁴ Consistent with the expression of the national discourse is his interest in data on the topography and economy. After that we have the usual expression of the national discourse. The publication was funded by the Epirote Michael Anagnostopoulos or Anagnos,²⁵ whose sudden death brought a new sponsor to the fore, *ο φιλόπατρις Ηπειρώτης* [the patriotic Epirote] *Γεώργιος Πούσιος*, who undertook the publication, showing the networks that locality can produce.

Territoriality is important to other writers, too. Hristovassilis writes about the place as space and limit of geographical claims, but has problems in the *construction of continuity* during the Medieval Era: after Antiquity and the Roman conquest, the next important references are to the invasions from the West and the Albanian settlements (11th-13th centuries).²⁶

Dimitrios Hassiotis (1879) was also involved in the Greek national discourse about Epirus; for his perception the political situation is very interesting. After the Berlin Congress and due to Protocol no. 13, negotiations were initiated about the new border between the Greek kingdom and the Ottoman empire.²⁷ Hassiotis tries to prove that Epirus was Greek and wishes to reject Albanian claims to the region. He uses three main elements: the *continuity*, the genealogy of the ancestors from ancient times and the *character* of the Epirotes, completed with benefactors.

All the intellectuals we have mentioned so far, who lived either in Epirus or in the newly established Greek State, or in the diaspora communities, have similar *perceptions* of territoriality and national aspirations. Their worries had no specific originality. In Greece

²⁰ See Θεσπρωτός – Ψαλλίδας 1964, 34-41.

²¹ See Σεμιτέλος 1854.

²² See Πάλλης 1858.

²³ See Χαβέλλας 1909, 3-4.

²⁴ See Χαβέλλας 1909, 4.

²⁵ For Michael Anagnostopoulos or Anagnos see inter alia and Παπαϊωάννου 1981.

²⁶ See Χρηστοβασίλης 1905, 140-143.

²⁷ See Χασιώτης 1887, 90-98.

during the 1880s and 1890s, knowledge of the homeland in combination with the rise of the discipline of Folklore Studies (*Λαογραφία*) added a new cultural component to the national discourse. The same applies to the territories of the Ottoman Empire where Greeks lived. But as Peckham showed, we have a contradiction: locality is interpreted at once as an element proving the *national rights* for the territorial expansion of the Greek State and as an identity of resistance to a nationalism guided by the State to homogenize the different populations.²⁸

A different but not necessarily contradictory approach emerged in the circles of the *Epirote Phileducational Society* in Constantinople. The ideological approaches of its members are well-known in the bibliography, in a period when *Greek-Ottomanism* played a major role. The charismatic personality of Iroklis Vassiadis is dominant and the *Society* led the efforts to increase the bibliographical production about *Epirus* with book-writing competitions. Hristakis B. Zografos awarded a prize for relevant writings and in this framework P. Aravantinos submitted, as a candidate, his work, the *Περιγραφή της Ηπείρου* [Description of Epirus]. The list of members of the Society attests that networks of communication already existed or were developing. Interest focused on the existence and operation of schools, the issue of teachers and the funding of the educational mechanisms. Chief concern is the intellectual growth of Epirus, with the contribution of *φιλοκαλία* by the Society's members.

So, Aravantinos' *Περιγραφή της Ηπείρου* was written in order to participate in the competition. Beyond territoriality and exercises in political geography, history – ancient and modern –, he is interested in inscriptions, coins, traditions and manifestations of worship. At the same time, he is interested in persons, as evidenced by his authorship of the *biography of illustrious men*. The concept of the *community of nostalgia* is reinforced also by his former profession as a language teacher.²⁹ (He studies the language, the culture, as well as the families of patriots and benefactors, and the occupations of the inhabitants.) Telling with regard to Aravantinos' views, is the inscription on his tombstone: *Το γένος Έλλην, και υιός της ευκλεούς Ηπείρου* [Nationality Greek, and son of glorious Epirus].³⁰

Similar views were shared by Vasileios Zotos, also known as Molossos, although he was soon at loggerheads with the Society and was rejected by Vassiadis and its leadership. Territoriality as well as the reaction to successive foreign occupations are the two pillars underpinning his own concept of locality.³¹ He *borrow*s several elements from Aravantinos. It is very interesting to whom he dedicates his work, which reveals also his cultural mentality: *τη σεβαστη τριανδρί των ενδόξων Ηπειρωτών: τω ηγεμονικώ γόνω της Γκεγκαρίας Βεζύρη Μουσύρη Μεχμέτ Χακίφ Πασσά Εφέντη Τετοβάλη, πατρικώ φίλω και συμπατριώτη, τώ εκ των στρατηγών της Ηπείρου, στρατηγώ της Ελλάδος Σπυρίδωνι Μίλιω, και τώ αγωνοθέτη κυρίω Χρηστάκη Ζωγράφω Εφέντη, Τόσκα την καταγωγήν* [the respected triumvirate of illustrious Epirotees: the princely scion of Gegaria Vizier Mousyri Mehmet Hakif Pasha Efendi Tetovali, paternal friend and compatriot, the General of Greece from the Generals of Epirus Spyridon Milios, and the agonothetes Mr Christakis Zografos Efendi, Toskas by origin].

In our opinion, the most distinguished Epirote intellectual was Ioannis Lambridis, whose thematic repertoire, as Asdrachas has argued too, belongs to the desiderata of a total history.³² He was interested in the schools, the charities and legacies (the benefactions, which include public benefit foundations and bequests of properties and money).³³ *Φιλογενεία* and *κληροδοσία* are revealed as traits of the Epirote character, so we are close to the perception that donators/benefactors (*ευεργέτες*) and Epirotes are closely affined concepts. It is

²⁸ See Peckham 2001, 76-80.

²⁹ See Αραβαντινός 1960, ια' - κζ', where the preface by K. Th. Dimaras.

³⁰ See Αραβαντινός 1960, ιθ'.

³¹ See Ζώτος (Μολοσσός) 1878, 50-52.

³² See Ασδραχάς 1996, 434.

³³ See Λαμπρίδης 1971, Part. Β', 168-176.

fascinating with respect to Lambridis' mentality that for him a leading figure in Epirote history was a medieval and not an ancient one (Michael II, Despot of Epirus and champion of Hellenism and Orthodoxy).³⁴

At the turn of the twentieth century, there was a notable proliferation of societies and associations involved with Epirus, mainly in Greece and particularly in the years after the Constitution of the Young Turks and before the Balkan Wars. There was a commensurate increase in the number of intellectuals writing about *Epirus*, always in accordance with the dominant discourse of the national centre. Haralambos Lesios (1909), for example, deals with the *επατρίδες* [noble patriots] and the best families (*αρχοντικές*) in Epirus.

Leonidas M. Vasileiadis (1904) writes about the landscape, but also about the schools and the benefactors. Georgios K. Gagaris describes anew the *character* of the *Epirote*: (φιλοπατρία [love of the fatherland] – τάση για γράμματα [inclination for education] – σχολεία [schools] – διασπορά [diaspora]).

Kougiteas writes about the topography, history and ethnology of *Άνω Αλβανίας ή Ιλλυρίας, Κάτω Αλβανίας ή Μακεδονικής Ιλλυρίας και Ηπείρου* [Upper Albania or Illyria, Lower Albania or Macedonian Illyria and Epirus], always in terms of *continuity*, as does Athanasios Petridis.

For all these intellectuals, who were living outside the homeland, mainly in the diaspora, the perception of *Epirus* is also as a *community of nostalgia*.

Another intriguing personality is the bishop of Arta and Preveza, Serafeim Xenopoulos the Vyzantios. In his self-definition he makes reference to his family, his place of origin and his genealogy (Vyzantios).³⁵ He describes *Epirus* as his second homeland. The members of the community who live in Epirus, though not indigenous, influence the formation of the discourse and thus, are part of our study.³⁶ Serafeim too is involved with the geography, institutions, administration, modern history and economy of the region, but he moves a step further: his *perception* of locality passes through the study of manifestations of worship.³⁷ He established in Preveza, as there was in Arta, a liturgy (Mass) on behalf of the donators (*ελαιοθέτες*), he took measures to ensure good order in places of worship, he set up two commissions – ecclesiastical and educational – and in general made every effort to stand by *the honest and good fellow citizens, blessed Christian inhabitants* of his episcopal see.³⁸

The second issue this paper deals with is *otherness*. The *other* becomes interesting when it produces or reproduces relations of power: relations of power between different ethno-cultural groups or empires, or later between minority groups and nation-states, relations of force between or inside these same groups, relations of inequality between natives and immigrants.³⁹ And the cultural *otherness* always exists.⁴⁰ *Otherness* can have different aspects (ethnic, religious, linguistic, etc.) and the *construction* of the *other* includes both the *etic* view and the *emic* view. The discourse on identities is revealed simultaneously with the decline in multiple forms of liberal societies and within a context of reconsideration of the relations between man and the social environment.⁴¹

In the period (19th century, and mainly the late 19th and the early 20th century) and the region examined here, national movements formed on different bases come into contact: the Greek movement exploits the religious perspective, while the Albanian one makes use of the

³⁴ See Λαμπρίδης 1971, Part. Α'.

³⁵ See Στεργιόπουλος 1985, 99-100.

³⁶ See Appadurai 1995.

³⁷ See Σεραφείμ Ξενόπουλος ²1986, 219-266 and 382-397.

³⁸ See Στεργιόπουλος 1985, 105-106.

³⁹ See Χριστόπουλος 2002, 11.

⁴⁰ See Αβδελά 1995, 17-20.

⁴¹ See Τσουκαλάς 2010.

linguistic one.⁴² In reality, the essence of political competition during the Late Ottoman period is *ethnic-religious*. Collective identities during the period of modernity and because of the dominance of the nation-state are frequently assessed in terms of territorial expansion. The sense of *belonging* to the Ottoman context has, mainly, religious meaning and is redefined by the oncoming national discourse based on territorial expansion.⁴³

The Epirote intellectuals perceived the *other* through two mirrors: a. the Greek national perspective b. the lived experience of the *other*. Otherness can be defined geographically but also symbolically.⁴⁴

Kosmas Thesprotos, regarding the *other*, distinguishes the various tribes of the Albanians, like Ghegs or the Crypto-Christians of Shpatë⁴⁵, and characterises them (the Albanians) as *Τάρταρους* (sic) *της Ελλάδος*.⁴⁶

Hristovassilis, in various articles and books, tried to describe, *to imprint* the different populations in Epirus and their friendly feelings towards the Greek State. According to his classification, there were:

- a. Greeks.
- b. Albanians, who in his view had benefited considerably from the Greek schools, since the Albanian elites were educated at Greek schools, primarily in the Zosimaia School in Ioannina (Ismail Kemal Vlora, Turhan pasha, Abedin Dino, Frashëri brothers, etc.). He distinguishes the Albanian Christians (*Ελληνοαλβανοί*), who had Greek consciousness and common national and religious aspirations with Hellenism (e.g. Souliotes and Himarriotes). However, there still existed few among them, those who set as a goal the *restoration* (reconstitution) of Albania or, more specifically of *Muslim Albania* [Τουρκαλβανία] as an autonomous state.
- c. Vlachs, who have Greek consciousness and are bilingual, speaking both the Vlach and the Greek language.
- d. Αρβανιτόβλαχοι (Arvanitovlachs) who are trilingual, speaking Albanian, Vlach, Greek. According to Hristovassilis, although they wrote only Greek, like the rest of the ethno-cultural groups, because they were baptized Greek Orthodox they became *κουμπάροι* [best-man, godfather] with the Greek Epirotes. His mother had about 200.
- e. Jews, who speak only Greek.⁴⁷

In Hristovassilis' description there is no place for Ottoman Turks, except the officials of the Ottoman Empire. Greeks who converted to Islam are characterized either as *Greeks Greek-speaking Mohammedans* or as *Greek Ottomans*. The Muslims of Epirus are Greeks and Albanians. Greeks are the Muslims of Ioannina, Preveza, Louros (the ones from Arta, etc.) who speak only the Greek language.⁴⁸

The *fluidity* of his conceptions can be seen in another of his works, where he speaks of three Christian tribes and one Greek idea (Greeks / Greek Vlachs / Greek (Christian) Albanians). His views belong in the framework of inquiries of the Greek national movement, in order to incorporate in the 'national core' populations 'speaking other languages'. Most *perceptions* of *Epirote* intellectuals subscribe to the concept of continuity' and not of *revival* (historical narrative with two poles, *Antiquity* and *National Renaissance*), as the first is already dominant in Greek ideology.

The national perspective is obvious. It is pertinent to remember that, as a boy, Hristovassilis did not consider himself an *ελληνόπουλο* [Greek child] but a *ρωμιόπουλο* [Rum

⁴² See inter alia Σκουλίδας 2001; Clayer 2007. For a different methodological approach see Motyl 2010, 59-71.

⁴³ See Τσιτσελίκης-Χριστόπουλος 2008, 33-67. Also, about an anthropological view in connection with segmentation, see Παπαταξιάρχης 2006, 25-39 and 407-460.

⁴⁴ See the significant work of Gounaris 2007.

⁴⁵ See Θεσπρωτός – Ψαλλίδης 1964, 7; Νικολαΐδου 1979.

⁴⁶ See Θεσπρωτός – Ψαλλίδης 1964, 15.

⁴⁷ See Δωδωναίος [= Χρηστοβασίλης] 1899, 366.

⁴⁸ See Χρηστοβασίλης 1905, 449-450 and Δωδωναίος [= Χρηστοβασίλης] 1899, 372.

child] and a *χριστιανόπουλο* [Christian child], as *Greeks were the people beyond the borders of the Greek State*. And in my opinion, Kokolakis correctly described this *fluidity* in ethnic-religious consciousness. If Hristovassilis, under the influence of the Greek schools and in an area with a strong Greek presence, raised this question, who can speak for sure about how Albanian-speaking populations in Linxurië, Delvino and so on perceived the national consciousness.⁴⁹

Similar classifications mixing ethnic and religious orientations and identities were made by different Epirotes throughout the nineteenth century. This was the time when ethnographic maps were used to solve the national problems in the Balkan Peninsula.

Aravantinos uses the term *Ημιελληνικόν ή Γραικοαλβανικόν στοιχείον* [Semi-Greek or Greek-Albanian element] to describe the bilingual populations speaking Greek with an Albanian accent; the women spoke Greek but their customs were purely Albanian.⁵⁰ Aravantinos describes the Albanians as *Σκιπεταρικόν ή Αλβανικόν στοιχείον* [Skipetarian or Albanian element], the Arvanitovlachs as *Γκαραγκούνηδες* [Garagounides] and he also talks about *Σλαβικόν στοιχείον, Αθίγγανους, Αράπηδες (Μαύρους)* [Slavic element, Roma, Blacks] in Epirus.

Serafeim Xenopoulos uses the term *Ηπειρώτες Αλβανότουρκοι* for the Muslims of Albanian origin in Epirus. He too borrows elements and terms taken from Aravantinos.⁵¹

Nikolaos Konemenos takes a different approach, by not denying his Albanian identity, although he participated in Greek public life. He accepts this identity and embodies it, without excluding the other identity: *κι εγώ είμαι φυσικός Αρβανίτης, επειδή κατάγομαι από τα χωριά της Λάκκας (Τσαμουριά) και είμαι απόγονος ενός καπετάν Γιώργη Κονεμένου 'λ που emίλειε τα' αρβανίτικα κι όπου ταις αρχαίς του προπερασμένου αιώνας ... είχε καταβεί κι είχε αποκατασταθεί στην Πρέβεζα...* [I too am a natural Albanian, because I originate from the villages of Lakka (Tsamouria) and I'm a descendant of a kapetan Giorgis Konemenos, who spoke Albanian and who at the beginning of the last century ... had come down and had settled in Preveza]. The spelling mistakes in this passage are a good indicator of what is happening.⁵²

Dimitrios Hassiotis talks about *Μπεκτασήδες* (Bektaci) and *Αλήτας* (Alevi), and recognized them as *γνησίους Ηπειρώτας* [genuine Epirotes], because they use the Trinity among their ritual symbols.

It is worth mentioning that the literary elites of these Epirote intellectuals, either under the influence of *Greek-Ottomanism*⁵³ or through their common everyday life, preserve a positive image of the Muslim community. Terms such as *Ηπειρώτες Οθωμανοί* [Epirote Ottomans] are commonly used (e.g. by Zotos and Lesios) and the local identity is a reference point. Lesios, for example, writes about distinguished Muslim families, such as Vloras – Vrionis – Delvinas – Frashëri, etc., in 1901, and includes people who have already developed a different ethnic orientation from that of the Greeks.⁵⁴

Another point to mention is the use of Pelasgian theories to describe a common past between the two major ethnicities in the region, the Greek and the Albanian, serving mainly the Greek national aspirations in the region. The ideas of Paparrhigopoulos (two in one) are developed, as can be seen in the titles of works: (Kougiteas, Havellas, etc., wrote *Histories of Epirus and Albania*, with a variety of terms used according to the intellectual formation of the authors. The Epirote G. Poussios in the preface of Havellas' book, for instance, discourses on the Pelasgian theories about the common origin of both Greeks and Albanians, the *όμαιμο* of

⁴⁹ See Κοκολάκης 2003.

⁵⁰ See Αραβαντινός 1984, Α, 194.

⁵¹ See Σεραφείμ Ξενόπουλος ²1986, 228.

⁵² See Αλισανδράτος 1993, 167; Καρζής 1993, 81-83 και 151-152.

⁵³ See Σκοπετέα 1988, 309-324.

⁵⁴ See, inter alia, Λέσιος 1900 [= 1899], 45-46.

the two peoples and adds to the myth of origin a common ancestor: *ο ηγεμών των Αλβανών και βασιλεύς των Ηπειρωτών Σκεντέρμπεης*.⁵⁵

To conclude: by observing two dimensions – locality and otherness – in a different perspective on and interpretation of local history, we believe that local history has to be, as every history, total in its goals but partial in its application. It cannot be an entrenched field, which is something that other social sciences frequently endeavour.

In the historiographical debate of the early twenty-first century and the crucial critique of theory (post-modernism), the conjunction of history and cultural identities,⁵⁶ may show as a new way to *discover* the past, it may lead also to a multi-level *abstraction*, which aims at a history that is holistic and therefore more *perceptible*.⁵⁷

Bibliography

- Αβδελά Ε., 1995, «Ετερότητα» και «ταυτότητα»: ιστοριογραφικές προσεγγίσεις, *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 54, 17-20.
- Αλισανδράτος Γ., 1993, Ο Νικόλαος Κονεμένος και η Πρέβεζα, στο: Αυδίκος Βαγγέλης Γ. (επιμ.), *Η ιστορία της Πρέβεζας (Πρακτικά Α΄ Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου)*, Πρέβεζα, 165-173.
- Αραβαντινός Π., 1960, *Βιογραφική Συλλογή Λογίων της Τουρκοκρατίας*. Εισαγωγή-Επιμέλεια Κ. Θ. Δημαρά, Ιωάννινα.
- Αραβαντινός Π., 1984, *Περιγραφή της Ηπείρου εις μέρη τρία*. Τόμοι Α΄-Γ΄. Εισαγωγή Κ. Θ. Δημαρά. Επιμέλεια Εκδόσεως-Ευρετήριο Ε.Ι. Νικολαΐδου, Ιωάννινα.
- Ασδραχάς Σπ., 1995, *Ιστορικά απεικασματα*, Αθήνα.
- Ασδραχάς Σπ., 1996, Από τους ορίζοντες της τοπικής ιστορίας, στο: *Από την τοπική ιστορία στη συνολική: το παράδειγμα της Λευκάδας, 15^{ος} – 19^{ος} αι. (Πρακτικά Δ΄ Συνεδρίου Επτανησιακού Πολιτισμού)*, Αθήνα, 433-437.
- Βακατσάς Κ. – Κολιός Β. – Σκουλίδας Η., 1998, *Ηπειρωτική Βιβλιογραφία (1981-1994)*. *Νεότερη και Σύγχρονη Ιστορία*, Εποπτεία Γεώργιος Πλουμίδης, Ιωάννινα.
- Βασιλειάδης Λ., 1904, Πρώται λέξεις, *Ηπειρωτικός Αστήρ* 1, 13-26.
- Γάγαρης Γ., 1896[=1895], Αντί Προλόγου, *Δωδώνη* 1, 23-34.
- *Γενικός Κατάλογος των μέχρι 20 Μαΐου εγγραφέντων τακτικών μελών*, 1872-1873 [= 1873], Επετηρίς του εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ηπειρωτικού Φιλεκπαιδευτικού Συλλόγου, 1, 15-44.
- Γούναρης Β. Κ., 2007, *Τα Βαλκάνια των Ελλήνων. Από το Διαφωτισμό έως τον Α΄ Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο*, Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Δρούλια Λ. - Κόντη Β., 1984, *Ηπειρωτική Βιβλιογραφία 1571-1980. α. Αυτοτελή δημοσιεύματα*, Αθήνα.
- Δωδωναίος Ζ. [= Χρηστοβασίλης Χ.], 1899, Η δύναμις του Ελληνισμού εν Ηπείρω, *Ελληνισμός* Β, 365-380.
- Ζώτος (Μολοσσός) Β. Δ., 1878, *Ηπειρωτικά Μελέται, Τόμος Δ΄, Τεύχος Α΄: Δρομολόγιον της ελληνικής χερσονήσου. Αρχαιολογικόν, ιστορικόν, γεωγραφικόν, στρατιωτικόν, στατιστικόν και εμπορικόν*, Εν Αθήναις.
- Θεσπρωτός Κ. – Ψαλλίδα Α., 1964, *Γεωγραφία Αλβανίας και Ηπείρου, εξ ανεκδότου χειρογράφου του Κοσμά Θεσπρωτού. Με τοπογραφικά σχεδιαγραφήματα και γεωγραφικούς χάρτας του ιδίου*. Προλεγόμενα και σημειώσεις Αθαν. Χ. Παπαχαρίση, Ιωάννινα.
- Καρζής Α., 1993, *Πρέβεζα (ιστορικολαογραφική αναδρομή)*, Πρέβεζα.
- Κοκολάκης Μ., 2003, *Το ύστερο γιαννιώτικο πασαλίκι. Χώρος, διοίκηση και πληθυσμός στην Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ηπειρο (1820-1913)*, Αθήνα.

⁵⁵ See Χαβέλλας 1909, 8-12.

⁵⁶ For the cultural identity as ideology see, inter alia, Herzfeld 1982, Chapter 1.

⁵⁷ See Ασδραχάς 1996, 437.

- Κόντη Β., 1999α, *Ηπειρωτική Βιβλιογραφία. Β΄. Κατάλογος εφημερίδων και περιοδικών 1886-1980*, Αθήνα.
- Κόντη Β., 1999β, *Ηπειρωτική Βιβλιογραφία. Γ΄. Μελέτες και άρθρα 1811-1980*, Αθήνα.
- Λαμπρίδης Ι., 1971, *Ηπειρωτικά Αγαθοεργήματα και άλλα δημοσιεύματα* (Ζαγορισιακά – 1870, διάφοροι λόγοι κλπ.), Ιωάννινα.
- Λέσιος Χ., 1899 [= 1898], *Τω αναγνώσοντι, Ο Ηπειρώτης. Ελληνικόν Ημερολόγιον του 1899*, 7-8.
- Νικολαΐδου Ε. Ι., 1979, *Οι κρυπτοχριστιανοί της Σπαθίας. (Αρχές 18^{ου} – 1912)*, Ιωάννινα.
- Νούτσος Π., 2002, *Τα χαμένα εξάμηνα του Αιγαίου, Το Βήμα*, Κυριακή 9 Ιουνίου 2002.
- Π.Α.Π. [= Αραβαντινός Π.], 1856, *Χρονογραφία της Ηπείρου των τε όμορων ελληνικών και ιλλυρικών χωρών διατρέχουσα κατά σειράν τα εν αυταίς συμβάντα από του σωτηρίου έτους μέχρι του 1854*.
- Πάλλης Αλέξιος, *Μελέται επί της αρχαίας χωρογραφίας και Ιστορίας της Ηπείρου*, Εν Αθήναις, 1858.
- Παπαϊωάννου Ι., 1981, *Μιχαήλ Αναγνωστόπουλος (Michael Anagnos). Πάπυγκο 7.11.1837 – Τούρνο Σεβερίν 29.6.1906*, Αθήνα.
- Σεμιτέλος Δημήτριος Χ., [Semitellos Dem.], [1854] *Epiroticorum Liber Primus. Dissertatio in audioralis philologicae quam consensus et auctoritae amplissimi philosophorum ordinis in alma literarum, Universitae Friderika Villielma Berolinensi, [Berlin]*.
- Σεραφεΐμ Ξενόπουλος ο Βυζάντιος, ²1986, *Δοκίμιον Ιστορικόν περί Άρτης και Πρεβέζης, Άρτα*.
- Σκοπετέα Ε., 1988, *Το «πρότυπο Βασίλειο» και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (18 30-1880)*, Αθήνα.
- Σκουλίδας Η., 2001, *Οι σχέσεις Ελλήνων και Αλβανών κατά το 19^ο αιώνα: Πολιτικές επιδιώξεις και θεωρήσεις (1875-1897)*, Ανέκδοτη διδακτορική διατριβή, Ιωάννινα.
- Σούλης Χρ., (1931-2) [= 1931], *Η έκθεσις του Ηπειρωτικού Τύπου, Η Δωδώνη Α*, 273-284.
- Σταγειρίτης Αθανάσιος, 1819. *Ηπειρωτικά, ήτοι Ιστορία και Γεωγραφία της Ηπείρου παλαιά τε και νέα και Βίον του Πύρρου*, Εν Βιέννη.
- Στεργιόπουλος Κ. Δ., 1985, *Ο μητροπολίτης Άρτης Σεραφεΐμ Μ. Ξενόπουλος, Ηπειρωτικό Ημερολόγιο 7*, 97-134.
- Τσιτσελίκης Κ. – Χριστόπουλος Δ., 2008, *Από το πολυπολιτισμικό «μέγα όνειρον του Ελληνισμού» των αρχών του 20^{ου} στην «πολυπολιτισμική πραγματικότητα» των αρχών του 21^{ου} αιώνα, στο Χριστόπουλος Δ. (επιμ.), Το ανομολόγητο ζήτημα των μειονοτήτων στην ελληνική έννομη τάξη*, Αθήνα, 33-67.
- Τσουκαλάς Κ., 2010, *Η επινόηση της ετερότητας. «Ταυτότητες» και «διαφορές» στην εποχή της παγκοσμιοποίησης*, Αθήνα.
- Χαβέλλας Θ., 1909, *Ιστορία Ηπείρου και Αλβανίας από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι του 1830 μ.Χ.*, εν Αθήναις.
- Χασιώτης Δημήτριος, 1887, *Διατριβαί και υπομνήματα περί Ηπείρου: από του έτους 1874 μέχρι του έτους 1879*, Αθήνησιν.
- Χρηστοβασίλης Χρήστος, 1905, *Η Ήπειρος γεωγραφικώς και εθνολογικώς από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι σήμερα*, *Ελληνισμός Η*, 17-33 και 140-146 και 205-208 και 447-451 και 497-502.
- Χριστόπουλος Δημήτρης, 2002, *Η ετερότητα ως σχέση εξουσίας. Όψεις της ελληνικής, βαλκανικής και ευρωπαϊκής εμπειρίας*, Αθήνα.
- Appadurai A., 1995, *The Production of Locality*, στο: Fardon R. (εκδ.), *Counterworks. Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*, London 204-225.
- Appadurai A., 1996, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*, Minnesota.

- Appadurai A., 2008, Συνέντευξη: *Airoots Interviews Arjun Appadurai, September 21, 2008* στο: <http://www.airoots.org/2008/09/airoots-interviews-arjun-appadurai/>
- Barth Fr., ¹1969, Introduction, στο: Barth Fr. (εκδ.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Bergen-Oslo-London, 9-38.
- Clayer N., 2007, *Aux origines du nationalisme albanais. La naissance d' une nation majoritairement musulmane en Europe*, Paris.
- Confino A. – Skaria A., 2002, The Local Life of Nationhood, *National Identities* 4/1, 7-24.
- Gupta A. – Ferguson J., 1997, *Anthropological Locations. Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, Berkley-Los Angeles.
- Hardt M – Negri A., 2000, *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Herzfeld M., 1982, *Ours Once More. Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*, Austin.
- Lovell N., 1998, Introduction, στο: Lovell N. (εκδ.) *Locality and Belonging*, London, 1-24.
- Low S. – Lawrence-Zúñiga D., 2003, Embodied Spaces – Locating Culture, στο: Low S. – Lawrence-Zúñiga D. (εκδ.), *The anthropology of space and place: locating culture*, Malden-Oxford-Carlton.
- Morley D., 2000, *Home Territories. Media, mobility and identity*, London-New York.
- Motyl A., 2010, The social construction of social construction: implications for theories of nationalism and identity formation, *Nationalities Papers* 38/1, 59-71.
- Peckham R.S., 2001, *National Histories, Natural States. Nationalism and the Politics of Place in Greece*, London – New York.
- Peleikis A., 2001, Shifting Identities, Reconstructing Boundaries. The Case of a Multi-Confessional Locality in Post-War Lebanon, *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series 41/3, 400-429.
- Robbins K., 2009, The “British Space”: World-Empire-Continent-Nation-Region-Locality: A Historiographical Problem, *History Compass* 7/1, 66-94.