ΚΑΜΠΟΣ

Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek

No. 15 2007

ISSN: 1356-5109

Published by
The Modern Greek Section
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge
CB3 9DA
United Kingdom
e-mail: moderngreek@mml.cam.ac.uk
http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/publications/kambos.html

Price per issue: £12.00
All correspondence should be sent to the above address.

Edited by David Holton and Notis Toufexis
Design by Mark Owen

Cover illustration: from the *Grammar* of Gregorios Sarafis, published at Kydonies (Ayvalik) in 1820 (see A. Koumarianou, L. Droulia & E. Layton, *Το Ελληνικό Βιβλίο 1476-1830.* Athens 1986, Plate 239)

Contents

Defining the Diaspora: the case of the Greeks
Richard Clogg 1

The Parthenon in poetry
Liana Giannakopoulou 23

Modern Greek in the 11th century – or what else should we call it?
Michael Jeffreys 61

Recording the history of the "Cretan War" (1645-1669): an overview
Tassos A. Kaplanis 91

Two surveys of Modern Greek literature: Stephanos Kanelos (1822) and Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos (1826)
Marc Lauxtermann 125

"A faint sweetness in the never-ending afternoon"? Reflections on Cavafy and the Greek epigram
David Ricks 149

The year 2006-7 at Cambridge 171

About the contributors 177

Defining the Diaspora: the case of the Greeks*

Richard Clogg
St Antony's College, Oxford

I am currently engaged in writing a large-scale history, not of Greece, but of the Greeks in modern times. Should I survive to complete such a large project, this will seek to integrate four essential strands in the history of Greek people since the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. These are, firstly, the history of the *Tourkokratia*, the nearly four centuries of Ottoman rule over the Greek lands between the end of the Byzantine Empire and the creation of an independent Greek state in 1830. The second strand is the emergence of the independent state in the 19th century and the gradual expansion of its borders until they reached their present extent. We sometimes tend to forget how recently these boundaries were finally established, with the incorporation of the Dodecanese islands, since 1912 under Italian rule, into the Greek state as recently as 1947. We should remember, too, that Konstantinos Karamanlis, president of Greece until 1995, was born in 1907, in Kupköy, a small village near Serres, a citizen of the Ottoman Empire. Thirdly, there is the history of what in Greece is termed *I kath' imas Anatoli*. This an expression that is not easy to translate. Literally, of course, it means Our East, the East according to us, or the East as we see it. But in English it has to be translated by some such expression as "the Greek East". *I kath' imas Anatoli* refers to the great Greek presence in the Balkans, the Near and Middle East and Southern Russia, that in many cases dated back to Byzantine or classical times. *I kath' imas Anatoli* survived

* This paper is an amended version of my introductory chapter in Richard Clogg (ed.), *The Greek Diaspora in the twentieth century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan 1999).

the emergence of the independent state and continued to exist until the catastrophic defeat of the Greek armies in Asia Minor in 1922. Fourthly, there is the history of the diaspora proper, comprised of migration outwith the bounds of the Greek state and of the Greek East.

Like the Jews and Armenians, the Greeks are pre-eminently a diaspora people, although the last fifteen years or so have seen Greece cease to be a country that exports emigrants and become a country of immigration. The recent establishment of a Polish language school on the island of Santorini is a small straw in the wind. Not so long ago there was a curious reminder of the rather obvious fact that Greece has, historically, exported a sizeable proportion of its population. In April 1991, the cruiser *Spiro*, Argentina's contribution to the first Gulf War, paid a courtesy visit to Piraeus. There was naturally a certain puzzlement in Greece as to how an Argentinian ship came to be bearing a seemingly Greek name. There was considerable interest when it became known that the ship was en route for the island of Hydra, the birthplace of Spyros Petrou, one of the great heroes of the Argentine navy. Born in 1784, Petrou had migrated to Argentina where he had come to command an Argentinian ship in the war of independence against Spain. In 1814, rather than submit to the Spanish, Petrou had preferred to blow himself up with his ship. If Petrou had thus became enough of a national hero, whose exploits are familiar to every Argentinian school child, for one of the most important ships in the Argentinian navy to be named after him, very few Greeks had been aware of his existence. Moreover, Petrou was not the only Greek to have distinguished himself in the service of the Argentinian military. When, at the end of the Falklands/Malvinas War, General Galtieri, the leader of the Argentinian junta, was deposed, he was replaced by General Nikolaidis, who had actually been born in Greece and who had an aunt still living in Kavala.

With anecdotes of this kind, however, I am in danger of falling into what appears to be a major hazard of writing about diasporas, namely the stringing together of lists of those of Greek,

Jewish, Armenian or whatever ethnic origin who have risen to prominence (or notoriety as the case may be) in their adopted countries, a game whose doubtful pleasures are increased if the individuals in question have changed their names so as to be less visibly "foreign" in the host societies. The names, for instance, of the Andrews sisters (Patti, Maxine and LaVerne), whose morale-boosting, all-American songs such as "Boogie Woogie Bugle Boy" made them one of the most popular vocal groups during the Second World War, give no clue to the fact that they were second-generation Greek Americans. This process of name-changing has certainly happened with a sizeable number of Greeks in the United States. One example is George Tenet, whose name has clearly been changed from the original Greek. He was born to Greek immigrant parents and is the erstwhile director of the CIA. His mother is of Northern Epirot origin and when he was appointed to head the CIA in 1997 there were apparently rumours circulating in the Northern Epirot lobby in the US that it would not be long before Northern Epirus was united with Greece.

Some years ago I taught in a summer school organised at Anatolia College in Thessaloniki on behalf of AHEPA (The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association), the largest Greek community organisation in the US. All those attending were of Greek descent and I had the unusual task of seeking to reinforce their sense of ethnic identity. I remember in particular twins from Georgia, named Campbell. I naturally asked them how, given their Greek background, they came to have the name Campbell. They told me that one of their forebears had migrated to the United States from the Mani in the southern Peloponnese and, seeing a resemblance between the clan systems of the Mani and of Scotland, had adopted the name of the largest Scottish clan, on the ground that his own clan had been the most powerful in the Mani. I now realise, indeed, that the twins are likely to have been related to the two Campbells, James and George, who, along with other prominent members of the Greek-American community, founded AHEPA in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1922.

In gathering material for my large-scale history of the Greek people in modern times, which will include the Greeks of the diaspora, I have been struck by the relative paucity of writing about diasporas in general and about the Greek diaspora in particular, although there are encouraging indications of a growing interest in the subject. Given the centrality of *xeniteia*, another difficult word to translate but roughly meaning sojourning in foreign parts, with overtones of nostalgia for the homeland, in the historical experience of the Greek people in modern times, it is noteworthy how relatively little has been written on the Greek diaspora as a whole. There are some notable exceptions, e.g. Theodore Saloutos, and Charles Moskos on Greeks in the United States.[1] Reference should also be made to the pioneering studies of Helen Zeese Papanikolas on the Greeks of her native Utah. Greek railroad workers and miners (and, indeed, some sheepmen) managed during the early decades of the present century to reconstruct in Utah a remarkable imitation of life in the old country. Helen Papanikolas managed, virtually single-handedly, to rescue these for the most part anonymous early migrants to the intermountain West from oblivion. Recently attention has been paid to the substantial Greek communities of South America, including that of Argentina, of which Aristotle Onassis, an archetypal diaspora figure, remained a citizen until his death.[2]

---

[1] See now also Ioanna Laliotou, *Transatlantic subjects: acts of migration and cultures of transnationalism between Greece and America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2004).

[2] See, for instance, Maria Damilakou, *Έλληνες μετανάστες στην Αργεντινή (1900-1970): διαδικασίες συγκρότησης και μετασχηματισμοί μιας μεταναστευτικής κοινότητας* (Athens: Istoriko Archeio 2004). Patrick Leigh Fermor records meeting a scattering of Greeks in Central America and the Caribbean. These included three barmen in Panama City who originated from Karlovasi in Samos; a businessman in Haiti; and a "lonely innkeeper in Cordova, on the shores of Lake Nicaragua opposite the volcano of Momotombo"; see *Roumeli: travels in Northern Greece* (New York 1966), p. 96.

There have been relatively few attempts to consider the history of the Greek diaspora as a whole.[3] Whereas in Israel the study of the Jewish diaspora is a well-established academic discipline and there are entire institutes devoted to the subject, there is no such academic tradition in Greece, nor is there a single institute devoted solely to the study of the Greek diaspora. There is much fascinating material on the diaspora scattered through libraries and archives in Greece but it would be good to see the establishment of an institute or library whose primary task it would be to collect material relating to the diaspora worldwide. Merely to collect copies of the numerous publications of the various diaspora communities would be to perform a service of immense value to present and future generations of historians. All too often newspapers and periodicals that have frequently been run on a shoestring, close down on the death or retirement of their editors. Whole runs of back issues, in some cases the only complete sets, are destroyed.

Where could one now hope to find, for instance, a complete run of the periodical *Νέα Ζωή*, published by Menelaos Antoniadis in Elisabethville in the Belgian Congo during the 1940s and 1950s? There are, however, exceptions to this general lack of interest, among them Manos Haritatos's comprehensive collection of material relating to the Greeks of Egypt in the Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο (ΕΛΙΑ) in Athens. The very rich and well-ordered collection of material on the Greeks in the United States assembled by Theodore Saloutos and now held in the Immigration History Research Center of the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis is a shining example of what can be done to salvage the collective historical memory of the Greeks of the diaspora. A hopeful portent of an interest by the Greek state in the history of the diaspora was the organisation of an exhibition by the Greek Parliament in December 2006. I was unable to visit

[3] An exception is the very useful synthesis of Ioannis Hassiotis, *Επισκόπηση της ιστορίας της νεοελληνικής διασποράς* (Thessaloniki 1993). An older study is Mikhail Dendias, *Αι ελληνικαί παροικίαι ανά τον κόσμον* (Athens 1919).

this but, judging by the splendid catalogue, *Οι Έλληνες στη Διασπορά 15ος-21ος αι.*, it was a very useful attempt to present an overall picture of the diaspora. The extensive bibliography appended to the catalogue gives an insight into the richness of the subject. Two articles, in particular, caught my attention. These were about Karpathian masons in Sudan and Morocco.[4]

Not only does there appear to be a paucity of writing about diasporas as such, and the Greek diaspora in particular, but, until recently, relatively little appears to have been written about diasporas on a comparative basis. One of the pioneering such studies, published in 1976, is John Armstrong's stimulating article on "Mobilized and proletarian diasporas", which seeks to construct a typology of diasporas. He makes a basic distinction between what he terms "proletarian" and "mobilized" diasporas.[5]

Quite where the Greeks would fit into Armstrong's schema is not immediately clear. Greek miners and railroad workers in Utah at the turn of the last century and Greek *Gastarbeiter* in the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1960s, 70s and 80s clearly form part of a proletarian diaspora. On the other hand, the prosperous Greeks (and Cypriots) of, say, the Congo in the 1950s or the Greek shipowners of London clearly constitute part of a mobilised diaspora. Moreover, individual diaspora communities could be highly stratified. The tobacco workers in Egypt clearly formed part of a proletarian diaspora, while the great mercantile grandees such as the Benachis, the Zervoudachis, the Salvagos etc. clearly formed part of a mobilised diaspora.

One of the most interesting recent analyses of the diaspora phenomenon is Robin Cohen's *Global Diasporas*, published in 1997. One point that he makes is the negative connotation that the term diaspora has for many diaspora peoples. For the Jews, for

---

[4] E. Georgitsoyanni, "Greek masons in Africa: the case of the Karpathian masons of Sudan", *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 29 (2003) 113-27; "Greek masons in Africa: the case of the Karpathian masons in Morocco", *Journal of Oriental and African Studies* 14 (2005) 111-20.

[5] *American Political Science Review* 70 (1976) 393- 408.

instance, it was the Babylonian captivity, the pogroms in 19th-century Russia and the holocaust during the Second World War that gave rise to their diaspora; for Africans the diaspora experience is overshadowed by slavery; for the Irish, the Great Famine of the 1840s was the principal impetus behind the large-scale migration from Ireland in the 19th century; for Armenians it was genocide that was one of the principal factors that led to the modern diaspora of the Armenian people. Such is not, however, the case with the Greek diaspora. The Asia Minor "catastrophe" of 1922 was certainly a disaster of immense proportions but it followed rather than preceded the great migratory wave that lasted from 1890 to the Balkan wars of 1912-1913. Refugees from Asia Minor certainly joined existing diaspora communities, in Egypt for instance. The main impulse behind Greek emigration, however, was not disaster or persecution in the homeland but poverty, exacerbated by the effective bankruptcy of the Greek state in 1893. While poverty is certainly a dispiriting and miserable experience, it is not usually a life-threatening one. Like Armstrong, Cohen proposes a typology of diasporas. For him they fall into five basic categories: victim (a category into which Jews and Armenians would fall), labour, trade, imperial and cultural diasporas. Cohen does not have much to say about the Greek diaspora but clearly, in his categorization, Greek migrants would form part of trading and labour diasporas.

How then should the Greek diaspora in modern times be defined? The question is a rather more complex one than appears at first sight. Clearly the Greek state as it is presently constituted must be removed from the equation. The Greek state has never included more than a proportion of the Greeks of the Near East. The original state that came into existence in 1830 had a population of some three quarters of a million, roughly a third of the two million or so Greek inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire at the time of the Greek War of Independence. For the first century of its independent existence the foreign policy, and, indeed, much of the domestic politics, of the new state was critically determined by the *Megali Idea*, or "Great Idea", the elusive vision of incorporating

all areas of compact Greek settlement in the Near East within the bounds of a single state, with its capital in Constantinople.

Although the term *Megali Idea* was explicitly used for the first time by the Vlach politician Ioannis Kolettis in a famous speech to the Constituent Assembly in Athens in 1844, the concept long antedated Kolettis's formulation. Throughout the period during which the *Megali Idea* was the dominant ideology of the Greek state there was a huge disparity between Greece's irredentist, expansionist ambitions and the physical means at the country's disposal. It is difficult from the perspective of the 21st century to credit the fact that Greece in the 19th century saw herself as the rival of Russia in seeking to establish hegemony over the Christian East. As that acute observer of late 19th and early 20th century Greece, William Miller, once observed, Greece had the appetites of a Russia but the resources of a Switzerland.[6]

There is a tendency on the part of some Greek historians to refer to the Ottoman Greeks, the Greeks who remained under Ottoman rule *after* the emergence of the independent Greek state, rather loosely as Greeks of the diaspora. But strictly speaking the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire did not form part of the diaspora. Apart from the Greek populations that were eventually to be incorporated into the Greek state, there were four main population clusters in the Ottoman Empire. These were the Greeks of the capital, Constantinople and its hinterland, including the sea of Marmara; those of western Asia Minor; those of Cappadocia (many of them Turkish-speaking); and those of Pontos, on the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea. Although indeed dispersed, these populations did not form part of a diaspora in the sense that they had arisen as a result of migration, voluntary or imposed. In all these areas, and particularly in Pontos, there was a continuous history of Greek settlement going back to Byzantine and, indeed, in some cases, to classical times.

The Greek-inhabited areas of the vast Orthodox commonwealth, or to use that wonderfully evocative Greek phrase, *I kath'*

---

[6] *Greek life in town and country* (London 1905), p. 44.

imas Anatoli, a world which disintegrated, along with the project of the *Megali Idea*, in the debacle in Asia Minor in 1922, do not in my view constitute a part of the modern Greek diaspora. For this reason I would not include within the diaspora the now pitifully small Greek community in present day Turkey (in Istanbul and, even more vestigially, on the islands of Imvros and Tenedos), perhaps amounting to two thousand or so. Nor would I include the much larger Greek minority in southern Albania. Together with the Greeks of Cyprus, these are the last remnants of the Greek East to remain outside the borders of the Greek state.

In my view the diaspora proper is constituted by migration outwith the bounds of the Greek state and of *I kath' imas Anatoli*, the Greek East. This was a process that initially got under way on a small scale in the 16th century but which accelerated markedly during the course of the 18th century. It was during this century that Greek mercantile *paroikies* (literally, colonies) were established throughout the Mediterranean and the Balkan peninsula and, indeed, as we shall see, further afield.

Wherever they were active, these merchants established their mercantile *kompanies* (companies) and *paroikies* and, during the 18th century, *xeniteia*, or sojourning in foreign parts, became so ingrained a feature of life in the Greek world that an Epirot folk song contained the complaint:

> Accursed be Wallachia
> Accursed be dark Jassy
> Whither go our husbands
> May the Danube dry up
> Because it lets them cross over.[7]

Itinerant Epirot workers were so common in Russia in the 18th and 19th centuries that Greeks were apparently referred to as *Pindoi* or *Pindioi*, people of the Pindos mountains which divide mainland Greece.

---

[7] Victor Papacostea, "Esquisse sur les rapports entre la Roumanie et l'Epire", *Balcania* 1 (1930) 230.

So close at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries were the ties between the Thessalian town of Ambelakia, famous for its spun red cotton which was widely exported to Central Europe, and the German-speaking world that a German traveller, J. L. S. Bartholdy, came across a small amateur theatre in the town in which plays such as Kotzebue's *Menschenhasse und Reue* were performed in German "wie in der ganzen übrigen cultivierten Welt",[8] while increased commercial contacts with the German-speaking lands even began to have a vestigial influence on the Greek spoken in Macedonia. Moreover, during the 18th century, Greek migration became ever more far-flung, prefiguring the present worldwide dispersion of Greek communities. It was in the mid-18th century that Greeks from Corsica, together with Italians, Corsicans and Minorcans, became caught up in Dr Andrew Turnbull's ill-fated attempt to establish a colony at New Smyrna in Florida.[9] Following the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, which brought to an end the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74, the Russian Empress Catherine the Great encouraged Greek migration from the Peloponnese and the islands of the Aegean to help populate her newly acquired territories on the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. Greeks came to develop a dominant position in the commerce of towns such as Odessa, Taganrog and Mariupol.

One of the most interesting of these far-flung Greek communities was that established towards the end of the 18th century in India by Greeks from Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, and more particularly from Philippoupolis (now Plovdiv in Bulgaria) and Adrianoupolis (now Edirne in Turkey). The first Greek community came into being in Calcutta in ca. 1770-75, and was followed a few years later by a community in Dacca. Both communities prospered so that by 1821 there were some 120 Greek families established in Calcutta, Dacca and the interior. Some of their Indian servants were Greek-speaking. The essential

---

[8] *Bruchstücke zur nähern Kenntniss des heutigen Griechenlands...* (Berlin 1805), p. 169.

[9] E. P. Panagopoulos, *New Smyrna: an eighteenth century Greek Odyssey* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press 1966).

core of any Greek mercantile *paroikia* was a church, and the Greeks of India were from the outset anxious to build a church and to attract a priest, who came under the jurisdiction of the monastery of Mount Sinai. A site was acquired in 1774 and the Greek church in Calcutta was duly completed in 1780. An unusual problem facing the community was the intense humidity of Calcutta and the merchants requested that the Cretan painter of icons for the church be asked whether he knew some means of preventing damage to the icons caused by humidity.

An early concern of this community, as it was to be of Greek communities wherever and whenever they were established, was the question of mixed marriages between members of the Greek community and the indigenous inhabitants. This matter was settled in 1782 when the Archbishop of Mount Sinai gave permission for Greeks to contract mixed marriages, provided that the children were baptised into the Orthodox faith. A major problem facing the Greek *paroikies* of Calcutta and Dacca was the availability and quality of priests, a recurring problem in Greek communities as they developed worldwide.

Before a school could be established for this early Greek community in India, the wealthier families employed tutors, of whom Dimitrios Galanos, who originally trained as a priest in Patmos, was one. After six years as a tutor in Dacca, Galanos went to live in the holy city of Benares, "the Oxford of the East", where, from 1793 until his death in 1833, he devoted himself to the study and translation of Sanskrit texts, on which he became one of the leading authorities of his time. His translations into the *katharevousa* (literally "purifying") Greek that was the fashion at the time, and was readily intelligible to those with a classical education, were a principal conduit for knowledge of Hindu religious texts in the West when a number of them were published in the mid-19th century.[10] His presence in Benares was something of a mystery to the British authorities, who for a time regarded

[10] On Galanos, see Siegfried A. Schulz, "Demetrios Galanos (1760-1833): a Greek Indologist", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89 (1969) 339-56.

him with some suspicion as some kind of *praktoras*. As one contemporary British traveller, Reginald Heber wrote, so few Europeans "who can help it, reside in India, that it seems strange that any man should prefer it as a residence, without some stronger motive than a fondness for Sanscrit literature..."[11]

A perennial concern in communities of the diaspora has been the preservation of the language among the children of the first emigrant generations. It is interesting to note how early this became an issue. Konstantinos Koumas, writing in the early 1830s of the numerous Greek *paroikies* in central Europe, complained that "our young people are being harmed by the inexperience of their parents. Greeks should pass on to their children their language, and together with the language, their religion, which brings salvation and which employs the Greek language in church". Instead of this, he went on, "parents despise Greek and talk to their children in German. Young women are ashamed to appear as Greeks. A Greek woman who knows Greek speaks to another Greek woman arrogantly in German. Mothers speak to their children in German."[12]

Migration from the Greek lands before the war of independence and the establishment of mercantile *paroikies* were clearly factors of major significance in the emergence of the Greek national movement. Wealthy Greek merchants of the diaspora provided the material underpinnings of the pre-independence intellectual revival, while the *Philiki Etairia*, the secret revolutionary society that laid the groundwork of the Greek revolt, was, by no means coincidentally, founded in 1814 by three young Greeks from the Odessa *paroikia*. One of the most brilliant

---

[11] *Narrative of a journey through the Upper Provinces of India from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825* (London 1828), I, p. 329. A useful book on Greeks in India is Paul Byron Norris, *Ulysses in the Raj*, published in 1992 by the British Association for Cemeteries in South Asia.

[12] Konstantinos Koumas, *Ιστορίαι των ανθρωπίνων πράξεων* (Vienna 1832), Part XII, p. 552, cited in Athanasios Karathanassis, *L'Hellénisme en Transylvanie: l'activité culturelle, nationale et religieuse des compagnies commerciales helléniques de Sibiu et de Braşov aux XVIII-XIX siècles* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies 1989), p. 147.

polemicists of the national movement, the anonymous author of the *Elliniki Nomarkhia* of 1806, attributed the continued servitude of the Greeks to two principal factors: the "ignorant priesthood", of which he was a savage critic, and the absence abroad "of the best fellow citizens", by which he meant the Greek merchants that had established themselves outwith the Greek lands. He called on these voluntary emigres to return and to place their skills, knowledge, and, indeed, wealth at the service of their motherland. But he was severely critical of the two main groups that had established themselves abroad, the merchants and the students. The merchants, he believed, had become "de-Hellenised", a familiar complaint about subsequent generations of migrants, and had been transformed into "true enemies" who were worse than Greece's Ottoman tyrants. Once they had made money the merchants sank into "the mire of debauchery and wallow about like pigs until they die", perverted by the immorality characteristic of the foreigner and interested only in the price of cotton and of beans. Much the same strictures were directed at the students. These he accused of wasting their time in reading poems "of which there were more volumes in France and Italy than pumpkins in the Peloponnese" and of being interested only in girls and the theatre instead of studying subjects that would be beneficial to a newly self-aware Greece such as politics, law, military tactics and "sciences useful for our nation".[13]

Important though this early, pre-independence migration was in economic, cultural and political terms it was numerically relatively restricted in relation to the much larger migrations that got under way later. These occurred during the fifteen years or so before the Balkan Wars of 1912-13; in the aftermath of the Asia Minor "catastrophe" of 1922; and during the 1950s and 1960s. Together these great migrations laid the foundations of the present very large Greek communities in America, Canada, Australia, Germany and elsewhere.

---

[13] G. Valetas (ed.), Ανωνύμου του Έλληνος, *Ελληνική Νομαρχία* ("Italy" 1806, reprinted Athens 1957), pp. 150ff.

The war of independence itself gave rise to certain migratory patterns. The great massacre on Chios of 1822 resulted in considerable emigration from that island. Much of the Greek community in 19th-century England was of Chiot origin. The history of the Anglo-Chiots and of the rapid assimilation of a number of families, mainly of Chiot origin, such as the Rallis, the Pallis and the Vlasto families, to the English upper middle classes is a phenomenon not, to my knowledge, encountered in Greek communities elsewhere.[14] The mere sight of the grandiose Greek churches built in the 19th century in London (*Aghia Sophia*, Bayswater, 1877), Liverpool (*Aghios Nikolaos*, 1870) and Manchester (*O Evangelismos tis Theotokou*, 1861), the first two in a neo-Byzantine style, the last in a neo-Classical style, not to mention the Greek cemetery in West Norwood in London, is sufficient testimony to the prosperity of these important diaspora communities at the times these churches were built.

Such emigration as took place from the Greek kingdom until the 1890s tended to be to traditional centres of Greek commercial activity in the Ottoman Empire such as Smyrna and Constantinople and there was always a certain traffic to the established mercantile *paroikies*. A significant new destination for Greek migrants did, however, emerge in the 19th century, namely Egypt. There had always been a small Greek community in Egypt during the 16th and 17th centuries but Mohammed Ali, the ruler of Egypt, during the earlier part of the 19th century, gave strong encouragement to Greek migration, which received a further boost in the boom years for Egyptian cotton during the American Civil War of the 1860s, when the foundations of many Egyptian-Greek fortunes were made.

Another important migratory movement during the 19th century were the migrations that took place from the Pontos region on the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea to the Cau-

---

[14] See, for instance, the memoirs by A. A. Pallis, *Ξενητεμένοι Έλληνες: αυτοβιογραφικό χρονικό* (Athens: Aetos 1954) and Peter Calvocoressi, *Threading my way* (London: Duckworth 1994). Both authors had been to Eton.

casus and other areas of southern Russia. These population movements took place in the aftermath of the numerous wars between the Russian and Ottoman empires during the 19th and 20th centuries. One of the unexpected consequences of the period of *perestroika* and *glasnost* in the last years of the Soviet Union was the re-emergence of a sizeable but hitherto submerged ethnic Greek population, the descendants for the most part of these 19th- and early 20th-century migrants.

During the early years of Bolshevik rule, the Greeks enjoyed a considerable degree of cultural autonomy, with their own schools, newspapers and books (published in the Pontic Greek dialect and using a twenty instead of twenty-four letter alphabet) and even a Greek-language theatre in Sukhum, the capital of Abkhazia. In the late 1930s, however, the Greeks were among the nationalities that fell victim to Stalin's paranoia as a "disloyal" nation. Schools and cultural institutions were closed and book production ceased. In 1949 the Greek populations were deported, in conditions of appalling hardship, to a bleak exile in Central Asia.

Only after the death of Stalin in 1953 were they for the most part permitted to return, although their confiscated properties were often not reinstated. It is difficult to estimate the present size of the Greek population of the former Soviet Union. Preliminary data from the all-Union census of January 1989, the last ever census to be made in the Soviet Union, gives a figure of 356,000. There are, of course, probably many more of Greek, or partial Greek, origin than those who admit to this ethnicity in the census returns. In recent years considerable numbers of these Russian Greeks of Pontic origin, the Rosso-Pontioi, have settled in Greece.

In the 1890s, of course, as a result of economic crisis and bankruptcy in the kingdom of Greece, the great wave of emigration to the United States that was to last until the outbreak of the First World War developed. One of the problems in assessing the numbers of Greek migrants to the US is that the relevant US statistics do not make it possible to isolate the numbers of Ottoman Greeks who migrated to the New World. During the 1920s and 1930s, with the introduction of the quota

system, Greek migration to the United States virtually dried up. But there was some limited migration to South America, to Africa and to Australia during this period. The third migratory wave, after the period 1890-1912 and the early 1920s, is that of the 1950s and 1960s, principally to Australia and Canada but, after the lifting of quota restrictions in the mid-1960s, once again to the United States.

Any attempt to construct an overall estimate of the size of the Greek diaspora must necessarily be a tentative undertaking. Wildly exaggerated statistics are frequently bandied about. A bulletin of the *Athens News Agency* (4 September 1991) spoke of a Greek community in Australia almost 600,000 strong, a considerable exaggeration. I am reminded of Charles Moskos's observation when some years ago he was showing me some of the sights of Greek Chicago, which attracted many of the early Greek settlers to the United States. He made the wise observation that the safest way to calculate the size of a given Greek community is to take the lowest estimate of one of its members and then divide this in half. But even applying this formula still leaves some very substantial communities.

Not so long ago a BBC television current affairs programme, for instance, referred to the "hundreds of thousands" of Greek Cypriots living in North London. The Cypriot community in Britain is certainly large but is on nothing like this scale. Mention of the Greek Cypriots raises the question of whether they are deemed to constitute part of the *omogeneia*, whether they can truly be considered "kith and kin". In the rhetoric of politicians in both Greece and Cyprus they are clearly so regarded. The reality, however, is somewhat different. In the 1990s, the weirdly named "Hellenic Observatory" (clearly scarcely an *asteroskopeio* [astronomical observatory] nor a *paratiritirio*, a [military] observation post) was set up at the London School of Economics in connection with the establishment of the Venizelos Chair of Contemporary Greek Studies. The associated publicity material stated that one of the objectives of the "Hellenic Observatory" is to develop close links with the "wider *Greek* [my italics]

community" in London, estimated to number some 16,000 strong. But this statistic ignores the presence in London of some 100,000 Greek-speaking Cypriots. For all the public rhetoric about the common fate of Hellenism, it is clear that many Greeks do not in their heart of hearts deem the Greek Cypriots to be part of the *omogeneia*, although such attitudes, for obvious reasons, are seldom explicitly articulated.

Clearly much the largest of the diaspora communities is that of the United States, followed by Australia, the republics of the former Soviet Union, Canada, South Africa (where the community, including Greek Cypriots, between 1965 and 1975 numbered some 170,000), Germany, Argentina and Brazil. Some diaspora communities are now much reduced in size compared with their heyday. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Greeks, some 100,000 strong, were the largest of the several foreign communities of Egypt. By the 1970s they numbered a few thousand at most. The decline in the size of the Egyptian Greek community was somewhat compensated for by the emergence of a substantial (20-30,000 strong) Greek community in the oil-rich states of the Persian Gulf, the Arabian peninsula, Iraq and Libya. Unlike the established Greek community in Egypt, these were for the most part *Gastarbeiter*, working with limited contracts. The Belgian Congo had a flourishing Greek community of some 20,000 in the 1960s (some of them living in a town called Kalamata[15]) but this is now very much reduced, as is that of Morocco, now down to a few hundred from a peak of 10,000 in the 1930s. We should not forget the very large Greek migration to Western Europe and,

---

[15] One occasionally comes across in second-hand bookshops a book with the title *The Road to Kalamata*. This is not, as one might imagine, a book about the Peloponnese but is the memoir by "Mad Mike" Hoare about his experiences as a mercenary in the Congo (Zaire). The full title is *The road to Kalamata: a Congo mercenary's personal memoir* (London: Cooper 1989). By contrast, Leonard Marsland Gander's *Long road to Leros* (London: MacDonald 1945) does have a concluding section about the fiasco of the attempt to capture and hold Cos, Leros and Samos in the autumn of 1943. Churchill, who inspired the campaign, unfairly dubbed "Jumbo" Wilson, the commander-in-chief in the Middle East, as the "Wizard of Cos".

more particularly, to West Germany that took place in the 1950s and 1960s, when Greeks in their tens of thousands became *Gastarbeiter*.

Another fascinating chapter in the saga of Greek migration and of the development of the modern Greek diaspora is the story of the communist refugees who fled to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in the aftermath of the 1946-49 civil war. A sizeable proportion of these ended up in Tashkent in Uzbekistan and strenuous, and largely successful, efforts were made to retain a sense of Greek identity on the part of the children who were born in exile. The case of the civil war exiles in the Eastern bloc countries has a particular interest, for a sense of ethnic identity had to be maintained in a secular context, without the benefit of the churches that were established elsewhere in the diaspora and which were an important means for the preservation of religion, language and culture.

Many of the communist exiles have now returned to Greece and I much hope that someone will attempt a proper study of this particular episode in the history of Greek emigration, voluntary and enforced, while those involved are still alive to speak of their frequently harrowing experiences. Research is needed into the educational and cultural mechanisms by which a sense of Greek identity was sustained in the children of the refugee generation and in the twenty-five thousand or so children evacuated in 1948 towards the end of the civil war from areas controlled by the communist Democratic Army, for their own protection and with the consent of their parents in the communist view, as part of a new *paidomazoma*, or janissary levy, in the view of the Greek government and nationalists.

A few years ago I attended a most interesting conference in Hungary devoted to the history of this second *paidomazoma*. It was held at Fehérvarcsurgo in a splendid mansion that had been confiscated from the aristocratic Karolyi family (and now restored) by the post-war communist government to house some of the evacuated children, who were widely dispersed throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. They were housed and

educated in *paidikoi stathmoi* or "children's stations", of which there were three in Albania, seventeen in Bulgaria, ten in Hungary, nine in Romania, three in Poland, one in East Germany, and fifteen in Yugoslavia.

Although the occasion was an academic conference, a number of the evacuees who had been housed at Fehérvarcsurgo in the late 1940s and early 1950s returned after half a century for a reunion. It stands to reason that only those who had cause to be grateful for what had been done for them would have returned, but it was nonetheless moving to witness their genuine gratitude for the new life that had been opened up for them behind the Iron Curtain. There was one group of four who were born in a Vlach-speaking village near the Albanian border. It was only when they were taken to Hungary that they learned Greek. So much for the argument that the purpose of the *paidomazoma* was to de-Hellenize the Greek children and inculcate in them a sense of Slav-Macedonian identity. One of the alumni of Fehérvarcsurgo was Georgios Vassiliou, who was subsequently to become a millionaire and President of the Republic of Cyprus in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The children were taken from poor, often desperately so, villages, with very limited educational opportunities. In the Eastern bloc, they achieved in many cases a higher standard of education than they would have received had they remained in Greece. A significant number were to follow professional careers. The physical conditions in which the children were held were often good. For, for propaganda reasons if no other, the communist authorities were determined to demonstrate that the conditions at the homes were a marked improvement over those that they had left behind in a "monarcho-fascist" Greece, in which the "imperialist" Americans pulled the strings.

From the 1950s onwards some of the children were repatriated to Greece and re-united with their parents. But not all those who returned were happy with what they met with in the old country. Some of them had become accustomed to classical music, of which there was a total absence in their home villages.

The girls and young women did not relish being obliged to wear headscarves and give up wearing trousers and the (relatively) fashionable clothes to which they had become accustomed in the Eastern bloc. Nor were they enamoured of the idea of arranged marriages with villagers of a lower educational level. By the 1980s, however, when there was a renewed wave of repatriations, the situation was reversed. Rural Greece, thanks in part to EU subsidies, was now prosperous. Peasant farmers took to driving BMWs and installed the latest labour-saving devices in their homes. Their standard of living was now markedly higher than that prevailing behind the Iron Curtain. Removing young children from their parents, for whatever motives, was indeed a harsh measure. Nonetheless, for a fair proportion of the evacuees their life in the Eastern bloc opened up new opportunities which would have been denied them had they remained in Greece.

Finally, I should like to say a few words about a question of definition central to the study not only of the Greek diaspora but of all diasporas. How does one define a Greek, particularly a third, fourth or even fifth generation Greek of the diaspora? This is a problem that is assuming some urgency now that we witness the phenomenon of Greeks from the former Soviet Union and Northern Epirus migrating to Greece, the only migratory inflow of ethnic Greeks as opposed to foreign workers of any significance since the Exchange of Populations in the 1920s, which, in any case, as it was involuntary, cannot properly be described as a migration.

While doing some research on the Greeks of Utah in Salt Lake City in the summer of 1991, with the invaluable help of Helen Papanikolas, I learned of the existence of a "Hellenic Latter-Day Saint [i.e. Mormon] Society", formed in the late 1950s to bring together what were described as the many Mormons of Greek ancestry in Utah and to work for the day "when the Greek people will turn to the Restored Gospel in greater quantity". The early Greek migrants to Utah were almost exclusively male and tended to marry local girls, many of whom in Utah were of course Mormons. At meetings of this group, the first verse of the Greek

national anthem was sung in Greek by those who knew it and one verse of the Star Spangled Banner was sung by all. It was stressed that it was important when preaching the Gospel to non-L(atter) D(ay) S(aint) Greeks that "we point out our firm intention of preserving our Greek identity, our Greek names, and our characteristics of Hellenic origin". Certainly, the Mormon Greeks appear to have remained on friendly terms with the local Orthodox community.[16]

My question is: to what extent can someone who has lost both his/her language and religion in any meaningful sense be described as Greek? Is a self-perception of being Greek such as is manifested by Mormons of Greek descent in Utah enough? Or are there any objective criteria of Greekness? I might frivolously answer that, until the early 1990s, there was one clear criterion. Ethnic Greeks, whether citizens of Greeks or members of the worldwide Greek diaspora, were not required to pay, at the behest of Melina Mercouri, the larger-than-life Minister of Culture, to get into museums and archaeological sites in Greece. But a European Community directive requiring an end to this discriminatory policy, which benefited, besides Greeks, Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese and others of broadly "Mediterranean" appearance, even Turks, provided they had the sense to keep their mouths shut when they approached the ticket kiosk, when they would be waved through, has done away with this "objective" criterion! Now everyone, whether Greek or non-Greek, has to pay.

A useful definition of who is a Greek is that given by Eleftherios Venizelos when advancing Greek territorial claims at the Versailles Peace Conference in the aftermath of the First World War. "A Greek", he declared, "is a person who wants to be Greek, feels he is a Greek, and says he is a Greek."[17] Venizelos's

---

[16] See Harry George Greaves [Theokharis Georgios Grivas] and Sarah S. Greaves, *Hellenic Latter-Day Saints.* I. A Summary of the Activities of the Hellenic Latter-Day Saint Society (1959-1965) (mimeographed ms compiled Salt Lake City, 1964-67, Marriott Library, University of Utah).

[17] Recorded in the Saint Photios [Greek Orthodox] National Shrine at Saint Augustine in Florida. This is constructed on the site of the house

pithy formulation was a distillation of the official definition advanced by the Greek delegation at the Versailles Peace Conference, which was of course led by the Cretan statesman. This reads as follows:

> the condition, which the Greek government, and with it the whole of Hellenism, put forward as the basis of nationality [...] is [...] national consciousness. Religion, race, language, cannot be considered as certain indicators of nationality. The sole unmistakable criterion is ethnic consciousness, that is to say the expressed wish of people as they determine their fate and decide to what national family they wish to belong.[18]

The debate as to what precisely it is that defines the ethnicity of a Greek or, for that matter, a Jew, an Armenian or, indeed, a Scot, for the Scots are very much a diaspora people, is an endless one that falls beyond the scope of this paper. May I conclude, however, by making a plea for the integration of the study of the Greek diaspora with the study of the Greek state? The history of the Greek people, irrespective of the way in which national boundaries have been drawn, should be seen as part of a seamless entity. *Xeniteia*, sojourning in foreign parts, the diaspora experience, call it what you will, has been so central to the history of the Greek people in modern times that it merits much greater attention than we historians have so far chosen to give it.

---

where the bedraggled Greek remnants of the ill-fated New Smyrna colony gathered for Orthodox worship following its collapse.

[18] This passage is taken from a memorandum submitted to the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference, *Observations sur la réponse bulgare au sujet des questions territoriales* (Paris 1919), cited in Konstantinos Svolopoulos, "Εθνικισμός και φιλελευθερισμός στην Ελλάδα και η «Μεγάλη Ιδέα»", in: *Φιλελευθερισμός στην Ελλάδα: φιλελεύθερη θεωρία και πρακτική στην πολιτική και στην κοινωνία της Ελλάδας* (Athens 1991), p. 85.

The Parthenon in poetry

Liana Giannakopoulou
King's College London

> Ὅταν δέ τις ἵσταται παρὰ τὸ μνημεῖον τοῦ Λυσικράτους, λίαν παράδοξος εἶνε τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως ἡ ἄποψις· βλέπει τις τὴν κολοσσικὴν ἀνατολικὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ βράχου μετὰ τῆς βαθείας αὐτοῦ κοιλάνσεως καὶ οὐδὲν ἑλληνικὸν κτίσμα, οὐδένα τῶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ναῶν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸν περίβολον τῶν μεμελασμένων τειχῶν μετὰ τῶν ἐπάλξεων αὐτῶν οὕτως, ὥστε ἡ Ἀκρόπολις παρουσιάζεται αὐτόχρημα ὡς ἡ Rocca di Setine τῶν φραγκικῶν χρόνων, ὡς θέαμά τι μεσαιωνικόν.[1]

This awkward view of the Acropolis that one gets when standing by the choregic monument of Lysicrates, as described here by Gregorovius, has an uncanny truth about it, difficult if not impossible to imagine today. Indeed, if the above description refers to a specific viewpoint from which most of the buildings inside the Acropolis were not visible, it is also true that it could successfully represent, in a metaphorical sense, attitudes towards the Acropolis and its monuments – especially the Parthenon – from late antiquity until the 17th century. For if today the importance and symbolic value of the Parthenon are firmly established in Greece and abroad, things have not always been so. To be more specific, the monuments on the Acropolis are hardly ever mentioned at all after, roughly, the 2nd century AD, and even before that admiration should not always be taken for granted. For Plato, for example, the Periclean building programme was not only an extravagant waste of money on public display, but also an

[1] Ferdinandos Gregorovios, *Ἱστορία τῆς πόλεως τῶν Ἀθηνῶν κατὰ τοὺς μέσους αἰῶνας ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ μέχρι τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Τούρκων κατακτήσεως*, μετ. Σπ. Π. Λάμπρου, Τόμος Β΄ (Athens 1904), p. 521.

example of how art can be used to corrupt the citizenry.[2] Much later and in a different tone, Plutarch praises the monuments erected during Pericles's ambitious building programme in a way that brings to mind modern criticism.[3] Pausanias, on the other hand, although he visited the Parthenon, says surprisingly little about it except for the detailed passages he devotes to the famous statue of Athena in the temple. Pliny too only mentions that same colossal statue.

In any case, as the fame of Athens gradually wanes and seems to be totally forgotten after the 4th or 5th century AD, so too the Parthenon disappears from writers' view. Depictions of Athens during the Middle Ages bring to mind Gregorovius's description quoted above: it is represented as a Flemish city by Léon Gaucherel, or as a German fortress by Hartman Schedel, or again as a port with buildings that justify the title André Thevet gave to his engraving: *Imaginary View of Athens, 1575* – and the Parthenon or the other monuments on the Acropolis are nowhere to be seen.[4] It is well known of course that the temple did not fall into disuse. Prominent on the hill and still intact, it became the Christian church of God's Holy Wisdom around the 5th century, later known as Παναγία η Αθηνιώτισσα.[5] After the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders the Parthenon becomes the Latin Cathedral of Our Lady. Later still, two years after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans, the Sultan Mehmet II visits "the church of the mother of God", which he admires, and the ancient temple duly becomes a mosque a few years later, in 1460. We can

---

[2] Plato, *Gorgias*, 518-19.

[3] Plutarch, *Life of Pericles*, XIII.3.

[4] These imaginary depictions of Athens can be seen conveniently in Savas Kondaratos, "The Parthenon as cultural ideal", in: Panagiotis Tournikiotis (ed.), *The Parthenon and its impact in modern times* (Athens: Melissa 1994), pp. 31-3. (The volume is also published in Greek, by the same publisher, as *Ο Παρθενώνας και η ακτινοβολία του στα νεώτερα χρόνια.*)

[5] Although the name "Αγία Σοφία" is not certain, it may indicate a confusion with the original dedication of the Parthenon to the goddess of wisdom, Athena. See A. K. Orlandos and L. Vranousis, *Τα χαράγματα του Παρθενώνος* (Athens: Academy of Athens 1973), p. 31.

say then, that the history of the Parthenon up to the 18th century is a history of change and adaptation to new requirements, and the beholders, mostly unaware of its ancient fame, speak about the monument in terms of its function. And although the monument's transformations seem to conceal the original Parthenon from the eyes of its viewers – most of them at least – it is also true that it is those same transformations that have kept the monument alive.

The written sources that refer to the Parthenon follow the monument's changes of face. There are two passing references to the monument in the 5th century about the statue of Athena being in the Parthenon, and then, after almost eight centuries of silence, passing references only are found from the 12th century onwards. But here again, the Parthenon is no longer mentioned as such. References are made to it as "the church" with such variants as "the church of the Mother of God" (933 – Osios Loukas); "the church of the Virgin" (St Nikon of Sparta); "Μήτηρ Θεού η Αθηναΐς" (Metropolitan Nicholas Hagiotheodorites (1160-75); or "the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in which an ever burning oil lamp, never goes out", described by the Icelandic pilgrim Saewulf.[6] When the Parthenon is converted into a mosque, it becomes, accordingly, "the most magnificent mosque in the whole atlas of the globe. In civilized countries no sanctuary exists to equal it", in the words of the Turkish traveller Evlia Çelebi in 1667.[7] Indeed the first time that the Acropolis was ever named as such in the era after Antiquity was in the middle of the 15th century by Cyriac of Ancona, the first person to look upon Athens's ancient monuments with classical understanding – this is why Kenneth Setton calls him the founder of modern archaeology. The

---

[6] See Robert Ousterhout, "'Bestride the very peak of heaven': the Parthenon after Antiquity", in: Jenifer Neils (ed.), *The Parthenon from Antiquity to the present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005), pp. 293-329 (pp. 308-10).

[7] For a detailed list of written sources referring to the Parthenon under its various names and functions from the 5th century up to 1800, as well as the relevant extracts, see the important study by Anastasia Demetriades Norre, "Studies in the history of the Parthenon" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966), pp. 215-310.

name Acropolis was unknown in the Middle Ages and even though the Catalan Don Pedro IV of Aragon, in 1380, looked upon it as "the richest jewel in all the world" – furnishing the first piece of art criticism in the West – it was known in official Catalan documents as *Castell de Cetines* and by the Burgundians as the *Château de Sethynes*.[8] Indeed, up until the 17th century, the Acropolis was widely known as the Castle or the Fortress, and it is only after this date, when visitors to the city become more conscious of the historical and aesthetic value of the monument, that they begin to use its ancient name more systematically.

Such a surprising lack of interest in the archaeological or aesthetic value of the Parthenon is actually confirmed in poetry. As I stated above, the Parthenon is hardly ever mentioned in documents, let alone in literature, and the one poem to have reached us from the Middle Ages, which looks upon Athens through the eyes of a lover of antiquity, is provocative in its blatant lack of acknowledgement towards the monument. The author is Michael Choniates, who was metropolitan of Athens between 1182 and 1205. Choniates admired the city for its illustrious history and its glorious monuments and was hoping to find something of the long-lost glory of Athens and its citizens in the city and people of his time. It seems though that he quickly became disillusioned, and his letters and other writings testify to his disappointment that nothing has survived of the once world-famous city of art and knowledge. The poem he composed, "Verses of the most wise metropolitan of Athens, Kyr Michael Choniates, on the original reconstruction of the city of Athens", reflects these feelings:

Ἔρως Ἀθηνῶν τῶν πάλαι θρυλουμένων
ἔγραψε ταῦτα ταῖς σκιαῖς προσαθύρων
καὶ τοῦ πόθου τὸ θάλπον ὑπαναψύχων.

[8] As Setton explains, "both names are only the obvious corruption, in the typical Latin fashion of the day, of the Greek phrase εις τας Αθήνας, in which the sigma of the article has become the initial letter of the proper name". See Kenneth M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Medieval Academy of America 1948), p. 187.

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν οὐδαμοῦ φεῦ προσβλέπειν
αὐτὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἀοίδιμον πόλιν,
τὴν δυσαρίθμου καὶ μακραίωνος χρόνου
λήθης βυθοῖς κρύψαντος ἠφαντωμένην,
ἐρωτολήπτων ἀτεχνῶς πάσχω πάθος,
οἵ τὰς ἀληθεῖς τῶν ποθουμένων θέας
ἀμηχανοῦντες τῶν παρόντων προσβλέπειν
τὰς εἰκόνας ὁρῶντες αὐτῶν, ὡς λόγῳ,
παραμυθοῦνται τῶν ἐρώτων τὴν φλόγα. [...]
οἰκῶν Ἀθήνας οὐκ Ἀθήνας που βλέπω,
κόνιν δὲ λυπρὰν καὶ κενὴν μακαρίαν.
Ποῦ σοι τὰ σεμνά, τλημονεστάτη πόλις; [...]
Ὄλωλε σύμπαν τῶν Ἀθηνῶν τὸ κλέος·
γνώρισμα δ' αὐτῶν οὐδ' ἀμυδρόν τις ἴδοι. [...]

Love of Athens, of ancient legend,
depicted these things, with shadows playing
to cool the ardour of my longing.
For since, alas, was nowhere to be seen
in its own right that celebrated city
which Time long aged and incalculable
has hidden, in oblivion's depths obscured,
I suffer literally the passion of the lovestruck,
who, when the true sight of those they long for
among those present they find no way of seeing,
looking on their likeness, as in pretence
soothe the flame of their desires. [...]
dwelling in Athens, I see Athens nowhere,
only drab dust and empty blessedness.
Ill-fated city, where is your majesty? [...]
– perished, the whole renown of Athens,
not even a faint token of it may one see. [...]
(tr. Paul Magdalino)

The speaker, a thinly veiled Choniates, longs for the ancient city he can no longer see. His feelings are described as the frustration of the love-struck who, being unable to meet the actual object of his desire, finds consolation in the sight of its image. (It is said that this poem commemorated a painting of ancient Athens which Michael had commissioned.) Ancient Athens is gone for good and

nothing is left behind of its ancient glory. Time has turned everything to dust. Being unable to see anything of the ancient city of the Athenians, the speaker considers that he will be forgiven for raising a graphic/written idol of her.

The poem, probably the earliest of its kind at least in Greek, introduces some very important elements that will be detected in the poetry devoted to monuments many centuries later: the frustrated eroticism of the viewer, the realization that Greece's glorious past is now lost and beyond grasp, the wish to reproduce an image of this lost world, knowing at the same time the limitations of word or image to fully incarnate what is lost. But this dynamic interaction of love, longing and artistic creation has been discussed extensively.[9] What I want to underline here is the following paradox: how could Choniates complain in line 19 "ποῦ σοὶ τὰ σεμνά, τλημονεστάτη πόλις" or lament that: "Ὤλωλε σύμπαν τῶν Ἀθηνῶν τὸ κλέος· γνώρισμα δ' αὐτῶν οὐδ' ἀμυδρόν τις ἴδοι", doing so from inside the very monument that came to be at the centre of everybody's view and attention from the 18th century onwards? This is not to say that Choniates was not aware of the ancient monument, but his attitude helps us understand the shift of emphasis: the importance of the monument as a building that served its purpose and not as a work of art set apart from its context and cherished for its own sake. A comparison between this text and Renan's famous *Prière sur l'Acropole* (written 1876, published 1883 – based on his visit in 1865) vividly shows, I think, the stark contrast between the Parthenon of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages and the Parthenon after the 18th century:

> The impression which Athens made upon me was the strongest which I have ever felt. There is only one place in which perfection exists, and that is Athens, which outdid anything I had ever imagined. I had before my eyes the ideal of beauty crystal-

[9] For a detailed discussion of the poem see Christopher Livanos, "Michael Choniates, poet of love and knowledge", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 30 (2006) 103-14.

> lized in pentelic marble. Up until now I had thought that perfection was not to be found in this world. [...] The sight of the Acropolis was like a revelation of the Divine. [...] The whole world then appeared to me barbarian. [...] But here you had a whole people of aristocrats, a general public composed entirely of connoisseurs, a democracy which was capable of distinguishing shades of art so delicate that even our most refined judges can scarcely appreciate them. Here you had a public capable of understanding in what consisted the beauty of Propylaea and the superiority of the sculptures of the Parthenon. This revelation of true and simple grandeur went to my very soul.

These lines come from what is perhaps the single most famous text on the Acropolis and the Parthenon. It epitomises and crystallises perceptions of the Parthenon as expressed in the late 18th and the 19th centuries in travel writing, architectural treatises and aesthetic dissertations related to ancient Greek art. Indeed, it was generally agreed that the temple is ideal and divine in its beauty and in the skill involved in its sculptures. Everybody saw it as the product of a democratic city-state and the work of free people. The monument became intimately connected with the landscape in which it belongs, and it was seen to maintain the perfect balance between nature and art. Travellers particularly become more personally involved in their responses. Long lyrical passages often expressed sadness about the ruined state of the monument, a certain nostalgia for its lost glories and an emphasis on the power of imagination to reconstruct the ancient world.[10] But nothing of what happened after Plutarch and before Winckelmann could have prepared us for such worldwide acclaim in modern times. And the reasons that led to this change of heart are intimately connected to the changes in the relationship between Greece and the West after the 17th century and particularly in the reappraisal by educated people in the West of Athens as an important city and the

[10] See Fani Mallouchou-Tufano, "The Parthenon from Cyriacus of Ancona to Frédéric Boissonas: description, research and depiction", in Tournikiotis (ed.), *The Parthenon and its impact*, pp. 162-99.

recognition of its rich cultural heritage.[11] These reasons could be summarized as follows:

- A change in the political, social and cultural horizons of the West led to a new appreciation of ancient Greek values as opposed to the Roman cultural tradition. For its new face, Europe was searching for a new mirror to look into and Athens fulfilled this role.
- The rediscovery of Athens took place through its monuments: their description, measurement and aesthetic appreciation became the prime concern of important architects and painters such as James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, who undertook the pilgrimage to Athens for that purpose.
- Travellers who visit Athens are more and more aware of the history and value of the monuments they see and describe. Although accuracy of description and depiction is not achieved right away, there is an increasing emphasis on the observation of the monuments for their own sake.
- Winckelmann's aesthetic writings seal the way through which antiquities and Greek art in general are perceived and his approach to ancient art is detectable in all sorts of writing, from architectural treatises to literature.
- Last but not least, the symbolic weight of the Parthenon becomes intrinsically connected with the Greek struggle for independence and Greek nationalism. From the arrival of King Otto, and Leo von Klenze's inaugural speech on the

[11] The volume edited by Tournikiotis devotes many chapters to the shifting attitudes towards the Parthenon. A most important book that deals with great care and detail with the rediscovery of Greece in the 17th century and discusses all the factors that contributed to it, is by Nasia Yakovaki, *Η Ευρώπη μέσω Ελλάδας. Μια καμπή στην ευρωπαϊκή αυτοσυνείδηση, 17ος-18ος αιώνας* (Athens: Estia 2006). See also the short but dense and witty narrative of the history of the Parthenon by Mary Beard, *The Parthenon* (London: Profile Books 2002); also contributions 9, 10 and 11 in Neils (ed.), *The Parthenon from Antiquity to the present*; and William St Clair, "Imperial appropriations of the Parthenon", in: John Henry Merryman (ed.), *Imperialism, art and restitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2006), pp. 65-97.

> Acropolis Greek freedom and Greek values have always been somehow linked to the ancient monuments, and in particular the Parthenon, which became "the heart of the Race", as Palamas later put it.[12]

It is at this point in time that poetry on the Parthenon begins to be composed, when the monument stops being a useful building and is elevated to a work of art. The poems on the Parthenon, in their vast majority, belong to the tradition of Idealism, or else Romantic Hellenism. Inspired by Winckelmann, by Stuart and Revett, and by important travellers such as Chateaubriand, they all share an admiration for ancient Greek culture and place its art at the pinnacle of civilization. The ideal, the beautiful, the cult of whiteness, democracy, and freedom are key words here.[13] A random glance through many poems, especially those of the 19th and early 20th centuries confirms this. For Louise Colet, who contemplates the Parthenon from afar at first and closer later, the hill on which the Parthenon is built is:

> Comme un trépied géant un roc a large cime
> Qui porte avec fierté le Parthénon sublime! [...]
> Le voilà ce temple sans tache,
> Blanc comme un vêtement sacré!
> Comme la neige qui s'attache
> Au front du Parnasse éthéré!
> Éblouissante colonnade
> Que Zéphire va caressant:
> Le voilà tournant sa façade
> Aux feux du matin rougissant![14]

---

[12] See, characteristically, the description by A. Miliarakis of the official ceremony on the Acropolis on 28 August 1834 to welcome Otto, the new King of Greece, in *Εστία* 18 (22 July 1884) 461-7. It includes the inaugural speech of Leo von Klenze, in which the connection of the glorious past with the aspirations of the new King is clearly made through the monuments on the Acropolis and the ideas they represented.

[13] See, for example, St Clair, "Imperial appropriations", pp. 82-6.

[14] Louise Colet, *Ce qu'on rêve en aimant* (Paris: Librairie Nouvelle 1854), pp. 117-41.

Her long narrative poem, "L'Acropole d'Athènes" won the French Academy prize in 1854 and was followed closely in style and content by Ioannis Kambouroglou in his own long poem "Ακρόπολις", submitted for the Voutsinaios Poetry Competition (1870) of the University of Athens and published in 1871:

> Αφέλεια και εμπειρία,
> νους εις άπειρον εισδύων,
> σπουδή της φύσεως βαθεία
> και ηθικόν τι μεγαλείον,
>
> Όπερ την ύλην ωραΐζει,
> ακτίνας βάλλον δι' αυτής
> και την ψυχήν εξευγενίζει,
> ιδού η τέχνη. Δυσπιστείς;[15]
>
> Naivety and experience,
> mind that penetrates the infinite,
> deep study of nature
> and a moral grandeur,
>
> that embellishes matter,
> dashing sunbeams through it
> and ennobles the soul,
> here is art. Do you doubt it?

For Ch. A. Parmenides in his "Ωδή εις τα ερείπια της Ακροπόλεως" (1858), the temple and the other monuments on the Acropolis are "Έργα μεγαλοφυΐας, / Έργα έθνους ελευθέρου" (Works of genius, Works of a free nation).[16] G. Lampelet ascends the Acropolis and exclaims, on seeing the Parthenon:

> Στην έκλαμπρή σου όψι, ω Παρθενώνα,
> Ψυχής θεϊκής ύμνε μαρμαρωμένε,
> Γονατιστός ο νους μου ζη στα χρόνια

[15] I. Kambouroglou, *Η Ακρόπολις* (Athens: Ilissos 1871).
[16] Ch. A. Parmenidis, *Νέα ποιήματα* (Athens: N. Filadelpheus 1858), pp. 145-9.

Που υφαίνουν τον χρυσό σου τον αιώνα,
Και τη ζωή τους πλάθει, ω δοξασμένε,
Ω αλήθειας κι ομορφιάς σύνθεσι αιώνια![17]

In front of your majestic façade, o Parthenon,
You, petrified hymn of a divine soul.
My mind, prostrated, relives the years

That weave your golden Age,
And it reshapes their life, o glorious one,
O eternal composition of truth and beauty!

And in her poem "Στον Παρθενώνα", Athina Tarsouli claims that:

Στα πολυκαιρισμένα σου τα μάρμαρα,
χαράχτηκαν αιώνων πεπρωμένα
κι' όλα τα μυστικά μιας Τέχνης άφταστης,
από Αρμονίες και Ρυθμούς γραμμένα.[18]

In your worn-out marbles,
the destinies of centuries have been engraved
and all the secrets of an unequalled Art,
written with Harmonies and Rhythms.

All and all, as Richard Etlin has pointed out, "the superlatives accorded to the Parthenon were not limited to an appreciation of its supreme beauty; rather, they were extended to include the highest possible manner of aesthetic experience, which was the 'sublime'."[19] And they also usually encompassed moral qualities. This brings us back full circle to Renan's *Prière sur l'Acropole*, a circle that keeps turning, though, considering that such attitudes towards the Parthenon continued to be expressed well into the 20th century. The poems presented here should be seen against

---

[17] In Karolos Moraitis, *Μεγάλη ανθολογία Ελληνικού σονέττου* (Athens 1987), p. 340.
[18] In D. Lampikis, *Ελληνίδες ποιήτριες* (Athens 1936), p. 50.
[19] Richard A. Etlin, "The Parthenon in the modern era", in: Neils (ed.), *The Parthenon from Antiquity to the present*, pp. 363-95 (p. 370).

this background of idealizing attitudes, and they are chosen because they display an originality of thought and expression in an otherwise familiar context, or because their groundbreaking, radical attitudes create an interesting counterpart to the overwhelmingly idealistic approach to the monument. One of the earliest such examples is "The Parthenon" (1857) by Herman Melville.

Melville travelled in Europe and the Levant over a period of eight months, from 11 October 1856 to 6 May 1857. In the diary he kept of those travels he made interesting and original comments on the places and monuments he visited, and especially the Parthenon.

> Acropolis – blocks of marble like sticks of Wenham ice – or like huge cakes of wax. – Parthenon elevated like cross of Constantine. Strange contrast of rugged rock with polished temple. At Stirling – art & nature correspond. Not so at Acropolis.
> Imperceptible seams – frozen together. – Break like cakes of snow. –
> *Feb 10th* [...] Pavement of Parthenon – square – blocks of ice. (frozen together.) – no mortar: – Delicacy of frostwork.
> *Feb 11th* Wednesday. Clear & beautiful day. Fine ride on box to Pireus. Acropolis in sight nearly whole way. Straight road. Fully relieved against the sky – [20]

They show his acquaintance both with Byzantine history and with Greek literature and tradition, as well as his familiarity with the, by now, well-established discourse relating to the Parthenon and its perceived qualities. They may also echo the guidebook Melville carried with him during these travels, Murray's *Handbook for travellers in Greece*, which, like most guides and travel literature at the time, popularized the idealizing tradition of Romantic Hellenism in the perception and interpretation of ancient art. This can be seen in the four poems that Melville wrote

---

[20] Herman Melville, *Journal of a visit to Europe and the Levant*, ed. Howard C. Horsford (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1955), pp. 170-1, 172, 173.

about the Parthenon: "Greek Architecture", "Greek Masonry", "The Apparition" and of course "The Parthenon", all included in his collection *Timoleon* published in 1891.

In "The Apparition" he compares the impact of the Parthenon on the visitor who approaches Athens to the miraculous appearance of the Cross that caused Constantine to become a Christian.

THE APPARITION

(The Parthenon uplifted on
its rock first challenging the view
on the approach to Athens.)

Abrupt the supernatural Cross,
Vivid in startled air,
Smote the Emperor Constantine
And turned his soul's allegiance there.

With other power appealing down,
Trophy of Adam's best!
If cynic minds you scarce concert,
You try them, shake them, or molest.

Diogenes, that honest heart,
Lived ere your date began;
Thee had he seen, he might have swerved
In mood nor barked so much at Man.

Wrongly assuming that Diogenes was not alive when the Parthenon was built, he claims that the Cynic would have had a different view of man had he seen the monument. More importantly, we may want to consider the impact of the temple on the poet himself. The parallel of Constantine and Diogenes is set there to suggest indirectly the extent of Melville's own change of heart at the sight of the Parthenon. Words such as "uplifted" and "challenging" that introduce the poem confirm the suspicion that the poet's experience can be seen in terms of an epiphany too, and that he himself was smitten by the divine apparition of the temple. Only that in the case of Melville the loyalties went the other way

round. As Cohen points out, "Melville's travel journal indicates that he found in Greek architecture sustaining concepts, somewhat offsetting the dearth of such sustenance in what he had seen when he visited the Holy Land."[21]

But if "The Apparition" preserves the idealizing perception of the Parthenon and the idea that when seeing the relics of the past one can become a different person, can be reshaped into a better individual, the originality of "The Parthenon" lies to a great extent first, in the perspective it introduces, that of a learned tourist who has come to visit Greece, and second, in its subtle, almost imperceptible, irony. This is not to say that there were no other learned visitors, but that such visitors did not usually write poetry but travel accounts; and those who write poetry, irrespective of whether they have travelled to Greece or not, follow a different pattern, usually attempting to offer long narratives of the monument's history over the centuries or sad reflections on its fate and fall. Therefore, Melville is the only poet who brings the style of travel literature into a poem. But what exactly does this mean? Let us read the poem first:

THE PARTHENON

I.
Seen aloft from afar.

Estranged in site,
Aerial gleaming, warmly white,
You look a suncloud motionless
In noon of day divine;
Your beauty charmed enhancement takes
In Art's long after-shine.

II.
Nearer viewed.

Like Lais, fairest of her kind,
In subtlety your form's defined –

---

[21] *Selected poems of Herman Melville*, ed. Henning Cohen (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press 1964), p. 247.

The cornice curved, each shaft inclined,
While yet, to eyes that do but revel
And take the sweeping view,
Erect this seems, and that a level,
To the line and plummet true.

Spinoza gazes; and in mind
Dreams that one architect designed
Lais – and you!

III.
The Frieze.

What happy musings genial went
With airiest touch the chisel lent
To frisk and curvet light
Of horses gay – their riders grave –
Contrasting so in action brave
With virgins meekly bright,
Clear filing on in even tone
With pitcher each, one after one
Like water-fowl in flight.

IV.
The last Tile.

When the last marble tile was laid
The winds dies down on all the seas;
Hushed were the birds, and swooned the glade;
Ictinus sat; Aspasia said
"Hist! – Art's meridian, Pericles!"

The poem is divided into four sections, which allow different views of the monument. This is a very photographic approach and it has its own long history in travel literature. Indeed, as Yakovaki informs us, from the 17th century onwards an unnoticed and almost unfelt aspect of the early descriptions of Athens is its image through binoculars or *lunettes de longue vue*. Babin, for example, is among the first to use binoculars to observe Athens from a distance. George Wheler (1682), the travel companion of

Jacob Spon, goes as far as writing with sarcasm about those who had ignored Athens and its monuments so far: "Maybe they were looking from the wrong side of the lenses", he says.[22] Overall, the space of the city and its monuments become for the first time, through the use of binoculars and the framing possibilities they offer, objects of European representations, long before the first lithographs.[23]

What Melville's poem also presupposes is a photographic lens, and this was beginning to become popular among foreigners in the 19th century. Indeed, at the time of Melville's visit to the Acropolis, in 1857, the art of photography already had a history of eighteen years, since the first daguerreotypes were taken in 1839 by the Canadian Joly de Lotbinière. More importantly, among the most acclaimed photographers of the Parthenon in the 19th century was William James Stillman, an American whose original views of the monument sealed what is now considered to be the golden age of photography in Greece. His album, *The Acropolis of Athens illustrated picturesquely and architecturally in photography* was published in 1870.[24] Although it post-dates Melville's visit, it comes before the actual publication of his poems on the Parthenon, and it is not impossible that the photographic eye that lies behind "The Parthenon" is inspired by Stillman's work.

The poem incorporates, as mentioned above, a large amount of aesthetic discourse on the Parthenon. Its view from afar (as well as following the traditional trajectory of the foreign visitor) underlines its otherworldly character suggested by words and phrases such as "estranged in site", "aerial gleaming", "suncloud", "motionless", "divine". The monument appears to the view as in an epiphany (cf. "The Apparition"), and line 4, "in noon of day divine", frames the impact of this first impression. The fact that

---

[22] Yakovaki, *Ευρώπη*, p. 296.
[23] Yakovaki, *Ευρώπη*, p. 301.
[24] For the importance and originality of Stillman's work, see Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, "'Well-recorded worth': Photographs of the Parthenon", in: Neils (ed.) *The Parthenon from Antiquity to the present*, pp. 331-61.

the Parthenon is "estranged in site" suggests both its unique character that makes it stand out and apart of the actual landscape that surrounds it, but also confirms the fact that, in many instances in travel writing, the monument was indeed seen out of context. Its admiration was related to ancient Greece, and travellers often failed to link it to the contemporary city of Athens that provided its context, preferring to reconstruct the ancient world that gave birth to such a majestic monument. But in Melville's poem, this link with Antiquity is extremely original in its own right.

As we can see in section II, the poet is approaching the monument and, before actually zooming on the frieze, he is close enough to grasp its structure and parts as a whole. And to that whole he attributes the sensual characteristics of a woman. It is worth pondering, then, the reasons that led the poet to make this association and its possible significance. In what ways can a temple and a woman be compared? A common, general feature of poets' perceptions of the Parthenon is a more or less explicit amount of eroticism (compare Choniates's frustrated feelings). Melville's originality lies in the person he chooses to compare the Parthenon with. Lais was famous in antiquity for her exceptional beauty and this could be a first point of convergence. Both become representative of the ideal in their kind. What is more, Melville may well be suggesting that just as Lais is using artificial means to improve her natural beauty, so too the Parthenon depends on optical illusions that enhance its impression on the viewer. In other words, both Lais and the Parthenon show in what ways art can enhance and perfect natural beauty. It is worth commenting, however, on the fact that Lais was not simply a woman of extreme beauty, but also a courtesan. Is this an indication that Melville admired women of this kind for their culture and their education? The fact that the final and ultimate pronouncement on art is made by Aspasia, another courtesan, may confirm this. But Henning Cohen also talks about a possible "deliberately meretricious quality in Lais's beauty appropriate to the poem".[25]

---

[25] *Selected poems*, p. 245.

Melville may have in mind here all those travellers or "pilgrims" that paid visits to the monument contributing to its "prostitution", an association that is not altogether out of place.[26] If this is indeed the case, then Melville's poem is unique in introducing this association of tourism and debasement, one that will be vehemently criticized by Calas in his "Acropolis".

* * *

In any case Melville's perception of the Parthenon is that of a learned tourist who can appreciate what he sees and be inspired by it. And he certainly keeps the serene detachment that characterizes all non-Greek poets when facing the famous monument. For the Greeks, on the other hand, the Parthenon revealed a more complex problem. Their poems display quite clearly the struggle to cope with the remains of a glorious past as they try to justify their own artistic essence in relation to it. Despite the rebirth of Athens through neoclassical architecture and planning, archaeological excavations and restorations of monuments, as well as the use of a purist idiom, the *katharevousa*, in the hope of emulating if not resurrecting Ancient Greece, the Greek poets of that period emphasize in a number of poems about ancient monuments their frustration or deception – and the ruin motif is used extensively to suggest the glories of the past and the present miseries of Greece. An important poem by Spyridon Vasileiadis, "Ο Παρθενών" ("The Parthenon"), stages those issues clearly, introducing at the same time the artist's predicament in the face of such a majestic

[26] Melville's address to the tourist in his poem "Attic landscape" supports this reading: "Tourist, spare the avid glance/ That greedy roves the sight to see:/ Little here of 'Old Romance,'/ Or Picturesque of Tivoli." Athens was also accused of being adorned like a courtesan, and twice at least in its history the Parthenon actually became the setting for this kind of activity: during the visit of Demetrius and during the Ottoman period when the Erechtheion became a harem.

monument.[27] I believe that Vasileiadis and 19th-century Greek attitudes in general owe a lot to the tradition of writing about monuments in French literature – and the most characteristic example here would be Du Bellay's *Antiquités de Rome* (1553-7). This collection, the only one as far as I know to concentrate solely on ancient monuments, introduces a large corpus of vocabulary and imagery which is found in so many Greek poems of the 19th century – particularly the concern about whether the work of a poet can restore in writing what time has destroyed.

"Ο Παρθενών" is a long narrative of four sections in which the poet tells the story of the Parthenon throughout the centuries. The contrast between antiquity and Vasileiadis's own time is made clear from the very beginning and is kept throughout the poem as Vasileiadis emphasizes how the ancient glories are lost, leaving Greece in its present state of ruin and desolation with artists that cannot be compared in any way to their ancestors. What I want to highlight here, however, is an interesting paradox that makes itself felt as we read this poem: on the one hand Vasileiadis only sees in the Parthenon dead marbles that can no longer be bought back to life, but on the other hand, it is writing *about* the Parthenon or even *on* the Parthenon that gives the troubled poet hopes of immortality.

> Το όνομά του καθώς χαράσσει
> εις τας πλευράς σου ξένος θνητός
> κ'εκεί ο χρόνος το προφυλάσσει
> κ'επιτυγχάνει ούτω ν'αρπάσση
> αθανασίαν σεμνήν αυτός,
> ούτως επάνω ωραίου φύλλου
> γράφων την τύχην σου την πικράν
> ως εις το στήθος λευκού σπονδύλου
> ζωήν να ζήσω είθε μακράν. (I, stanza 7)

---

[27] For a detailed discussion see Liana Giannakopoulou, "Perceptions of the Parthenon in Modern Greek poetry", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20 (2002) 244-6.

As when a mortal stranger
engraves his name on your flanks,
and there, protected by time,
he achieves to grasp a modest immortality,
thus, if I write your bitter
fate on a fair page,
as if on the breast of a white drum,
may I live long.

Writing about the Parthenon, even a ruined Parthenon, is equivalent to engraving one's name on a marble column's drum, an act supposed to give immortality to the author. Byron is the famous example here, for he indeed carved his name on the temple of Poseidon at Sounion. "Like fragment hunting," Andrew Szegedy-Maszak reports, "graffiti writing was a frequent pastime of the foreign visitor." And many philhellenes, especially those who fought inside the Acropolis during the Greek War of Independence, carved their names for posterity on the columns of the Parthenon. One of Stillman's photographs actually focuses on these names. But for Stillman, just as for Vasileiadis, such an act of petty vandalism (as it would have been perceived by us today) is transformed. The Parthenon, Stillman suggests, "is not defaced but enlivened, perhaps even ennobled, by the signatures of men who came from abroad to help the Greeks regain their freedom."[28] And the association of Byron with the Greeks' struggle for freedom certainly sanctifies his own act. On the other hand, the idea of transcendence associated with the act of writing on stone has not passed unnoticed. At least two poems can be read as responses to this idea expressed here by Vasileiadis. Kleanthis Papazoglous, in a poem explicitly devoted to Vasileiadis, "Ανάμνησις του Παρθενώνος" (1872), expands on that very same idea of writing one's name on the Parthenon:

---

[28] Szegedy-Maszak, "'Well-recorded worth': Photographs of the Parthenon", p. 351. As the author points out, "Stillman may have seen in the Philhellenes' resistance to the Ottomans a precursor to his own opposition to the Turks on Crete."

[...]
Μίαν ημέραν – ήμην παιδίον –
Έγραψα μέσω γραφών μυρίων
Το όνομά μου,
Κ' ευθύς ησθάνθην πυράν εντός μου,
Κ' έκτοτ'υπήρξαν ωραίου κόσμου
Οι λογισμοί μου, τα όνειρά μου.
[...]
Θα ίδουν τάχα τα όμματά μου
Εκεί ακόμη το όνομά μου
Κεχαραγμένον;
Αν ούτω, – χαίρε, φιλτάτη Μοίρα!
Το άσμα όπερ θα ψάλλ' η λύρα
Θα ζήση χρόνους ηγαπημένον...

This is associated here with the naiveté and happiness of youth that still sees the ideal in the world – and I suppose that the choice of the Parthenon must be connected to the fact that, in criticism, the monument was perceived to belong in such a world (encompassing youth, naivety, the ideal and the beautiful). The last stanza seems to hint that the preservation of the poet's name on the monument implies poetic achievement and fame. A rather bold satire comes from the Left of the interwar period. Asimakis Panselinos, in his poem "Ακρόπολη", is ruthless in his criticism of such mentalities:

Του απόλυτου του ωραίου είσαι κορόνα,
το μάρμαρό σου είν' άσπιλο σαν κρίνο...
(κάτι αν δεν πω για σένα, ώ Παρθενώνα,
σπουδαίος ποιητής πώς θες να γίνω;)

You are the crown of ideal beauty,
your marble, like a lily, is unblemished...
(if I say nothing about you, o Parthenon,
how can I ever become a great poet?)

* * *

Coming now to Keats's famous sonnet, I choose to present it here because, apart from its obvious relevance, it introduces a totally new aspect in poetry on the Parthenon: the issue of the Elgin Marbles. Only two other poems adopt this point of view, Hardy's "Christmas in the Elgin Room"[29] and Dimoula's "Βρετανικό Μουσείο".[30] In both these poems, though, there is a subtle though explicit allusion to the sculptures' violent uprooting from the Parthenon to Bloomsbury, which leaves out the political dimension of the problem. In Hardy, the most prominent conflict is between Christianity and paganism. Keats's response, on the other hand, is deeply personal, almost existential. It is not Lord Elgin's activities that preoccupy him, but their repercussions.

I mentioned earlier that non-Greek poets have a more relaxed attitude towards the Parthenon, but here is one that doesn't. In a way comparable to Greek poets, Keats is not inspired and elated at the sight of the Marbles, but becomes petrified as if he were looking at the terrible Medusa. Except that, whereas the Greeks were facing a devastated monument *in situ*, Keats observes the fragments that came from that monument in the British Museum, which finally purchased them in 1816, one year before the publication of the sonnet. And if the Greek poets' predicament is related to the burden of the past, Keats's own attitude towards the Marbles must be seen in the light of the cultural/aesthetic debate that went on in England from 1801 to 1816. Scott is right to point out that Keats's predicament is related to cultural imperialism and the discovery and possession of foreign heritage.[31] How can one write about art that has been removed from its original location? How can one understand and appropriate a tradition that is not one's own?

---

[29] The poem is reproduced in *Dialogos* 3 (1996) 134-5.

[30] Kiki Dimoula, *Ποιήματα* (Athens: Ikaros 1999), pp. 36-7.

[31] See the detailed and engaging discussion in Grant F. Scott, *The sculpted word. Keats, ekphrasis, and the visual arts* (Hanover: University Press of New England 1994), pp. 45-67. The quoted sources of the following paragraph are taken from Scott's study.

ON SEEING THE ELGIN MARBLES (1817)

My spirit is too weak – mortality
    Weighs heavily on me like unwilling sleep,
    And each imagined pinnacle and steep
Of godlike hardship tells me I must die
Like a sick eagle looking at the sky.
    Yet 'tis a gentle luxury to weep
    That I have not the cloudy winds to keep
Fresh for the opening of the morning's eye.
Such dim-conceived glories of the brain
    Bring round the heart an undescribable feud;
So do these wonders a most dizzy pain,
    That mingles Grecian grandeur with the rude
Wasting of old Time, with a billowy main,
    A sun, a shadow of a magnitude.

When the Marbles arrived in England in 1801 they were greeted with indifference and were put in a storeroom. They were first exhibited privately in 1807 and again the reactions of the viewers were not what we would have expected by today's standards. Scott, who has researched extensively in archival and published material of that period reports that Joseph Farington, a painter, recorded in his diary, the reactions of colleagues and friends that went to that exhibition. Some "seemed to be disappointed", he notes; "the whole was a mass of ruins." Sir George Beaumont recommended that "the mutilated fragments brought from Athens by Lord Elgin should be restored as at present they excite rather disgust than pleasure in the minds of people in general, to see parts of limbs, & bodys, stumps of arms, etc.–". Most famously, Byron, in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (1809) called the Marbles "Phidian freaks,/ Misshappen monuments and maim'd antiques". When the long debate about their artistic value finally ended in 1816, the tide had changed. Although the negative references never disappeared, the dominant aesthetic discourse emphasized their perfection and truth to nature. Important painters and sculptors such as Benjamin West, Thomas Laurence, and John Flaxman agreed that the marbles

were the finest things of their kind ever discovered. Their acceptance marked a new era in British taste. As Haydon, a friend of Keats, said about them: "That combination of nature and idea which I had felt was so much wanting for in high art was here displayed to midday conviction. My heart beat!" Others described them as "matchless works", "exalted in sentiment", "specimens whose peculiar and transcendent quality consists in the total absence of all manner whatsoever", "peerless relics", and hope was expressed that "with a more constant examination of those divine models, a purity of taste and accuracy of judgment grows up in the mind of the student..." This last remark highlights another factor that might be echoed in the poem by Keats. The Marbles were purchased as national treasures in the hope that they would inspire British artists, particularly the young. As the closing statement of the Select Committee put it: "...they will imbibe the genuine spirit of ancient excellence and transfuse it into their own compositions. This and this only, is the true and genuine method of properly studying the Elgin Marbles."

Although the possibility of imbibing the Marbles' spirit is clearly questioned in it, the poem is admirable in becoming the stage on which the conflicting views of the experts and the humble reaction of a young poet meet. The Marbles are not mentioned at all throughout the poem, but we can feel their impact and their symbolic weight without a doubt. The weak spirit of a young artist hopes to be inspired and strengthened but what comes forward instead is an agonizing struggle against death. Keats's selection of vocabulary is not random: phrases like "weighs heavily", "pinnacle and steep", "godlike hardship", "glories of the brain" etc. emphasize the widely accepted grandeur of the sculptures on the one hand and their paralysing effect on the artist on the other. Instead of being uplifted, the poet is compared to a sick eagle for whom the sky is only a distant, unreachable goal. The lightness that major critics saw in the art of the Marbles and their ability to breathe life seem only to impose inertia and death. And the words of admiration often tinted with eroticism that were used to refer to ancient sculpture in general and to the Marbles in

particular become here an indescribable feud in the heart of the artist and "a most dizzy pain" that does not allow for enlightenment and the clarity of mind necessary for the appreciation of such masterpieces.

But if the sonnet asserts the poet's weakness and mortality it also questions that side of criticism that rejects the Marbles' fragmentariness by emphasizing their ideal character and perfection. They are indeed "dim-conceivèd glories of the brain" not only because the artist's imagination can hardly grasp their beauty and magnificence but also because they are the works of a foreign civilization that is lost in time. The marbles are here but come from far away, both chronologically and spatially, and therefore their context is hard to reconstruct: both their original, ancient Greek one, and the contemporary one, since the Marbles, extracted from the temple in which they belong, are exposed now out of context and "outside in", as William St Clair has pointed out.[32] Keats boldly acknowledges here, in spite of the dominant discourse, that Grecian grandeur cannot be disconnected from "the rude wasting of old Time". Those sunny peaks of ancient art are lost, both because of the cloudy setting of Bloomsbury and because they have lost their integrity: they are fallen masterpieces, shadows of what they used to be.

Not that this leaves the poet unaffected. The encounter of the artist with what used to be a work of art of incomparable greatness engenders thoughts about the nature and value of artistic creation. If those wonders, as he calls them, have perished, in spite of the hardness and durability of their material, what is the fate that awaits the young poet whose inspiration and medium seem to be much more perishable? The "undescribable feud" and "most dizzy pain" the poet confesses here are also the result of his realization that, unlike his ancient Greek counterpart, he cannot yet control the reins of his inspiration. The phrase "billowy main" makes this point vividly. Though it brings into the poem the image of a winter seascape with waves that have the power to sweep off

---

[32] William St Clair, "Imperial appropriations", p. 82.

whatever is in their way, it also alludes phonetically to the horses depicted on the frieze of the Parthenon. Unlike those riders of the frieze who seemed to be in full control of their steeds, Keats seems unable to hold the reins of his own art. While still acknowledging the splendour of the Marbles, Keats emphasizes their fragmented condition which reflects his own state of mind. The Marbles are neither inspiring nor uplifting. On the contrary, they become the sad relics of a past glory, shattered fragments with which the stumbling poet can identify.

* * *

A long jump will take us now from the 19th to the 20th century, to Calas's 1933 poem "Ακρόπολη". This abrupt transition leaves out the voices of the Demoticists, with Palamas prominent among them.[33] The most important characteristic in their approach to the Parthenon is that they give great emphasis to the symbolic value the monument had acquired in the 19th century, and especially the notion that writing about the Parthenon and using *katharevousa* would restore the tradition the monument came to represent in the newly founded Greek state. The Demoticists link such ideas to their polemical discourse about the Modern Greek language. The Parthenon is associated with *katharevousa* and the dead elements of Greek tradition. That is why they are against the restoration of the Parthenon and their poetry on the Parthenon usually involves the juxtaposition of the ancient ruins with flowers or birds that, on a deeper level, symbolize the Modern Greek language and its power to enliven the relics of the past.

In any case, all the poems on the Parthenon up to this point choose to adopt either the traditional stance of unconditional admiration or a more original approach that usually challenges the idealizing attitudes in the perception of the Parthenon. Calas's poem, on the other hand, is unique in making such a variety of

---

[33] For a detailed discussion of Palamas's perception of the Parthenon and the context of Demoticism, see Giannakopoulou, "Perceptions of the Parthenon", pp. 247-53.

perceptions of the Parthenon its own topic, stretching the iconoclastic tradition that – ironically – began with the Palamas, to its limits:

Στο πρώτο πλάνο
ο Παρθενός
ο δηλητηριασμένος με ψυχαρική μελάνη
ο ψεύτικος, ο νεκρός
ο σκοτωμένος με φακό σε πλούσιο χαρτί
από τον Μπουασονά
νεκροθάπτη της Ελλάδας –
για φόντο χέρια σταυρωμένα
μπλεγμένα
σε θέση προσευχής
εντατικής προσευχής
τα χέρια φλύαρα χοντρά
εξόχως χοντρά
στα δάχτυλα για δαχτυλίδια
σύρματα ηλεκτρικά
που τρεμοσβούν τη λέξη
Ρ ε ν ά ν
– ο επίσημος της Ακρόπολης
κανδηλανάφτης –

In the foreground
the Parthenós
polluted by Psycharian ink
fake, dead
killed by a lens on deluxe paper
by Boissonnas
Greece's gravedigger –
in the background folded hands
twisted
into a posture of prayer
hands garrulous fat
extraordinarily fat
for rings on the fingers
electricity cables
vibrant with the word
Renan

– the Acropolis's official
verger – [34]

"Ακρόπολη" presupposes the literary and ideological tradition of Demoticism and the sentimental cries of Renan and it castigates the contribution of photography, tourism and advertising in the transformation of the monument from a work of art into a national memorial. Strong and vivid images, with qualities that bring to mind features of the cinema, expose and debase the Parthenon, attacking face to face what Calas perceives as the very symbol of the bourgeois attitudes. The Parthenon epitomizes the values of the official state, and its acclaimed repose and detachment could be interpreted as an immovable and stagnant frame of mind indifferent to the real problems ravaging society. Nationalism and Greek fascism are not irrelevant either. It is well known that during the Metaxas dictatorship the Parthenon was used to legitimize authority and power in Makronisos, called by the authorities the "new Parthenon".[35] The symbol of democracy had ironically become a tool in the hands of fascism.

But why should professional photography be to blame? The works of the Swiss Fred Boissonnas and Nelly helped to publicise Greece abroad. Such publicity is criticized by Calas, for, as well as perpetuating misconceptions about Greek art and culture, it foreshadows the touristic development of the Parthenon and – according to Calas – its humiliation. The reference to Delilah as a dancer, for example, brings to mind Nelly, who in 1927 and 1929 photographed two dancers (Paiva and Nikolska) naked on the Parthenon "with the female body symmetrically placed against the classical purity of the Acropolis":

πάνου στα μάρμαρα
πόδια, κοιλιά, στήθια, χέρια
μαλλιά ξέπλεκα

---

[34] The translation is by David Ricks.

[35] For a detailed discussion, see Yannis Hamilakis, "'The other Parthenon': Antiquity and national memory at Makronisos", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20 (2002) 307-38.

της Νταλιλάς
αλλά οι τρίχες κομμένες
είναι χορεύτρα που βαρέθηκε τα παρκέτα
και πηδά
σε παλιά μάρμαρα
προκλητικά
πηδά ανάμεσα σε κολόνες
τοποθετημένες φανταστικά
από ποιητή μεγαλόπνοο πολύ
τον Χερ Καρλ Μπέντεκερ –

on the marbles
feet, belly, breasts, hands
dishevelled hair
of a Delilah
but the locks shorn
she a dancer who has tired of the floor
and leaps
over old marbles
provocatively
leaps among columns
fantastically positioned
by that poet of veritable inspiration
Herr Karl Baedeker –

Such attitudes are interpreted by Calas as yet another step towards the debasement of the ancient temple. The attempt to associate the naked body of the dancer with the aesthetics of the classical nude fails, because they are both torn out of their original (historical) setting and the set of values which supported them. I think that the piling up of the dancer's limbs proves this point. The body has lost the vertical stature of a classical statue and has become a heap of severed members. Such a deconstruction of the ideal is bitterly underlined by the scene of prostitution in the lines quoted below. Calas is here subverting the very name Παρθενών with its connotations of virginity and purity. The erotic element associated with the Parthenon in previous poems is challenged through this imagery and is taken to its extremes, bringing certain ideas of Melville's poem into a modern and very radical context:

ενώ σε νύχτες πανσελήνου
ο φορατζής εισπράττει τα φιλιά
που κρύβει ψεύτικης καρυάτιδας η φούστα
κι αφήνει σ' αυτές
χοντρές κοιλιές
σ' αυτούς σωληνάρια εξακόσια εξ

while on moonlit nights
the tax collector transacts the kisses
hidden under a fake caryatid's skirt
and leaves the women
with fat bellies
and the men with tubes of six-o-six

"Ακρόπολη" is an ecphrastic poem which does not restore the ancient temple, but, following Marinetti's urges, blows apart the icon formed by the bourgeois perceptions linked with it.[36] Ultimately the Parthenon is put by the poet to the service of his own understanding of art: it becomes itself the powder-keg that explodes all the conventional perceptions woven around it. Calas's avant-garde view of art as destroying every link with tradition finds here a successful expression. If Delilah has ironically survived Samson, the poet's art inherits the power of Morosini's cannons which are turned against the inauthentic icon. Even better, his cylindrical pen will act as a new Samson who will demolish the temple together with all those infidels who disgrace it. From that point of view the word ακρόπολες (l. 58) is of some significance. By debasing the word in a demoticist way, the poet, does not only mock the movement, but shows through the use of the plural that the acropolises are just faked icons created by various manipulations, ideological or others.[37]

* * *

[36] For Marinetti, see D. Philippides, "The Parthenon as appreciated by Greek society", in: Tournikiotis (ed.), *The Parthenon and its impact*, p. 285.

[37] For a detailed discussion of the poem, see Giannakopoulou, "Perceptions of the Parthenon", pp. 258-66.

Calas's polemical and deconstructive poem does not, however, mark the end of poetry on the Parthenon. It is true that the number of poems devoted to the Parthenon in Greece since the 1930s is small when compared to the poetic production of the period 1860-1933. In fact, I have found only five: Engonopoulos's "Τραμ και Ακρόπολις" (1938), Angelos Karousos's "Προσευχή στην Ακρόπολη" (1958), Katerina Angelaki-Rooke's "Ακρόπολη-Κεραμεικός" (1963–77), Kiki Dimoula's "Βρετανικό Μουσείο" (1999), and last, but not least, Kostas Montis's aphorisms from *Στιγμές*, published in 1978 but probably written in the 1950s. And with the exception of two, they all keep a low-key, whispering tone that sees the past as an important constituent of the present (Engonopoulos), or contrast its aloofness and acclaimed repose to the internal, usually frustrated, realm of the individual (Angelaki-Rooke), or again, as we have seen in the context of Keats's sonnet, reflect on the fate of the Parthenon Marbles in the British Museum (Dimoula). But only Karousos and Montis bring back Calas's polemical spirit and his daring encounter with the ideological clusters crystallized around the Parthenon. In Karousos's poem the allusion to Renan and his "extempore" prayer is unmistakeable in the title, but the poet provocatively leaves the ancient relics in their "wakeless slumber". His prayer is for the new, modern city that emerges against the old.

ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗ ΣΤΗΝ ΑΚΡΟΠΟΛΗ

Ένας ήλιος είχε δύσει –
τα καινούργια ψηλά χτίρια
νέα εφάνταζαν στα βάθη·
οι μεγάλοι θεοί, πεθαμένοι για πάντα,
μαζί με ιστορίες και μύθους,
τον αξύπνητο είχαν πάρει.
Κι' εκεί μόνος, με φαντάσματα,
αφουγκράζοντας κάτι:
Μεγάλοι ναοί δεν υπάρχουνε.
Μια ολόδροση Αθήνα
στην παλιάν είχε φέξει.

Προσευχή με χαμόγελο
στη ζωή, χωρίς λέξη.[38]

PRAYER ON THE ACROPOLIS

A sun had set –
the modern tall buildings
in the background appeared strikingly young;
the great gods, dead forever,
along with stories and myths,
had fallen into a wakeless slumber.
And there, alone, with ghosts,
listening to something:
There are no great temples.
A fresh Athens
had dawned over the old one.
A smiling prayer
to life, without a word.

And Montis takes the ultimate step of rejecting the Acropolis altogether, both as a relic of the past and as an ideological symbol:

Ό,τι και να 'ν' η Ακρόπολη,
να το ξέρει πως στη πλάτη μας ακουμπά.

Μ' όλο το δέοντα σεβασμό
έχουμε σοβαρότερα θέματα απ' την Ακρόπολη.

Λοιπόν, πολύ κάθησε απάνω απ' τα κεφάλια μας η Ακρόπολη!

Αν εξαρτιόταν από εμένα
θ' απαγόρευα, σας λέω, τις ανασκαφές.

Δε μπορείς να γεννιέσαι με την Ακρόπολη απάνω απ' το κεφάλι σου,
δεν μπορείς να 'χεις ισοβίως την Ακρόπολη απάνω απ' το κεφάλι σου.

---

[38] In *Νέα Εστία* 64 (1958).

Whatever it is, the Acropolis
ought to know that what it rests on is our backs.

With all due respect
we have more important things to think about than the
Acropolis.

Well then, the Acropolis has been sitting there on our heads
quite long enough!

If it were up to me,
I tell you, I'd ban excavations.

You just can't be born with the Acropolis over your head,
you just can't have the Acropolis over your head for life.

* * *

The English or American poets who write about the Parthenon during or after the Second World War are not altogether dismissive in the way of Montis or Karousos. They, at least, have preserved what has always been characteristic of foreign visitors to Greece: the eyes and attitudes of a tourist. Nevertheless, they are no longer the tourists who cannot see beyond the idealized perceptions of Winckelmann, Murray, Beadecker and other famous travel guides. Although such visitors know the tradition behind the monuments of the Acropolis, they know, in other words, what they are expected to feel when encountering such works of art, the revelation of "beauty" and "grandeur" as expressed in the poems of the 19th and early 20th centuries is no longer automatic and spontaneous. The post war poets who come from England or America (Durrell, John Heath-Stubbs, Josephine Jacobsen) experience a modern, vibrant Athens which is compared and contrasted to the classical city, but the ancient heritage, diluted in "every second-rate 'classical' building – / Church or museum –" and vandalized now, appears almost as an after-thought, or as a sudden revelation or again as a desperate cry, as in "The Parthenon" (1965), by John Heath-Stubbs:

[...]
A dash in a reckless and exorbitant taxi
Will get you there; then climb
Above the esurient, lively, and stuffy city
Feet slipping on loose stones.

Suddenly it stands there; like a familiar quotation
From dusty oleographs, the model
Of every second-rate "classical" building –
Church or museum –
[...]
Long since; the centaurs and heroes
Shanghaied to Bloomsbury.
It seems very small:
And she has departed.

So that's all. There is nothing to do
But stand and gape like any other
Romantic tourist; and then go.

But turn your back, and stumble
Down the steep track – then suddenly
The mathematical candour,
Neither over- nor under-statement,

Owl-clawed, hooks to the heart.

Furthermore, poems such as Durrell's "Acropolis" (1966) and Josephine Jacobsen's "An absence of slaves" (1965-70) are daring in alluding in a rather bold and provocative manner to the political situation in Greece in the late 1960s. In the case of Durrell's poem, for example, although the colonels' dictatorship is still a year away, the mention of the "socratic prison" in line 3, the bleak atmosphere of the cemetery (line 7) and the word "carnage" in line 17 put the glorious and radiant monuments of antiquity into a rather foreboding scenery. The grim association of the Parthenon (a monument to democracy) with totalitarian regimes, already effected in Makronisos, is here clear and unambiguous:

ACROPOLIS

the soft *quem quam* will be Scops the Owl
conjugation of nouns, a line of enquiry,
powdery stubble of the socratic prison
laurels crack like parchments in the wind.
who walks here in the violet dust at night
by the tower of the winds and water-clocks?
tapers smoke upon open coffins
surely the shattered pitchers must one day
revive in the gush of marble breathing up?
call again softly, and again.
the fresh spring empties like a vein
no children spit on their reflected faces
but from the blazing *souk* below the passive smells
bread urine cooking printing-ink
will tell you what the sullen races think
and among the tombs gnawing of mandolines
confounding sleep with carnage where
strangers still arrive like sleepy gods
dismount at nightfall at desolate inns.[39]

Last but not least, Jacobsen's poem is another blow to the tradition of idealism and may also have been written with the Greek Junta in mind. The rejection of the widely accepted idea that the Parthenon was the creation of a democratic society that enjoyed freedom is darkened by her daring reference to slavery in the Cavafian title of her poem and in her reference to the Pyramids. Indeed, since Winckelmann's *History of Ancient Art*, the importance of ancient Greek values such as freedom and democracy was constantly compared and contrasted with Egyptian society, and the art of each country reflected the values of their systems:

[39] In Lawrence Durrell, *Collected poems 1931-1974*, ed. J. A. Brigham (London: Faber 1980), p. 281.

AN ABSENCE OF SLAVES

The Greek guide
said:
"I want you to remember one thing."
With her deep voice and curly
hair
and small shocked shoes, she said,
"This is our pride:

this was free
labor:
free men built this Par-
thenon. Athenians
left fold and press and field
and harbor:
gave no slavery."

The sun broke
on glorious stone, ripped from the dark
quarry; she said: "The city
sent a slave
to each man's yoke,
oil press and furrow,
to free for toil the free Greek:

the free raised these!" she cried
to the blue sky and honey-
veined columns. "This is
no pyramid." And I saw
the loins and wrists
and bones and tendons of those disprized
who in absence reared the great frieze.

What is unique here compared to all the other poems on the Parthenon is the introduction of the voice of the Greek guide. So far, the experience of the Parthenon was personal, individual, only mediated by a travel guide or by the classical knowledge of the visitor. Here, on the other hand, the voice of the guide acts as a mediator between the relics of the past and the tourists – again,

unlike previous poems we probably have a whole group following the Greek guide. On a first level of course this reflects the reality of the times. In the 1960s tourism was certainly an organized business in Greece. But on a deeper level this is not without consequences. Having a Greek promoting the Greek values, especially in the late sixties, becòmes dangerously propagandistic – the guide sounds a bit too eager to convince us about the values of freedom and democracy. Such subtle subversion is not unique, of course. In Durrell's poem, quoted above, the reference to the "soft *quem quam*" and the "conjugation of nouns" makes the experience of the classics a mechanical endeavour subject to teaching and, possibly, to the ideological orientations of the official state. And the appropriation of the ancient heritage for propaganda by the official state and its educational system has already been criticized by Seferis in his poem "The last day", where he introduces a voice speaking in *katharevousa*: "της εν Σαλαμίνι ναυμαχίας", and of course by Ritsos in many of his later poems of the 50s and 60s.[40]

To conclude, the poems devoted to the Parthenon span from the early 19th century to the late 20th century, and the majority were published between 1850 and 1940. Overall, irrespective of whether they were written by Greek or foreign poets, they display similar attitudes towards the monument, attitudes that involve admiration, awe, respect and deep emotional responses of the Renan type. Nevertheless, a small number among them went beyond the tradition of Idealism. Melville used the new art of photography to frame his poem and give us different points of view – physical, but also, much more indirectly, ideological. Keats challenged, in a way that reminds us of Greek poets such as

---

[40] For Seferis, see D. N. Maronitis, "Αντιστάσεις και συγκρότηση του ποιητικού λόγου", in *Η ποίηση του Γιώργου Σεφέρη* (Athens: Ermis 1984), pp. 108-29 (p. 124). For Maronitis the use of *katharevousa* reflects "τη ρητορική προσφορά του ανθρώπου στην ιστορία" and is characterized as a "ψευδοηρωική [...] παγίδα [που] χρησιμοποιεί συνήθως αρχαία σύμβολα και σύνεργα ηρωολογίας". For Ritsos, see again Maronitis, "Η τιμή του χρυσού και η τιμή της πέτρας", in *Πίσω μπρος* (Athens: Stigmi 1986), pp. 153-62 and David Ricks, "Ρίτσος-Όμηρος: ένας ποιητικός διάλογος", *Δωδώνη* 22 (1993) 49-65.

Vasileiadis, the burden of a foreign tradition that is experienced out of its local/geographical and historical contexts. The demoticist reaction to the ideological exploitation of the Parthenon was taken to its extremes in the poem of Nicolas Calas, who, in the manner of Marinetti, proposes the complete destruction of the Parthenon and all the ideological clusters attached to it for the sake of a new poetry. Finally, the poets that come after the Second World War all find a more or less direct way to continue the deconstructive tradition of Calas. Whether we have the sharp and unambiguous rejections of Karousos and Montis, or the more subtle but strongly undermining reactions of Durrell and Jacobsen, the modern poets cannot fail to see how an ancient monument that has been in the process of being restored and purified for the last one hundred and eighty years, keeps collapsing under the ideological and historical circumstances that frame it.

Modern Greek in the 11th century – or what else should we call it?

Michael Jeffreys
King's College London/University of Oxford

For the quarter of a century after 1976 I taught Modern Greek in Sydney, Australia, looking at much of the world through the prism of 20th-century Greek demotic. In 2000 I returned to the UK with a job that involved (among other things) reading everything written in Greek in the 11th century. The latter perspective naturally did not immediately and totally replace the former. I found myself searching the 11th-century material for traces of the present, or rather for signs that 11th-century Greek would develop into the forms visible in the 20th century. As well as the language itself, I was interested in kindred features like onomastics and metrical patterns. The first part of this article reports the results of this quest.

My acculturation as a teacher of Modern Greek also had another result. As I sought to send David Holton a title for the talk, I began to doubt whether it would be seen as a legitimate subject for a Modern Greek series. The material certainly prefigured aspects of modern linguistic usage and metalinguistic patterns. However, most texts I used were far outside any Modern Greek canon. Above all, every title I thought of to describe my subject suggested barriers between it and the modern spoken language, not the simple continuity of use which seemed to me self-evident. Hence the oxymoron you see above ("modern" vs. "11th century"). I felt defensive and apologetic, sensing I was infringing some rule. My solution was to turn problems of terminology into part of the talk, adding to the discussion a simple exploration of the issues which were making me uncomfortable.

We start with 11th-century language. The first category of material is a learned text including surprising vernacular elements. Nikon of the Black Mountain[1] is still a shadowy figure in the history of the 11th century, because much of his work is not yet properly edited. He was born around 1025 in Constantinople, had a military career under Constantine IX Monomachos (before 1054), but then renounced the world and retired to the Black Mountain, a collection of monasteries north of Antioch in Syria. He wrote three works, of which the most important is his *Taktikon*. This is a collection of forty chapters, of which the first two are regulations for different monasteries, one at the Black Mountain itself, the second at Roidion, where Nikon took refuge after the Seljuqs captured Antioch in 1084. Most of the other 38 are Nikon's letters to fellow *hegoumenoi* on monastic subjects. The Greek text is preserved in a 12th-century Sinai manuscript, which probably guarantees that the language is Nikon's, and certainly establishes its importance in linguistic history. It was translated early into Arabic, and later into Slavonic: the latter version became very influential.

A new edition of the Greek and Slavonic texts is being prepared at Würzburg by a team led by Christian Hannick. Early indications are that it will confirm the linguistic evidence of the published monastic typika and the other passages edited by Benešević in his catalogue of Sinai manuscripts.[2] Though the language is basically learned, there are frequent examples of accusatives in the place of datives with verbs of speaking and occasional relative pronouns in the form resembling the article, even clauses introduced by να, the most reliable single marker of vernacular Greek. Some of these function as imperatives and futures. There are also forms characteristic of high learned levels. Judgement must wait for the new edition, but the first impression is that Nikon took a northern spoken dialect with him to the Black

[1] *ODB* (1991), vol. 3, pp. 1484-5.

[2] Sinaiticus gr. 436 (441). See Benešević 1917 (two monastic regulations); Benešević 1911: 237-46 (manuscript description and contents list), 561-601 (partial editions of some letters).

Mountain. There he wrote seriously for the first time, basing his language and style on his wide reading in canon law. However, geographically insulated from the normative pressures of Byzantine education, he seems to have allowed interference in his writing from his own spoken dialect. Nikon's letters vary in date: some were written in his old age, since they mention the First Crusade, but others belong to the last decades of the 11th century.

The next two examples are isolated passages in works which otherwise give limited evidence of the spoken language. The *Peira*[3] is probably unique anywhere in Europe at the time, a collection of the judgements of a major jurist, Eustathios Romaios, mostly delivered in the first three decades of the 11th century. They were collected by one of Eustathios's students, who often writes himself into his master's story. The language used seems specially adapted for writing legal notes. It is brief, with unexpected rules for omitting the article, for example, which often make it hard to read. It would be worth a linguistic study, since it does not operate by standard Byzantine learned rules, though the influence of the spoken language seems also limited. Again we need to wait for an edition, under preparation in Frankfurt by Ludwig Burgmann. Most of the text survives in one late manuscript, but several passages are attested elsewhere.

In the late 1030s, Eustathios was sitting in his office as *droungarios*, chief of police. Suddenly a subordinate burst in and reported an exchange of insults between magistrates in the nearby hippodrome, which ended with one striking and injuring the other. Eustathios immediately sent officers to ask the crowd about the insults, to see whether the violence could be justified by provocation. The actual words spoken were obviously important for the case, and we seem to have a verbatim account. Some phrases are easier to understand than others, and I will not propose a complete translation. The first insult made by the *kandidatos* to the *protospatharios* may amount to a simple "Damn you", in return for which he is called "cuckold, son of a whore". It requires subtlety

[3] Ed. Zepos 1931.

to interpret the next phrase so as to motivate the *protospatharios's* loss of temper. The new edition will probably make all clear.

> Ἐν τῷ ἱπποδρομίῳ ἱστάμενός τις κανδιδάτος λόγους ὑβριστικοὺς μέν, οὐ τραχεῖς δέ, οἷον: *ἐξαλειπτὰ ὅς του ἠφάνισας τὸν κόσμον*, ἐρρίπτει κατὰ τοῦ πρωτοσπαθαρίου. Ὁ δὲ ὕβρισε τὸν κανδιδάτον: *κερατᾶν κούρβας υἱόν*, ὁ δὲ ἀνθυπέφερε: *ὁ λέων εἶσαι*, καὶ ὠργίσθη ὁ πρωτοσπαθάριος καὶ ἔτυψε τὸν κανδιδάτον καὶ ἐμάδισεν.[4]

In 1057, after a civil war, the new emperor Isaac Komnenos marched on the capital, which the defeated Michael VI still controlled. Negotiations started to prevent another bloodbath, but the situation was resolved by the Patriarch, Michael Keroularios. He gathered the rebels in Hagia Sophia and persuaded Michael to abdicate, allowing Isaac to march in later. The new emperor and patriarch were both strong characters, and a clash was predictable. At the climax, the patriarch is said to have threatened the emperor in a single fifteen-syllable line, which was reported to Isaac, who arrested him and was only prevented by his death from putting him on trial. Most of the story is available in two texts of Psellos, his violent undelivered denunciation for Keroularios's trial, and an encomium, spoken before the patriarch's niece, the new empress, which resembles hagiography.[5] The key decapentasyllable which set things off is found in Skylitzes Continuatus:

> τὸ δημῶδες τοῦτο καὶ κατημαξευμένον: Ἐγὼ σὲ ἔκτισα, φοῦρνε, καὶ ἐγὼ νὰ σὲ χαλάσω.[6]

Manuscripts of the continuator are confused here. It is assumed, reasonably, in the edition that where readings close to 11th-century oral language are found in some manuscripts and conven-

---

[4] Zepos 1931: section 61.6.

[5] Dennis 1994: 1-103: Πρὸς τὴν σύνοδον κατηγορία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. Sathas 1874: 303-87: Ἐγκωμιαστικὸς εἰς τὸν μακαριώτατον πατριάρχην κῦρ Μιχαὴλ τὸν Κηρουλλάριον.

[6] Ed. Tsolakis 1968.

tional written forms in others, preference should be given to oral forms. Thus the future "νὰ σὲ χαλάσω", is printed in preference to its learned equivalent "σὲ καταλύσω", since the former is unexpected in writing and therefore the *lectio difficilior*. The φοῦρνος concerned probably needed to be broken to remove its contents, like a pottery kiln; or maybe it conceals another insult which was misunderstood before any surviving manuscript was written.

I mentioned Psellos. The sheer bulk of his writings ensures him a major part in any study of 11th-century language. Most interest derives not from the *Chronographia*, but the letters (more than 500)[7] and poems (covering more than 400 pages in the Teubner edition edited as *Poemata*).[8] Almost half the letters have as one of their purposes an attempt to get a response from their recipients. If they receive perfectly crafted pieces of Atticism, what do they do, if they cannot reply at the same linguistic level? "Don't feel intimidated", Psellos repeatedly says, "write what you can: I much prefer responses straight from the heart. You are a soldier: write like a soldier. You're a landowner: write like a farmer. You're a monk: write simply like the Gospels." It is interesting to speculate how informal the language of these answers might be, if and when they came. Unfortunately the only preserved letters written to Psellos are from those, like Ioannes Mauropous, who have linguistic skills equivalent to his.

I report a phenomenon which I do not fully understand, and for which I am searching for parallels. Psellos suffered serious clerical persecution and unemployment in 1055-56. He blamed the persecution on Michael Keroularios, alleging that he, leader of the populist faction of the church, could have called off the persecutors. Psellos only escaped by becoming a monk. The unemployment he blamed on another old friend, Leon Paraspondylos.[9] Leon contributes to our picture of 11th-century

---

[7] Detailed by Papaioannou 1998.

[8] Ed. Westerink 1992.

[9] The correspondence with Leon is well studied by De Vries-Van der Velden 1999.

spoken language the unstable second element to his name, Strabospondylos being used as often as Paraspondylos, an easy oral alternative before telephone directories. Whether this was a family name or not is beside the point, as he was a eunuch. Leon was out of favour with Constantine IX, and was patronised in Psellos's letters until Constantine's death in 1055. Suddenly Leon was chosen by the new empress Theodora to head her administration. Psellos sent his friend a c.v. (a surviving letter), and waited for a good job. There was no reply.

Psellos had crucial interviews with Keroularios and Paraspondylos within around six months of each other. He failed in both cases, and after each he accused his interlocutor of linguistic barbarism. With Keroularios the situation is plain: although the patriarch usually employed Attic Greek, he suddenly switched to a barbarous level.[10] We are approaching the time when the same Keroularios called Isaac I an oven. With Paraspondylos the complaint is longer and less definite. Leon is accused of several crimes of populism – an intellectual adopting an anti-intellectual stance, a religious thinker using the language of popular piety, and an Atticist denying knowledge of Attic.[11] There are enough coincidences here to suggest a link, and make one wonder whether our sources hint at a wider attempt by populist leaders to undermine learned Greek.

Nearly all Psellos's poetry was addressed to the three emperors to whom he was closest, Constantine IX, Constantine X and Michael VII. At first sight, we are here a long way from the spoken word. But in fact few of the poems deserve the name. Most (including the longest) are fifteen-syllable verse introductions to subjects he regards as essential to a Byzantine ruler – religious, legal, grammatical and more general educational points. The word "doggerel" comes to mind. The level of language is not vernacular, but simple, in comparison with that which Psellos adopts in prose treatises on the same subjects. This is the title to

[10] Maltese 1988: ep. 16, ll. 59-77.
[11] Kurtz and Drexl 1941: ep. 185, pp. 203.17-204.30.

the collected edition of all these little handbooks, requested by Constantine X for his son Michael VII:

> Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ψελλοῦ Σύνοψις διὰ στίχων σαφῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν περὶ πασῶν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν, γενομένη πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβέστατον βασιλέα κῦριν Μιχαὴλ τὸν Δούκαν, ἐκ προστάξεως τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ βασιλέως, ὥστε διὰ τῆς εὐκολίας καὶ ἡδύτητος ἐνεχθῆναι τοῦτον εἰς τὴν μάθησιν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν.[12]

The texts are recommended as clear, easy and delightful (in similar introductions they are also praised as memorable). I have argued before that political verse is the simplest language of written communication at court in the 11th and 12th centuries, easier than prose, which followed stricter ancient rules.[13] There must by then have been decapentasyllable songs, circulating probably at a vernacular level, involving memorisation and entertainment. Psellos, teaching half-educated princes, used these connotations to enliven his lesson and make his texts more memorable.[14]

I want finally to speak of names. Eleventh-century Greek personal names followed regular Christian patterns: Ioannes, Konstantinos and Michael are the commonest. But this was the century in which most Greeks came to have a family name. At one level this showed pride among the great aristocratic families, at another, the need for tax officials to distinguish between many persons called Ioannes on their books. Secondary names had existed in a scattered way before, but it was only in the 11th century that one expects everyone to have one. They include nicknames, some satirical, others indicating personal characteristics,

---

[12] Westerink 1992: 81.

[13] Jeffreys 1974: 156-61.

[14] Jeffreys 1974: 164-8. The first extensive use of unmixed decapentasyllables in writing was in the *Hymns* of Symeon the New Theologian; see Kambylis 1976. These were written at the beginning of the 11th century. They had little to do with the conventional hymn, but were inspired utterances falling from his lips in whatever shape they may. See Lauxtermann 1999: 39-40.

geographical and racial origins and simple patronymics. There are many coincidences between 11th-century prosopography and the modern telephone directory.

The best source of names is sigillography. Significant Byzantines in the 11th century had seals to authenticate documents – which did not mean that they could write or even read and properly understand them. There are some 70,000 surviving Byzantine seals, 25,000 or more datable to that century.[15] The language of the seals presumably reflects negotiation between the owners and the die-cutters, who engraved letters backwards. Linguistic analysis is impeded because the terminations of many words are abbreviated. But where they are written in full, one finds serious linguistic confusion. Many seals picture a holy person (usually the Theotokos or a saint), and that person or God is begged by the seal-owner for protection by one of a handful of standard learned invocations. The most common formulas are Κύριε βοήθει or Θεοτόκε βοήθει followed by the owner's name in the dative, or a verse form involving σκέποις (optative, "may you protect"), naturally taking the accusative. The seals show every imaginable mistake of misunderstanding, confusion between formulas and hypercorrection (like dative with σκέποις). If one adds plain misspelling, usually by iotacism, perhaps 50% of seals show mistakes, including many belonging to those whose offices suggest high literacy.

Late in the century twelve-syllable verse becomes common, and the counting of syllables may confirm phonological impressions, especially the omission of unstressed initial vowels. I feel considerable sympathy for a family writing its name alternately as Panokomites and Epanokomites; even more striking is a bishop whose verse inscription on his seal includes his title as πίσκοπος with no unstressed epsilon, which would break the metre as a superfluous syllable.[16]

---

[15] On seals and the kinds of research which may be done on them, see Oikonomides 1986.

[16] Details are available on the website of the Prosopography of the Byzantine World (http://www.pbw.kcl.ac.uk). Niketas 15002, Niketas

The most interesting innovation in 11th-century names is the first systematic appearance of the -πουλος ending of the surname, surely a prime marker of Modern Greek onomastics and identity.[17] The -πουλος termination comes from Latin, and is first used, it seems, with reference to young birds and animals, e.g. ὀρνιθόπουλο. The first such family name I have found is Gavrielopoulos (first decade of the 10th century), a debauched companion of the Emperor Alexander. The termination might have a dismissive connotation. Later in the 10th century there are the Kometopouloi, Bulgarian princes, and a Sarakenopoulos, a military man stationed in Bulgaria. For the 11th century I have found the following (note that the list includes -πωλος terminations, which seem to be used interchangeably with -πουλος): Ameropoulos, Argyropoulos (Romanos III, also called Argyros), Chaasanopoulos, Domestikopoulos, Drakontopoulos(?), Iatropolos, Iberopoulos, Kardamopoulos, Lazaropoulos, Longibardopoulos, Maniakopoulos, Marzapoulos, Metretopoulos, Metropoulos, Oumbertopoulos, Pentaïlopoulos, Pharakopoulos, Philippopoulos(?), Phrangopoulos, Politopolos, Rousopoulos, Sagopoulos, Saponopoulos, more Sarakenopouloi, Skleropoulos, Spanopoulos (many examples), Symponopoulos, Syropoulos, Theophilopoulos, Tourkopoulos, Tourmarchopoulos, Xylopoulos.[18] The list contains many names derived from ethnic markers and a smaller group from dignities and offices.

One thinks instinctively of this as a popular form bubbling up from below, but this is not the whole story. There is an important Frankish general in Byzantine service at the end of the 11th cen-

---

20104, Niketas 20161 and Niketas 20165 all have the surname (E)panokomites. They are currently (1 July 2007) classified as four separate individuals, but it is most unlikely that there are more than two persons involved. See also Anonymus 20197, the Bishop of Alabanda.

[17] I have found no recent study of this onomastic pattern; but as there are many contexts where one could have been published, I may have missed something.

[18] Reference to sources for these names (nearly all seals) may be found at http://www.pbw.kcl.ac.uk by selecting the factoid type "Second name".

tury called by Anna Komnene "Konstantinos Oumbertopoulos" in her impeccably Atticist text.[19] Seals have been published since the 1980s, mainly from Bulgaria, belonging to Konstantinos Oumbertos, who (it was suggested) might be Oumbertopoulos's father, otherwise unknown (presumably Humbert, whatever the spelling and pronunciation appropriate for his origin in western Europe). But each newly published seal pushed Oumbertos later, tying him closer to the dates and career of the son, Oumbertopoulos. Last year two older seals were published belonging to another Oumbertos, without forename, attributed by the editor to a father.[20] Thus the man called Oumbertopoulos by Anna called himself on his seals Konstantinos Oumbertos: his father was Oumbertos, *tout court*, as the single-word name of the original migrant regularly becomes the family name of his descendants. Why did Anna call the son Oumbertopoulos? I am currently testing the theory that the -opoulos ending, despite probable vernacular roots, took on in the learned language the force of the American "Junior", to distinguish between homonyms. Perhaps more seals will be discovered giving names without the -opoulos suffix parallel to names attested in narrative texts which do include the suffix.

We should now turn from 11th-century language to structures within which it may be viewed.[21]

* * *

Modern Greece has existed for less than two centuries since the Revolution of 1821. However, it is generally agreed inside and

---

[19] Ed. Reinsch and Kambylis 2001. References are listed in the index of vol. 2, pp. 44-5 (Konstantinos 14).

[20] All the seals are published together at Jordanov 2006: 312-15, though without a full commentary.

[21] Up to this point, this paper has been giving fairly precise information and supporting it with detailed notes. Its style will now change: it will largely work with well-known facts and patterns of the history of Greek, putting them together to point out terminological difficulties. Full annotation would be inappropriate, but I have tried to give references over controversial issues.

outside the country that the Greeks have a much longer history. That history is notoriously difficult to define: let me briefly rehearse the problems to introduce what follows, while spelling out the details to avoid misapprehensions.[22] Since the middle of the 15th century Greek speakers were a majority in the "Rum millet" of the Ottoman Empire, a population institutionalised as Christian and Roman and who named their spoken language "Romaic". For the millennium before 1453, Greek speakers had dominated another Constantinople-based multicultural empire which was Christian and called itself "Roman", but has since been rechristened "Byzantine". Byzantines rarely accepted a Greek identity: in fact words from the root (H)ellen-, the ethnic marker for Greeks common to Ancient and Modern Greek, usually in Byzantium meant "pre-Christian, pagan". From the modern point of view, this may seem mere terminological confusion; after all, a few educated Byzantines at several periods began to use (H)ellen- words of themselves. But this practice was not consistent till the 18th century, and probably not generalised to the majority of the population till the years around 1821.[23] Whatever sentiment (or nationalism) may say, it cannot be ignored that most Greek speakers from the 4th to the 18th centuries identified with Christianity and name-words from the root Rom-, making occasional use of (H)ellen-based words as signs of a past identity superseded by Christianity.

Other definitions of Greek identity before 1821 are equally problematic. Racial continuity from Ancient to Modern Greece was clearly diluted by barbarian migrations in Late Antiquity, followed later by major influxes of Slavs and Albanians. These points were made in a racist and provocative way by Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer, and caused outrage in Greece. But the case, if put in a restrained and scholarly manner, is unanswerable.[24]

---

[22] For this and much of what follows, see Browning 1983, Horrocks 1997.

[23] See Holton 1984-5.

[24] Fallmerayer's attack and the Greek reaction are both put into context by Veloudis 1970 and Veloudis 1982.

Indeed, it is difficult to define what racial continuity could mean anywhere in the world over a period of two millennia, without proof of strong barriers to migration. As well as large migrations there were constant smaller movements: in the 11th century alone numerous military commanders from several non-Greek sources joined the Byzantine and Greek-speaking elite with their retainers (like Oumbertopoulos's father). Eleventh-century Athonite documents, for example, written in Chalkidiki, may include (as well as conventional-sounding Byzantines with Greek names) a cast of first- or second-generation Byzantine landowners and officers of French or Armenian or Georgian descent and mixed populations including peasant families with Slavic names. The information is provided in learned Greek by well-educated officials. The documents involve many identities and languages, and varied genes.[25]

All, of course, would have called themselves Christians, and Orthodoxy is a major link from Byzantium through to Modern Greece. However Orthodoxy is too broad a category to serve as a marker for Greeks. In the first half of the Middle Ages it included all Christendom, before the split into Eastern Orthodox and Catholic western segments, which became definitive in 1204. Later, beside the Greek church, the Slavic orthodox became institutionalised as a parallel flock, united with their Greek co-religionists in nearly everything but the marks of Greek identity we are seeking.[26]

It is also tempting to use geography as a definition of Greekness. Compare maps of the archaic period of Ancient Greece (during its migrations) with the Byzantium of the 12th century (shrunken by Turkish invasions in the 11th) and Greece around 1920 (after the gains of the Balkan Wars and the Treaty of Sèvres but before the losses of the Asia Minor campaign). There are significant differences, but striking similarities. They might lead

---

[25] The largest collection of such documents is Lemerle, Guillou and Svoronos 1970, but monasteries like Iviron (primarily for Georgians), give a better sense of the multiculturalism of the area: see Lefort et al. 1985-90.

[26] An accessible introduction to this subject is Obolensky 1971: 237-71.

to the assumption of a Greek heartland which expanded into great empires with Alexander the Great, then shrank to its previous size towards the end of Byzantium and disappeared altogether as an independent state, to be reconstituted at its original size after the first century of Modern Greece. In this scenario, Greece's eventual modern borders might represent contraction to an even more fundamental heartland, perhaps archaic Greece before the migrations.

The geographical similarity of Ancient and Modern Greece has an insidious influence on all thinking on such questions. One must remember that nearly all those involved in setting the boundaries of modern Greece had a map of Ancient Greece on their schoolroom walls. In fact, there may be a good deal of truth in the first hypothesis above, that the shrinking of Byzantium represented (roughly speaking) a retreat to areas where Greek was a secure native language. However it is much more difficult to accept the second stage of the proposal, implying a Hellenic heartland in the Greek peninsula during the Turkish period. The population there appears less homogeneous and acculturated to Hellenism than, say, in areas nearer Constantinople. In fact comparative Turkish weakness is more likely to have determined where Greek independence was declared than comparative strength of Hellenic feeling. The Turkish presence in the Peloponnese was less than further east, leaving more opportunities for revolt. Geographical influences are more likely after the uprising, when revolution gave famous ancient names their full symbolic force.

If race, religion and geography all give uncertain results, how has a consensus arisen for the acceptance of a long history for the Modern Greeks? The answer is obvious, and has already been implied several times here by the use of "Greek-speakers" for the blunter but more problematic term "Greeks". The only secure index of past Greeks and a Greek past is the Greek language. Greek is a distinct member of the Indo-European language group, not easily confused with others. Its characteristic script has also helped it stay separate. Though some dialects show considerable

variation from majority norms, Greek has never looked like being divided politically like Romance in Western Europe, where differences between several descendants of Latin are now used against each other to reinforce national borders. The relationship of Cyprus to the Greek centre has always been different.

Languages may be used to attempt a historical trace of their users, providing a more acceptable and modern variant of racial descent. Greek carries in itself references to the history and culture of its speakers. Much of Greek food involves Turkish and Middle Eastern vocabulary (and taste), stressing linguistic influences around half a millennium old. On another level the disappearance of the Greek infinitive marks links between Greek and the Slavic languages to its north a millennium or so ago. Other linguistic changes show their importance by covering all elements of Greek. The best example is aphaeresis (the disappearance of unstressed initial vowels), which in Greek had results ranging from the omission of the unstressed augment in verbs through many vocabulary items to the conflation of the preposition εἰς with the article to form στό(ν), στή(ν) etc. The pervasiveness of this change throughout the language makes a suggestive link between contemporary Greek-speakers and past Greek linguistic communities in which aphaeresis developed. It is prominent in Egyptian papyri and remained so during the Byzantine period (witness [E]panokomites). However this feature is not of automatic significance for our purposes as it is not exclusive to Greek.

In trying to use linguistic history as a real part of the identity of a contemporary Greek, I suggest that there are three main patterns worth emphasis. Two have already been pursued in Greece with special vigour at different times for varying national purposes, and both have been well studied. The third, so far comparatively ignored, needs more prominence. That would make it easier to find a title for this talk.

The first of the three is the attempt to establish direct descent of the Modern Greeks from the revered ancients. As discussed above, this was not self-evident even for most Greek-speakers

before the 18th century. However in the years around 1821 it became essential to link the cause of Greek independence with Classical Studies, then a primary academic discipline in all the world's universities. This might lead to much-needed loans for the war, and also to the acceptance of a Greek state formed by revolution in the strongly anti-revolutionary climate of post-Napoleonic Europe. This story, told many times, includes a prominent place for folklore and archaeology in 19th-century Greek education, both in truncated forms stressing links between the 5th century B.C. and the 19th A.D., disregarding stages in between. In fact the initial historiography of the Modern Greek state ignored Byzantium. However, those demanding links to Ancient Greece had to postulate some level of Greek continuity during the Byzantine period: this concept was suggested by Zambelios (1859) and fully worked out by Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos (1860-77), making a triptych of Greek periods, Ancient, Byzantine and Modern, a pattern which has dominated Modern Greek historiography.[27] Linguistic policies too tried to bridge the gap to the ancients: there was an obsession with teaching Ancient Greek subjects and the use of archaic forms of language as the medium of education, reaching as far as the establishment of the artificial learned language *katharevousa* as the national language of Modern Greece. The self-projection of Greeks as descendants of the great ancestors is quite successful internationally to this day: it probably contributed, for example, to early entry of Greece into the European Community. The policy was naturally prominent at the Athens Olympic Games of 2004.

However, the results of the equivalent policy inside Greece were crippling, especially in education. Ancient subjects were allotted more hours than in Western Europe, where they already had privileged status: other subjects suffered. But the greatest problem was the failure to develop a Greek language fit for a nation in the modern world. The multilayered and informal status of Greek under Ottoman rule needed to be regularised when it

[27] Again Veloudis 1970 or 1982 gives a nuanced guide.

resumed the full status of a national language. The foundation of the new state increased both the need for a national language and the means to standardise and impose it. Demotic, based on the spoken language, was rather underdeveloped, but it is easy now to see that it was the only possible basis for education towards a national language. Yet it was systematically sidelined in favour of *katharevousa*, which came to have no consistency in any dimension of language apart from a determination to avoid taboos of spoken demotic. The Language Question developed into a major national debate, politicising language education and the discipline of linguistics. It became almost impossible to write a Greek sentence without taking a political stance, and unusual to bother describing how Greeks used their language before beginning normative correction.

Criticisms of the obsession with antiquity were made at every level by the demoticist movement in the hundred years before the solution of 1976. That century saw a series of linguistic events that meshed unpredictably with other forces in Greek history.[28] There were deaths in riots called by conservative academics against demotic translations of important texts from the past. *Katharevousa* was established as the national language by the left-of-centre Venizelos, while Triantafyllidis (1938), the prime demotic grammar, was produced under the semi-fascist Metaxas. Right-wing governments with foreign support after the Second World War promoted *katharevousa*, and later, just when it seemed about to be set aside, it was reimposed by the Junta of 1967-1974. Most developments since Metaxas tended to radicalise Greek academics and non-Greek students of Modern Greece (like myself) as demoticists. Demotic was established after the Junta as the national language and language of education, and has hardly been challenged since. There are still passionate disputes over Greek linguistic politics, mainly with a demoticist agenda, but within a similar range to disputes in other language communities.

---

[28] The complex story is told by Dimaras (1973-4), with a fascinating collection of relevant documents.

The demoticists' view of the Greek linguistic past is the second of the patterns I wish to discuss. It was a combination of opposites: on the one hand, they emphasised long continuity in the written use of demotic within the otherwise learned framework of Byzantine Greek, to establish demotic as the natural consummation of Greek linguistic history, countering parallel claims for the status of *katharevousa*.[29] But at crucial moments later, the emphasis was on exclusion of anything learned. A major (and far from unjustified) motivation was the need to develop a canon of texts to be read in support of a demotic national language. This led to the dating of the beginnings of Modern Greek literature early in the 16th century, with implications, not always explicit, that this should also mark a major point in the periodisation of the language. Much of the opposition to demotic came from Phanariots from Constantinople, many of whom supported the use of learned Greek. It was easy to stigmatise the Byzantines as their direct predecessors, and to despise the vernacular texts of the Byzantine period, many of which included a mixture of learned forms.

An interesting set of papers defining the beginnings of Modern Greek literature and culture is published in the first session of the proceedings of the conference on that subject organised in Venice in 1991 and edited by Nikos Panagiotakis.[30] After Nikos's own introduction, discussion is continued by Giorgos Savvidis, Mario Vitti, Hans Eideneier, Stylianos Alexiou and Eratosthenes Kapsomenos. Despite the prominence of the occasion and the distinguished list of speakers, the results are rather disappointing. All agree in setting the beginning of Modern Greek literature around 1500. The major dating criterion, suggested by Savvidis (1993), is the first printing of demotic texts (*Apokopos* in 1509), though this rather arbitrary date is not supported with confidence. Another general motivation is to parallel Western European literatures in their division into medieval and modern

[29] This is a major strand in demoticist publication, from early scholarly texts like Psichari 1886-9 through to late controversial works like Mesevrinos 1974.
[30] Panayotakis 1993.

phases, discussed especially by Alexiou. I shall return to this later. Only Eideneier, without disagreeing over the dating of the beginning of Modern Greek literature, points out at length that this literary periodisation does not correspond to linguistic criteria: he observes that a millennium or more before 1500 a form of Greek had emerged with close ties to modern demotic in morphology, syntax and vocabulary – not to mention phonology.

The remarks of Eideneier (1993) lead to the third of the frameworks for studying Greek linguistic history, that which I think is underused. It is interesting that Eideneier is the only one of the group to use language to discuss periodisation of literature. The literatures listed by Alexiou (1993) as Western European comparators are French, German, English, Spanish and Italian. All these names, as he says, are single words, allowing the use of a temporal adjective to add details of periodisation (*ancien français*, Middle English etc.). Modern Greek includes one temporal adjective (or, more usually, prefix) as an integral part of its name, making the use of a second very difficult. "Old Modern Greek" and "παλαιά νεοελληνικά" are impossible, and even "Early Modern Greek" and "πρώιμα νεοελληνικά" are problematic, especially when users less familiar with the articulation of the phrase give the adjective or prefix independent weight. This terminological problem is discussed by Alexiou and mentioned by others of the Venice speakers. But in my view it is much less serious than another, arising from the same cause.

Alexiou's five comparative languages are all regularly said to have origins before or around the middle of the first millennium A.D., or later for English, if Old English (Anglo-Saxon) is classified as a separate language. The Greek language spoken today also developed out of the Koine around the 3rd century A.D., as Eideneier remarked and I shall discuss in a minute. But the parallel is rarely made. When naming a modern language, it is surely appropriate to define it backwards, from the present back to the last linguistic event marking a break, before which the language might deserve a different name. This definition, I submit, should be based on the history of the spoken language, disregard-

ing written texts except as evidence for speech. On this basis let me propose a periodisation of the history of the Greek language, in the same schematic style as the rest of this discussion. The argument can only lead to relative judgements, because objectivity is impossible in the definition of a break between one language or linguistic phase and another.

If one looks at the sweep of the Greek language from Homer to 2007, two moments of change in its spoken form stand out, making three periods, Greek A, Greek B and Greek C (this nomenclature is used because of the difficulties in terminology we are trying to address).[31] Greek A (Ancient Greek) was a language with strong cantonal divisions into different dialects, which were slowly breaking down in the 5th and 4th centuries under the influence of population mixture, especially in Athens. Greek B (shifting structures of Koine or common languages) has a sudden beginning at the conquests of Alexander. The slow breakdown seen in Greek A was suddenly and massively increased, as a language of small city-states had to be adapted to administer a vast empire, first as a whole and then in parts. By migration and other forms of linguistic imperialism, the numbers of speakers of Greek and then the number of native speakers was massively increased, and their geographical spread became much wider. The natural effects of this were the disappearance of dialects (hence Koine), and a number of sharp linguistic simplifications of Greek, which it is unnecessary to describe here. The 3rd century B.C. marks for Greek a linguistic revolution, a change in the history of Greek which, under other circumstances, could easily have caused a division into different languages. However, no political pressures for division appeared.

Greek B began as an imperialistic and victorious language, but gradually lost both these characteristics. The states following Alexander were picked off one by one by the Romans, and the Koine became the victim of imperialism, the language by which the Romans administered the numerically larger eastern half of the

[31] Much of what follows is indebted to the ideas of Kapsomenos (1958).

empire's population. Yet the unity of Roman administration did not bring stability in spoken Greek. Evidence is not of the kind to permit precise dating, but it is clear that after the revolution in the decades following Alexander, deep structural change continued more slowly but persistently, probably faster in the new, eastern, extensions of Greek speech than in Old Greece: the changes were eventually completed there too. Before the foundation of Constantinople in the early 4th century A.D., the verb was fundamentally reconstructed in Greek speech and there were major changes in nouns, involving the fatal weakening of the dative case. There was considerable influence from Latin. At the same time there were radical alterations in pronunciation and other tidyings and simplifications, less easy to categorise. It was during this period that formal Greek diglossia was introduced, probably through a nervous sense of linguistic change felt as disintegration, mirroring consciousness of political subjection. The Atticist movement of the 1st century B.C. insisted on a return in writing to the Attic of Greek freedom and cultural success in the 5th century B.C. It was very effective, completely dominating many surviving texts and leaving a firm imprint on most others.

Linguistic genesis is less easy to document than change and disintegration. During the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., the informal levels of the language found in Egyptian papyri show increasing signs of a spoken language structured like modern demotic in morphology, syntax, vocabulary and phonology. The evidence is not consistent, with many older forms still surviving, and Atticist influence clouds the picture. Linguistic historians are helped in tracing what is happening by knowledge of later developments. There was a marked slowing of the pace of linguistic change. This is the beginning of Greek C. Even as spoken around 400 A.D. it was very much closer to Greek of the 21st century, 1600 years later, than to that of, say, Aristotle, at the end of Greek A, some 700 years before. The development of the language slowly continued. There were still many changes to consolidate, new developments to absorb, and influences to be undergone from west and east. But these alterations may be

characterised as normal linguistic evolution, rather than the revolutionary movements seen since the end of Greek A. In reading F. T. Gignac's careful and comprehensive studies of the Greek of the Egyptian papyri, I feel I am watching the birth of the Modern Greek spoken language.[32] It is a pity that papyrus grew and papyrus records were preserved in the valley of the Nile, rather than, say, the Vardar. In the latter case, the history of Modern Greek might have been written differently.

It is worth making two comments at this point, one looking back, one forward. First, the change from Greek A to Greek C is sharp, but less dramatic, for example, than that from Latin to French. Greek remained an inflected language operating with noun and verb terminations, while French has changed its linguistic type from Latin, losing many terminations and depending on word order, like English. Second, the beginning of Greek C coincided roughly in time with three other developments which have appeared in these pages: the foundation of the first Constantinople-based multicultural empire, institutionalised adoption of Christianity and the shift in identification of Greek-speakers from (H)ellen-based names to Rom-based names. Only in an impressionistic survey like this could it be hinted that the language change might have any link to the other three.

Greek C was from the start dominated by diglossia. The Atticists of the 1st century B.C. had tried to turn back the linguistic clock to the 5th. This motivation was just as strong for learned classicists of the 1st to 4th centuries A.D.,[33] especially the Christians, who had now inherited a second level of even more privileged text in the Greek translation of the Old Testament and the original of the New, written in the Koine. Though biblical language was simple, spoken Greek C slowly distanced itself from it. Learned 4th-century theologians, the greatest in the history of Orthodoxy, combined their two past linguistic heritages by writing exemplary Attic, whilst quoting the Bible verbatim in its non-

---

[32] Gignac 1976 and 1981.
[33] See, e.g., Bowie 1970.

current but less learned Greek. The chance of maintaining Christian texts at the near-vernacular level of the Bible was rejected, and the elites of ecclesiastical and secular learning were thus united in support of Atticism. The apparatus of Roman/Byzantine government was then moving from Latin to Greek. Predictably, it followed the example of other elite groups and set the administrative language level in the Atticist range. A major characteristic of Greek C, from the beginning to 1975, was its inability to win over ruling elites. One could say that it always came with a large superstructure of denial, one or more learned languages which controlled the written word and excluded the spoken language from surviving evidence. Did this at the beginning imply repression of some part of Byzantine society by another, or is it better to use the model of spoken and written languages existing harmoniously in parallel, each for its own purposes? Increased investigation of evidence for the spoken language will bring interesting answers.

Greek C has now lasted around sixteen centuries. In my view there are no signs of dramatic changes in oral language significant enough to provide robust periodisation within this time. But since linguistic history abhors so long a continuum, I will discuss two possibilities which may be of use in a subsidiary way. Both probably involve more changes in secondary dimensions, like written Greek and the general political and social context of the language, than in speech. The more prominent of the two involves the 19th- and 20th-century development of Greek as the national language of the modern state. Like all linguistic developments of the last two centuries, this must be viewed within an international framework involving issues like the spread of universal education, large-scale urbanisation and the introduction of mass media. All these factors serve to iron out differences within language communities, but are global phenomena which need special care in application to individual languages. However, the intensity of the Greek Language Question, especially its insistence on education in archaic forms, had specifically Greek results, even allowing for the international factors mentioned. Details have been given

above. The spoken language was not immune. One of my earliest Greek memories, for example, is listening to a televised oration of the 1967 Junta strongman Georgios Papadopoulos. I was in a room with democratic university students who delighted in correcting his mistakes in *katharevousa* and general linguistic incompetence. I was left in no doubt how completely 20th-century Greek education could fail, even at the oral level.

The second and less plausible break in the oral course of Greek C is in 1453 at the end of Byzantium, or some time in the next century, as suggested by several of those speaking at the Venice conference. This change represents the uncoupling of the language from government at the fall of Constantinople, just as the example discussed above begins with a recoupling to a fresh state with Greek independence in 1821. The surviving evidence on the earlier break is only a fraction of that available on the later, though a major Cambridge research project is doing all it can to remedy the situation. I shall concentrate a little on this earlier break, as one of the purposes of this paper is to cast doubt on the significance often implied for it.

Let us begin by summing up the information and comments already provided here about the ideological aspects of this proposed division. Nearly all views of the past current in 19th-century Greece traced Greek history in a full sense back to around 1500, and assumed a degree of further continuity back to antiquity. But different emphasis was given to different parts of this continuum. Adherents of the learned language stressed the ancient end, and found Byzantium an inconvenient (though unavoidable) interruption that strained their arguments. Demoticists gave weight to the modern language. Ancient and Byzantine Greek were an important introduction to the main linguistic narrative which climaxed in modern demotic: but the Byzantine phase was suspect because of the mixed nature of the vernacular texts it produced, the learned environment, dominated by the language of Byzantine intellectuals, and the obvious similarities of the latter to their geographical successors, the Phanariots. No text from the Byzantine period has made it into the full demoticist canon. Both

sides in the Language Question thus were lukewarm about Byzantium. Equally, Byzantines did not help their cause by calling themselves Romans, regarding Christian religious identification as more important than any nationalism, and failing to avoid the adjective "medieval", the one epithet to rival "Byzantine" in negative connotations. The vernacular of the Byzantine period and its literature came thus to be separated from Modern Greece by more than one ideological framework, despite little evidence of change in spoken language. The superstructure has had much more influence on terminology than underlying popular speech.

I have recently turned against application of the word "medieval" to Byzantium, despite being organiser of a conference in the *Neograeca Medii Aevi* series, contributing Byzantine articles to Dictionaries of the Middle Ages and advising the Grammar of Medieval Greek project. The concept of the Middle Ages is known to all and provides easy chronological reference. But the Italian humanists like Petrarch in the fourteenth century and Leonardo Bruni in the fifteenth who developed the idea, and Bruni's contemporary Flavio Biondo who coined the phrase, were speaking about the Latin West. Petrarch felt himself to be in the Dark Ages, while his successors were conscious of living at the dawn of a new era of intellectual vitality, and called the period from the end of Rome to their day the Middle Age. One of the most important of the reasons for this change of attitudes was the arrival in Italy of Manuel Chrysoloras and other Byzantine exiles, bringing knowledge of Plato, Aristotle and other ancient Greek writers, whom Bruni himself did much to translate and popularise.[34] The Fall of Constantinople has often been used to date the

[34] Bruni and Biondi together form a vital stage in the development of modern historiography. From my limited reading on this huge subject I will recommend two articles. Ferguson (1939) describes the change from the preliminary collection of references to rebirth and words implying "middle" to more subtle methods. Ianziti (1998) shows Bruni learning to be a historian by translating Plutarch, then rejecting Plutarch's *Cicero* and writing his own version. Later he was able to amend the historical details of other Italian periods and his historiographical approach to them by reading Polybius against Livy and Procopius against Latin histories of

end of the Middle Ages, not because of parallels between Greek and Latin developments, but because collapse in the East added vitality to the West. It is possible to disparage the actual historical results of the arrival of Byzantine envoys and migrants, but not to deny the importance, real and psychological, of the skills and knowledge they brought to Italian humanism.

In historiographical practice, the western Middle Ages show several tendencies opposite to those of the Byzantine East. In the broadest terms, the western narrative began with immediate political fragmentation, collapse of cities and decline of learning, industry and trade. Later, the tendency in many areas was to develop centralised nation-states, drawing many modern lines on the map of Europe. Latin preserved a learned linguistic form for scholarship and international communication, but vernacular Latin divided into separate spoken dialects, which became indices of nationality. Once vernacular literatures eventually appeared they were abundant and successful. In the East, this narrative is reversed. The same period began with a powerful centralised state, much more resilient than in the west. Though it lost territory to the Arabs and its cities declined for a time, it never lost its bureaucratic strength. But in the 11th century Turkish invasions began in the east, followed by attacks from the west, culminating in the loss of its capital in the Fourth Crusade. After a brief revival, the 14th and 15th centuries showed steady decline till 1453. The Balkans and Asia Minor became an undifferentiated and multicultural empire under Ottoman control. Learned Greek was the foundation of Byzantine bureaucracy. Written vernacular Greek appeared later than in the west, probably because Byzantine centralism limited the need for localised and competitive cultural production. When vernacular levels appeared, they showed few dialect features, and remained in constant relation to more learned literature.

---

the wars of Justinian. Both Ferguson and Ianziti stress the key role played by the rediscovery of Greek, which showed that there were dimensions beyond the medieval Latin tradition.

In view of these differences, to label Greek written in Byzantine times "medieval" seems to me rather like calling 19th-century architecture in Greece "Victorian". The label conveys a convenient chronological meaning, but its implications are wrong. If they were ever taken seriously, they could cause real confusion. It is only a little less serious (and probably less historically excusable) than the attachment of the unqualified adjective "Greek" exclusively to the ancient language, which is the source of the problem discussed in this paper. To this we must now return.

If my subject were a western European language, I could have used the title "French (or whatever) in the 11th century" with no trace of discomfort. It would be immediately understood that reference was to the spoken language of the area concerned in that century, together with the writing based on it and giving evidence of it. Since my subject is Greek, I have more choices, but none is satisfactory. "Greek" and "Byzantine Greek" would reference the learned language, and the former in many circumstances would imply a framework overbalanced towards Thucydides and Homer, which I do not want. "Medieval Greek", aside from other problems I have raised, would be tautological in this title, since its reference is largely chronological, and would form a less precise duplicate of "in the 11th century". "Modern Greek" at that date, as I have said, is rather an oxymoron and raises uncomfortable ideological hackles (exploited in this paper). "Romaic" has superficial attractions, until one realises that it lacks the most important element of continuity, the period from 1821 to the present. Perhaps the most satisfactory available title would use "Vernacular Greek", but the adjective sends out confused messages to the linguist, while giving the learned language the primacy in definition, implying that the spoken language is a secondary variant rather than the other way round.

The second part of this paper has been an exploration of the terminological impasse in which I find myself, hung on the hook provided by the first part. I hope I am not alone in thinking this a problem for Neohellenists and Byzantinists alike. I have discussed some of the prejudices causing the confusion and argued against

some of the solutions suggested, whilst trying to offend nobody. Maybe the discipline of linguistics already has a solution which I have yet to hear – perhaps the careful extension of one of the terms used here, or a good new label for "Greek C" that will catch on, hopefully, outside academia as well as inside it. It happens that my interest in the subject I profess, apart from teaching the post-1976 national language of Greece, centres round the relationship of speakers of Greek C at different dates with what I have called its superstructure. For half of the language's history so far, there seems to have been little desire to write it, and so study is limited to indirect evidence, scraps and influences of the sort described in the first part of this paper. This is an extreme case of a characteristic which rather reduces the excitement of studying most of the oldest continuously spoken languages of Europe. I hope that future students of Greek in this phase will have an easier time with their terminology than I have.

References

Alexiou, S. (1993). "Η ορολογία των περιόδων της λογοτεχνίας μας", in: Panayotakis 1993, pp. 54-60

Benešević, V. (1911). *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catharinae in Monte Sina asservantur.* St Petersburg, repr. Hildesheim 1965

Benešević, V. (1917). *Taktikon Nikona Chernogortsa.* St Petersburg

Bowie, E. L. (1970). "Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic", *Past and Present* 46, 3-41

Browning. R. (1983). *Medieval and Modern Greek.* 2nd ed. Cambridge

De Vries-Van der Velden, E. (1999). "Les amitiés dangereuses: Psellos et Léon Paraspondylos", *Byzantinoslavica* 60, 315-50

Dennis, G. T. (ed.) (1994). Michael Psellus, *Orationes forenses et acta.* Stuttgart-Leipzig

Dimaras, A. (1973-4). *Η μεταρρύθμιση που δεν έγινε.* 2 vols. Athens

Eideneier, H. (1993). "Αναζητώντας τις αρχές της νεοελληνικής γραμματείας", in: Panayotakis 1993, pp. 42-9

Ferguson, W. K. (1939). "Humanist Views of the Renaissance", *American Historical Review* 45, 1-28

Gignac, F. T. (1976). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods, I: Phonology*. Milan

Gignac, F. T. (1981). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods II: Morphology*. Milan

Holton, D. (1984-5). "Ethnic identity and patriotic idealism in the writings of General Makriyannis", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 9, 133-60

Horrocks, G. (1997). *Greek: a History of the language and its speakers*. London and New York

Ianziti, G. (1998). "Bruni on writing history", *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, 367-391

Jeffreys, M. J. (1974). "The nature and origins of the political verse", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 27, 115-39

Jordanov, I. (2006). *Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria II: Byzantine seals with family names*. Sofia

Kambylis, A. (ed.) (1976). Symeon Neos Theologos, *Hymnen*. Berlin-New York

Kapsomenos, S. G. (1958). "Die griechische Sprache zwischen Koine und Neugriechisch", *Berichte zum XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongress*. Munich

Kurtz, E. and Drexl, F. (1941). Michaelis Pselli *Scripta minora* II. Milan

Lauxtermann, M. D. (1999). *The Spring of Rhythm. An essay on the political verse and other Byzantine metres*. Vienna

Lefort, J., Oikonomidès, N., Papachrysanthou, D., Métrévéli, H., Kravari, V. and others (1985-90). *Actes d'Iviron*. 2 vols. Paris

Lemerle, P., Guillou, A. and Svoronos, N. (1970). *Actes de Laura. Première partie, des origines a 1204*. Paris

Maltese, E. V. (1988). "Epistole inedite di Michele Psello III", *Studi Italiani di Filologia Greca* 6, 110-34

Mesevrinos (1974). *Η προδομένη γλώσσα*. Athens

Obolensky, D. (1971). *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. London

ODB (1991). *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan. 3 vols. New York-Oxford

Oikonomides, N. (1986). *A collection of dated lead seals*. Washington DC

Panayotakis, N. M. (ed.) (1993). *Origini della letteratura neogreca. Atti del secondo congresso internazionale "Neograeca Medii Aevi"*. Vol. 1. Venice

Papaioannou, E. N. (1998). "Das Briefcorpus des Michael Psellos. Vorarbeiten zu einer kritischen Neuedition", *Jahrbuch der Österrieichschen Byzantinistik* 48, 67-117

Paparrigopoulos, K. (1860-77). *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. 2 vols. Athens

Psichari, J. (1886-9). *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*. 2 vols. Paris

Reinsch, D. R. and Kambylis, A. (eds.) (2001). Annae Comnenae *Alexias*. 2 vols. Berlin-New York

Savvidis, G. (1993). "Πότε άραγες αρχίζει η νεότερη ελληνική λογοτεχνία", in: Panayotakis 1993, pp. 37-41

Sathas, K. N. (1874). *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*. IV.Paris

Triantafyllidis, M. (1938). *Νεοελληνική γραμματική*. Athens

Tsolakis, E. D. (1968). *Η συνέχεια της Χρονογραφίας του Ιωάννου Σκυλίτση*. Thessaloniki

Veloudis, G. (1970). "Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer und die Entstehung des neugriechschen Historismus", *Südostforschungen* 29, 43-90

Veloudis, G. (1982). *Ο Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer και η γένεση του ελληνικού ιστορισμού*. Athens

Westerink, L. G. (ed.) (1992). Michael Psellus, *Poemata*. Stuttgart-Leipzig

Zambelios, S. (1859). *Πόθεν η κοινή λέξις τραγουδώ;* Athens

Zepos, I and P. (1931). *Ius graecoromanum*. Vol. 4. Athens

Recording the history of the "Cretan War" (1645-1669): an overview*

Tassos A. Kaplanis
University of Cyprus

The present paper originates in my research on Ioakeim Kyprios's *Book called Struggle*, i.e. *Battle of the Turks against the most venerable and most illustrious Grand Ruler and Prince of the most illustrious City of Venice.*[1] Ioakeim's *Struggle* was the subject of my Cambridge PhD dissertation[2] and the critical edition of the text, which is currently in its final stage of preparation, is expected to appear in 2009 in the publication series of the Cyprus Research Centre (Nicosia). Ioakeim's text attracted scholarly attention in the 20th century, because it was thought that it could potentially serve as a historical source for the Ottoman-Venetian conflict of the years 1645-1669 over the predominantly Greek-populated island of Crete;[3] its presentation as a vernacular Greek

* I would like to express my gratitude to the supervisor of my PhD dissertation at the University of Cambridge, Prof. David Holton, for his invaluable help in the preparation of this study; my due thanks also to Dr Paul Ries of the same University, to my historian friend in Italy Panos Stamatellos and to my wife, Athina Valdramidou, who all read a more or less final draft of it and made useful suggestions. I am always indebted to Prof. Emmanuel Kriaras for encouraging me to undertake the task of editing *Struggle* and for facilitating my research in all possible ways.

[1] The original title is "Βιβλίον ονομαζόμενον Πάλη, ήγουν μάχη των Τουρκών μετά του ευσεβεστάτου και εκλαμπροτάτου μεγάλου αυθεντός και πριντσίπου της λαμπροτάτης Βενετίας". All translations of quotes and italicizations, unless otherwise stated, are mine.

[2] Kaplanis 2003.

[3] This is the main point of Tomadakis (1947), who was the first to bring *Struggle* to the attention of the scholarly public – except, of course, for the entry in Litzica 1909 (= the catalogue of Greek manuscripts of the

history of the "Cretan War" by Emmanuel Kriaras (1962) reinforced the expectations concerning the historical information it could provide and, despite some, rather biased, objections that have been expressed,[4] one should regard these expectations as being still valid.[5] Given all this, it would be sensible, if not highly desirable, for the modern editor of *Struggle* to scrutinize its relation to the events of the "Cretan War" in order to evaluate the information it provides. A history of the "Cretan War" – and I mean a history that would make extensive use of available sources and that would concentrate on dates, events and "great" political figures – could have been used to control the accuracy of this information, had it been written. But it has not. Relevant scholarship – for all the general progress it has shown in the past thirty-five years – concerning the study of the "Cretan War" presents certain deficiencies and the analysis I will provide here simply aims to demonstrate why any discussion on the "Cretan War", at the present stage of research, could be nothing but introductory.

Ottoman-Venetian wars began in the 15th century as a result of the Ottoman expansion into the Balkan peninsula.[6] This expan-

---

Romanian Academy in Bucharest, where the autograph manuscript of *Struggle* is preserved to the present day).

[4] In a later publication, Tomadakis rejected the historical value of *Struggle* on the assumption that Ioakeim could not have been contemporary to the events of the "Cretan War" (see Tomadakis 1976: 41, n. 47); we now know that Ioakeim was contemporary to the events he described in *Struggle* (see Kaplanis 2005: 44-5; cf. Mavromatis 2005: 76).

[5] *Struggle* is regarded as a historical source that needs to be critically edited in Vincent 1970: 241, Vlassopoulou 2000: 15 and n. 16, and Kitromilides 2002: 40 and n. 26.

[6] The first encounter of the navies of the two powers took place in Kallipolis (May 1416) and resulted in success for the Venetians. The first full-scale war between Venice and the Ottomans was that of the years 1423-1430 and concerned the Ottoman conquest of Thessaloniki (March 1430) and Ottoman suzerainty over Thrace and Macedonia (see, conveniently, Shaw 1976: 47-9). Greek scholarship usually counts only those wars after the siege of Constantinople (May 1453) and considers the war of the years 1463-1479 – which was, indeed, the first large-scale/quasi-crusade operation of the Europeans against the Ottoman expansion into the Balkans – as the "first" Venetian-Turkish war (see e.g. Vakalopoulos 1968: 18-58).

sion, whether into the Balkans and the Aegean islands or into the Eastern Mediterranean basin, was taking place at the expense of Venetian colonization and trade and, because of this obvious clash of interests, the two powers were often dragged into wars. The so-called "Candian" or "Cretan War" of the years 1645-1669 was neither the first nor the last of such wars;[7] it was, however, the longest and, consequently, one of the most costly for both sides.[8] Its length, cost and casualties[9] can certainly explain the war's significance for its protagonists, i.e. the Ottomans, the Venetians and the Greeks, while, in parallel, the involvement of some European princes and political leaders of the time, mainly during the last phase of the war, would be a good enough reason to explain the interest that the war presented for, say, the King of France, the Habsburg monarchy and its allies or for Papal Rome.[10]

---

[7] "The Venetians were forced to face the Ottomans in seven hard wars (1463-1479, 1499-1503, 1537-1540, 1570-1573, 1645-1669, 1684-1699, 1715-1718)" (Chasiotis 2001: 187).

[8] This assumption is based mainly on the side-effects of the war, which can easily be traced in the trade of the period, for instance (see Faroqui 2000, esp. 510-19; her analysis is mainly based on Carter 1972, esp. 385-405, but, unfortunately, not on a monograph, which, nevertheless, needs to be undertaken in the future; for earlier wars see Mallett and Hale 1984). Some particular issues, such as the costs of ship-building, have been studied separately, in works dealing with the activities of arsenals: for the Ottoman Arsenal see Bostan 1992 (cf. Faroqui 2000: 461-5 for an account in English); for the Venetian *Arsenale* see Concina 1988 and for other Venetian arsenals in the Levant see Rossi 1998. However, given the present stage of both Ottoman and Venetian studies, it might be wiser to accept Shaw's vague comment that the fact "that both sides were able to carry on so long indicates that [...] both still had considerable wealth at their command" (Shaw 1976: 202) rather than subscribing to Vakalopoulos's assumption that "the high cost of this war has led both powers to financial decline" (see Vakalopoulos 1968: 525), no matter how probable it may seem.

[9] The matter of casualties is a complex one, since, as often happens in cases like this, each side makes its own estimations and these estimations are usually contradictory. Vakalopoulos discusses the problem and offers some numbers that need to be treated with caution (Vakalopoulos 1968: 525).

[10] Although generally reluctant to join Venice against the Ottomans and to listen to her continuous appeals, European princes did get involved in

But the significance attributed to this war by its contemporaries all over Europe – and I do not just mean monarchs, their courts and military officials – cannot be simply justified on the basis of the involvement of some members of the European nobility.

The war and, especially, the siege of the city of Candia and the resistance of its inhabitants "became the talk of Europe", as John Julius Norwich appositely remarks,[11] and the bulk of sources, written in many European languages and preserved to the present day in many archives and libraries, is the most significant manifestation of this interest of the European general public.[12] These sources include a great deal of official and semi-official correspondence and appeals, bureaucratic documents, diplomatic reports, military diaries, but also more popularized and, in many cases, more widely circulated informative pamphlets, panegyrical poems, travellers' accounts and historiographical works. Some attempts to gather them in bibliographical catalogues were undertaken already in the 19th and early 20th centuries, especially by specialists in Venetian history, such as Emanuelle A. Cicogna and Giuseppe Gerola.[13] There have also been attempts to edit some of

---

the "Cretan War" at some point, for better or worse: it has been argued that probably the worst enemy the Venetians faced during this war were not the Turks but their allies, whose assistance, "on the comparatively rare occasions when it was given at all, was grudging, half-hearted, inadequate or self-seeking" (Norwich 1983: 557).

[11] Norwich 1983: 552.

[12] I would still be hesitant about describing the "Cretan War" as "a historic event of *universal* importance" (Tomadakis 1976: 35), because such a phrasing indicates a myopic identification of the world with Europe. That is why I insist on the European dimension of the war's impact, although a broader Eurasian interest cannot be excluded, given the Ottoman involvement. Nevertheless, apart from the Ottoman sources, I have no knowledge of other Asian texts that would allow me to expand the war's dimensions to the Middle or the Far East.

[13] A milestone in Venetian bibliography was Cicogna's *Saggio di Bibliografia Veneziana* (Cicogna 1847; for the "Cretan War" see pp. 134-7 and 275-6) which retains its value not only for the richness of its information but for the extra reason that Cicogna's archive and library, including nearly all the works he consulted for the composition of his *Bibliografia*, have been preserved and may be found today in the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice. The bibliographical listings

them, but as Manoussos Manoussakas pointed out in his extremely useful "Brief review of researches on Venetian Crete",[14] "even today both the volume and the importance of the unedited and unexplored material, in comparison with that edited, is such, that we may well say that the latter is truly nothing but a drop in the ocean". Manoussakas's article was published in 1971 and although a few more drops have been added to this ocean since,[15] one still needs to subscribe to his pessimistic conclusion that "the time for the composition of an accurate history of Crete has not arrived yet".[16] Unfortunately, the same observation is also valid for historical syntheses with a much more limited scope, such as the "Cretan War".[17]

---

provided in Gerola 1905-32 and Kretschmayr 1934 and – for archival material – in Bernardy 1902 and Dujčev 1935 are still worth consulting.

[14] Manoussakas 1971: 294. It needs to be mentioned here that Manoussakas, remarkably, does not quote Cicogna 1847 (see previous note). Apart from Manoussakas's review, of similar importance are the critical bibliographical notes in Eickhoff 1991: 470-86.

[15] Among the various works that have appeared since 1971, the most important in their general scope are Panagiotakis 1988, Holton 1991 and Maltezou 1993, all rich in bibliographical references; ample material of all sorts may be found in the volumes of specialized conferences, such as *Venezia e Creta* (Ortalli 1998) or the published proceedings of the Conferences of Cretan Studies (the most recent being Detorakis and Kalokairinos 2004); for Greek literature in Venetian Crete and more recent editorial developments one may consult Manoussakas 1998, a notable follow-up to his 1971 article; finally, Ekkekakis's bibliographical compilation (Ekkekakis 1990 and 1991), though limited, is welcome as a step in the right direction.

[16] Manoussakas 1971: 293. In fact, this was Xanthoudidis's point in his *Επίτομος Ιστορία Κρήτης* (Xanthoudidis 1909: γ'-δ') and it is rather ironical that I am obliged to subscribe to it nearly a century later.

[17] There is no modern history of the "Cretan War" as such; however, some accounts of the war have been provided in the past in works with more general scope and objectives, such as the *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού* (Vakalopoulos 1968), the *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* (Chasiotis 1974), *Venezia e i Turchi* (Preto 1975) and *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi* (Eickhoff 1991); notably, none of these works is available in English (Vakalopoulos 1976 is a concise edition, not a full translation of Vakalopoulos 1968); for a brief account in English see Greene 2000: 13-22; more details are provided in Norwich 1983: 542-60 and, particularly, Setton 1991: 104-243 (the latter ignores/neglects most of the accounts

Although, as indicated earlier, some bibliographical listings of the main sources of the war have been compiled and could well serve as a starting point for future research, one needs to bear in mind that they are still far from being complete: uncatalogued works still come to light – and even more may be expected to be found when serious research is undertaken – while, on the other hand, there are also cases of important catalogued texts which have been long neglected and largely ignored. I will provide some examples: a few years ago, i.e. in May 2002, at the 2nd European Conference of Modern Greek Studies, Kostas Papadakis, librarian at the University Library of Rethymno, presented an unknown vernacular Greek poem entitled *The brave deeds of Lazaro Mocenigo* written by the author of *Evgena*, Teodoro Montselese.[18] The original title is: *Ανδραγαθίαν* [sic] *του εκλαμπροτάτου και ανδρειοτάτου Λαζάρου Μητζηνίγου, έτι δε και τα όσα εσυνέβησαν αναμεταξύ την γαληνοτάτην και χριστιανικοτάτην αυθεντίας* [sic] *των κλεινών Ενετιών κατά του Ισμαήλ επί της προστασίας του εκλαμπροτάτου καπετάν γενεράλε Λορέντζου Μαρτζέλλου έως την προστασίαν του καπετάν γενεράλε Λαζάρου Μητζηνίγου.* Προς τους αυτυχάνοντας [= εν-] τῳ παρόντι ποιήματι πάσαν χαράν και ευφροσύνην παρά Θεού. Ποιηθείσα υπό του κυρού Θεοδώρου Μοντζελέζε λεγόμενος [sic] Λούστρος Τζακύνθιος. Ενετίησιν, παρά Ανδρέᾳ τῳ Ιουλιανῴ, αχϟζ΄ [1697].[19] Unfortunately, for

---

mentioned above, but makes extensive use of archival material and sources that the aforementioned scholars have not used, such as Mormoris's *Historia della guerra di Candia*).

[18] For Montselese, who was previously only known to us as the author of *Evgena*, see Vitti and Spadaro 1995: 13-15.

[19] The koppa in the publication date is most probably a typographical error: it looks to me like an inverted nu, facing to the left instead of the right, most probably placed in this way in the composing stick/forme by a careless typesetter. If this is the case, the date of publication should be corrected to αχνζ΄ [1657], which would actually conform both to the contents (account of events of 1656) and the genre of the poem (panegyrical pamphlet). I have consulted the digital copy of the book that may be found in the invaluable "Anemi" of the Library of the University of Crete (http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/), for which see, conveniently, the presentation of A. Politis 2006.

reasons unknown to me, Papadakis's paper was not included in the publication of the proceedings of the Conference, but Papadakis in his presentation stated that he came across this book while working on the catalogue of the Library of the Educational Association of Adrianople. The poem consists of 1,044 fifteen-syllable rhymed verses, refers to events directly related to the "Cretan War" and has a pro-Venetian point of view, expressing optimism for the outcome of the war. Notably, this is not the only Greek source of the "Cretan War" of which we have very limited knowledge. During a research trip in Romania in March 2000, I discovered another vernacular Greek history of the "Cretan War" in prose; it is entitled *Diegesis of the island of Crete* (*Διήγησις του νησίου της Κρήτης*) and it is a brief historical account of the war as seen by the Turks, included in a work that deals with the reigns of several Ottoman Sultans up to 1672. The work appears to be a translation from Turkish into Greek – translated by Matthaios of Chios and "edited" (that is, corrected and copied) by Michael Vyzantios, in 1704 – and has been preserved in Greek manuscript 970 of the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest.[20] The exact title is *Ιστορικόν των εξ αρχής βασιλέων Τουρκών*, μεταφρασθέν εις γραικήν διάλεκτον από το τουρκικόν δι' επιταγής του υψηλοτάτου και εκλαμπροτάτου ημών αυθέντου και ηγεμόνος πάσης Ουγγροβλαχίας, κυρίου κυρίου Ιωάννου Κωνσταντίνου Βασαράβα βοεβόνδα, δι' υπαγορεύσεως του Μπεκτάς ντιβάνεφέντη, εξηγήσεως τε του μεγάλου πορτάρη κυρ Ματθαίου του Χίου και διορθώσεως και επιμελείας του Μιχαήλ Βυζαντίου, εν έτει αψδ΄ [1704] (BAR, ms. gr. 970, f. 5).[21] I believe that the work

[20] For a description of the manuscript see Camariano 1940: 70-1. The text of the *Διήγησις* covers ff. 70^{v}-77. I have in my possession a microfilm of the text and I intend to edit it in due course.

[21] Karathanassis, in his book on Greek scholars in Wallachia, provides some information on Vyzantios's activity as a copyist (Karathanassis 2000: 150-1). However, he presents Vyzantios as the translator of the book (Karathanassis 2000: 151), although elsewhere he attributes it to Matthaios of Chios (Karathanassis 2000: 174, n. 8). The text itself leaves little doubt about who did what.

did not attract scholarly attention, because it was considered irrelevant to the events of the "Cretan War", on account of its title.

Similar is the case of an Italian work, the *Compendio dell' Historie Generali de' Turchi* of the French historiographer Di Verdier, translated into Italian by a certain Ferdinando De' Servi and published in Venice in 1662.[22] The work, again because of its title, I think, did not attract scholarly attention in the 20th century and, thus, it has not been observed that it is accompanied by a version of the well known – but not at all studied – *Historia dell' ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi* of Girolamo Brusoni (first edition in Venice: Curti, 1673, second edition in Bologna: Recaldini, 1676).[23] Girolamo Brusoni was one of the most prolific Italian authors of the 17th century and the history of the "Cretan War" was one of his favourite subjects: he works on it again and again in literally dozens of historiographical compositions, all printed between 1656 and 1680. Unfortunately, as far as I know, there is no monograph on Brusoni; the only recent attempt to reconstruct his life and works is the homonymous article in the

---

[22] I have consulted the copy of the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice (coll. G1015). The exact title is: "*Compendio dell'Historie Generali de' Turchi. Con tutto quel ch'è successo di più memorabile sotto il Regno di XXIII. Imperatori, cominciando da Ottomano primo fino à Mahomet IV. di questo nome hoggi regnante.* Raccolto con diligenza dal Signore di Verdier, historiografo di Francia, e tradotto dal francese da Ferdinando De' Servi, Fiorentino. Aggiuntovi nuovamente la *Continuatione de' Successi e Guerre seguite tra la Potentissima Casa Ottomana e la Serenissima Republica di Venetia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662.* Con li somarii à ciascuna vita, e una tavola copiosa delle cose più notabili contenute nell'opera. Parte Prima, Venetia, Presso Gio. Battista Scalvinono, MDCLXII [1662]."

[23] Cicogna, who in many cases appears to have a better knowledge of the texts than his 20th-century counterparts, was aware of this fact and in his entry for Brusoni's book he actually mentions: "A p. 201, del Compendio delle Historie generali de' Turchi del signor di *Verdier* tradotte dal *De Servi* (Venetia, 1662, in 4.) vi è: *Continuatione de' successi della guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia, dall'anno 1647, fino al 1662, tratta dall' Istoria del sig. Girolamo Brusoni*" (Cicogna 1847: 135; italicizations are his).

Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani,[24] the most important and relevant information of which I summarize here. The *Storia delle guerre d'Italia dal 1635 al 1655*, printed in Venice in 1656, signals Brusoni's first engagement in the writing of the history of the "Cretan War".[25] This *Storia*, with Brusoni's successive additions (including many updates on the situation in Crete and the Aegean), was reprinted in Venice in 1657, 1661, 1664 (no extant copy), 1667 (with the definitive title *Historia d'Italia*), 1676 and, finally, in Turin in 1680. It would be no exaggeration to say that this is one of the most important sources of the "Cretan War": not only was Brusoni contemporary with the events and collected, almost obsessively, first-hand information (official records, reports, etc.), he also felt obliged to include them in his work as evidence. Inevitably, this resulted in a work that is almost unreadable – in its final edition (Turin 1680) it runs to 1,100 pages in folio, is divided into 46 books and includes hundreds of direct quotations of sources. Nevertheless, this can by no means justify the unfortunate fact that it is so largely neglected today.[26] Apart from this *Historia d'Italia*, there is at least one more notable example of a major historiographical work of his where the events of the "Cretan War" are dealt with and that is the *Istorie universali d'Europa* (first edition in Venice, 1657, re-elaborated and reprinted in 1663), while the infamous *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi* – the only historiographical work of Brusoni known to scholars of Venice and Venetian Crete[27] – is

---

[24] De Caro 1972, esp. pp. 719-20 for his historiographical work and a bibliography.

[25] The volume is a collaborative work, i.e. a compilation of histories by Ziliolo, Birago, Bisaccioni and Brusoni; Brusoni's part deals mainly with the events of the "Cretan War".

[26] It is significant that in the recent *Repertorio di Storiografia Veneziana* (Zordan 1998) there is no entry for Brusoni (either *of* or *on* his works).

[27] Although not even mentioned in Zordan 1998 (see previous note), this text is included in all bibliographical compilations, both old (see note 13 above) and more recent (Ekkekakis 1991: 49); Manoussakas, in his review, points to it explicitly (Manoussakas 1971: 250), Preto 1975 and Eickhoff 1991 are aware of it (it is impossible to say to what extent they

nothing but an extract from the *Istorie universali* and the *Historia d'Italia*, re-elaborated and, in its second edition (Bologna 1676), enriched with more first-hand information.

The version included in the *Compendio dell'Historie Generali de' Turchi*, which was the starting point of this Brusonian digression, is an interesting one. On the title page of the book it appears as *Continuatione de' Successi e Guerre seguite tra la Potentissima Casa Ottomana e la Serenissima Republica di Venetia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662*,[28] while on p. 201 the title is *Continuatione de' Successi della Guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662, tratti dalle Istorie del Signor Girolamo Brusoni, divisi in tre libri.* A first observation would be that the invariable part of the title, i.e. *Continuatione de' Successi*, not only confirms that a version of the text was available before 1662 (we have already seen that versions of both the *Storie delle guerre* and the *Istorie universali* were available before that date), but also allows some scope for the hypothesis that it was separately published under the possible title *Successi della Guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia* to which the version printed in the *Compendio* is a sequel (*Continuatione*).[29] The vague indication "*tratti* dalle *Istorie* del Signor Girolamo Brusoni" does not necessarily exclude this possibility;[30] however, neither does it tell much about the authorship of the version, i.e. it is not clear if it is simply another elaboration by Brusoni himself or if it belongs to the

---

have used it), whereas Setton 1991 makes sparing use of it; however, they all ignore the history of the text, which is presented here.

[28] For the full title see note 22 above.

[29] Unfortunately, Brusoni's minor historiographical works have not been studied at all and the version under discussion was not known to De Caro (1972).

[30] Brusoni, in general, dealt freely with his compositions; he often compiled and published as new books works that had previously appeared in other books and/or under different titles (for some literary examples see De Caro 1972: 715-17), while, other times, he extracted parts from his books and published them separately, as in the case of the *Historia dell'ultima guerra* that we have already seen.

otherwise unknown Florentine translator, Ferdinando De' Servi.[31] The case is a good deal more complicated,[32] but given Brusoni's revising historiographical habits, it is very likely that the text of the *Continuatione* comes from his pen – and this is, most probably, what Cicogna also had in mind when he tacitly corrected in his bibliographical catalogue the "tratti" of the inner title into "tratta" (which refers to the *Continuatione*, not to the *Successi*).[33]

Whatever the case might be with the *Continuatione*, Brusoni's various *Storie* presented above – most of them written and published *during* the "Cretan War" – make him, most probably, as important a historian of the war as Andrea Valier(o),[34] whose

---

[31] The De' Servi are a well-known noble family of Florence, already appearing in the "Libro d'oro" in 1457; however, I have not managed to find any information on this Ferdinando (he is not included in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, unlike other members of the family).

[32] In the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice the *Compendio* may be also found in manuscript form (cod. Cicogna 657-8), without the *Continuatione* and with a different dedication, less elaborated tables and, in parts, with a considerably different text too. All this indicates that the work was subject to an extensive revision before its printing, but of course the question still remains by whom. The dedication (excluded from the edition) to the Venetian Ambassador to the Court of the King of France and well-known author, Giovanni Sagredo, in cod. Cicogna 658 (which, despite its number, includes the first part of the work) is signed by Di Verdier himself and on f. 1 of the manuscript, at the end of the title, we find the note: "Trasportato dal Francese da me". Could this mean that the translator was Di Verdier?

[33] For Cicogna's text see note 23 above.

[34] The original Venetian form of his name is Valier, but he is better known as Valiero. He was a patrician from an old Venetian family – which counted among its members two *Dogi*, two cardinals and many high-ranking officials of the *Repubblica* – and had a "brilliant but not exceptional career" (Eickhoff 1991: 81), which, nevertheless, included many military, diplomatic and political offices: he served in the navy as a captain of a squadron and a captain of a ship in 1646 and 1647 under the commands of Tommaso Morosini and Tommaso Contarini respectively, and he became later *Avogador di Comun*, *Provveditor General* of the Ionian islands (during the "Cretan War") and Senator (Eickhoff reconstructs his life and offices in detail; see Eickhoff 1991: 80-2). Ten years after the end of the "Cretan War", Valiero published in Venice his

Historia della guerra di Candia is unanimously considered to be the most authoritative narrative of its time on the subject. Valiero's *Historia* indeed offers, in some cases, the official testimony of an eyewitness and co-protagonist in the theatre of the war,[35] but it was written and published long after the war was over (1679). From this point of view, his "eyewitness testimony" is not only based on memory, but it also falls, quite inevitably, into the trap of hindsight: he already knew so much more about what happened afterwards. Furthermore, Valiero was an insider: an aristocrat in direct contact with the powerful of the day and so actively involved in the war that he cannot actually have any claim to "objectivity". The value of his *Historia* is that it indeed expresses an official Venetian point of view, but as an *a posteriori* apology rather than as a contemporary account. The real *gazzettiere* of the war in the 1650s and 1660s, at least,[36] was Brusoni. It is his historiographical work that records events as they are progressing and, more importantly perhaps, it is his work that must have been more widely read, given the fact that Brusoni had already been a well-established and popular author since the

---

own account of it (Valiero 1679), which is also based on his personal experiences.

[35] For his involvement in the war see previous note.

[36] It is very possible that Brusoni started working on the subject much earlier, possibly from the beginning of the war. In a letter dated 1.2.1676 and sent by *padre* Arcangelo da Salto to the *marchesse di San Tomasso*, minister of Savoy, it is actually mentioned that "il mestiere del Brusoni *da quaranta anni indietro* era stato di tenere corrispondenze e *comporre storie* ed altri libri" (De Caro 1972: 718; my emphasis). Although the time indication ("da quaranta anni") is vague and not to be taken literally, still it allows us to believe that Brusoni's historiographical activity dates from before the 1650s, even though there are no *Storie* of his preserved from the previous decades. In any case, for the first years of the "Cretan War" there are other contemporary accounts available, such as Gonzaga's report (1647; see Papadia 1976) or Vellaio 1647 and Anticano 1647 (Sertonaco Anticano is Antonio Santacroce and it was again Cicogna who realized this first (Cicogna 1847: 134): "Hanno molto fantasticato per trovare il vero autore di questo libro, e chi disse essere *Girolamo Brusoni*, chi *Casimiro Frescot*, chi *Girolamo Michieli dalla Brazza*; ma pare che sia *Antonio Santacroce* purissimo anagramma di *Sertonaco Anticano*").

1640s.[37] His *Storie* with their successive reprints – under various titles and with different contents – between 1656 and 1680 may have served as a source for the composition of *any* history of the "Cretan War" written in this period, Greek or otherwise. And this actually sets the problem of contemporary sources and the relations between them on a totally different and, unfortunately, completely unexplored basis.

Given the importance of Brusoni's work, which I hope is now obvious, one can only wonder what could possibly have been the reasons for so much neglect. Of course, his *Storie* do not constitute a straightforward case as regards textual criticism and research: too many versions, under often misleading titles, must have made it impossible for scholars to trace them. Moreover, the existence of his *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi*, which was separately published twice, could easily lead any logical person to the assumption that this must have been the author's only contribution to the subject – which is not the case, as we have seen. On the other hand, the discovery of Valiero's "definitive" version of the history of the "Cretan War" by 19th-century scholars has not helped much. Valiero may have been a successful state official of fairly high rank, but a popular author he was not.[38] Even his famous account of the "Cretan War" was printed only once, in 1679. But this was but an insignificant detail for the 19th century: at a time of exaltation of nationalism and conservatism, the odds were overwhelmingly in favour of the

---

[37] For his romances, *novelle*, etc. see De Caro 1972: 712-18. Among many popular works of his, I mention here the romance *Le turbolenze delle vestali* (written in 1641-2 and printed in 1658 under the title *Degli amori tragici*), for which De Caro notes: "Il romanzo ebbe infatti una singolare fortuna, circolando a lungo manoscritto – certo la cosa non era casuale – in Italia e "di là dai monti", come affermava lo stesso Brusoni; quando passò finalmente alle stampe moltiplicò naturalmente i suoi lettori" (De Caro 1972: 714). This romance, together with other reasons, cost Brusoni a spell in prison in 1644.

[38] Following the trend of the *Seicento* and the ideal of the *gentiluomo* of the time, Valiero composed patriotic *canzoni*, sonnets and odes (Eickhoff 1991: 81), but there is no evidence that he ever managed to go beyond the mediocrity of a stylistic classicism and thus reach wider audiences.

patriotic spirit of the Venetian aristocrat Valiero and, thus, not only was his authority invented, but also his book was reprinted[39] and – thanks to this 19th-century reprint, which made it much more accessible to research – has remained over-estimated up to the present day. The non-Venetian-born and, most probably, non-aristocrat Brusoni, who had been a declared and practising libertine – a distinguished member of the *Accademia degli Incogniti* and the closest friend of Ferrante Pallavicino[40] – and had written against the moralism of the *pedanti*, against the tyranny of princes and, perhaps worst of all, against the hypocrisy of Christian morals and the Counter-Reformation oppression of his time,[41] did not really stand a chance in the 19th century. But it is exactly these qualities of his works that would make his case so interesting today.

The example of Brusoni, presented here in broad brush strokes, illustrates clearly the deficiencies of relevant scholarship; it shows how little has been done and how much still needs to be done at all levels of research – because, it will surely be agreed, it is one thing to search for and locate the existing sources of the "Cretan War", quite another to read and evaluate them[42] and yet

---

[39] Valiero 1859.

[40] The libertine and nihilist Pallavicino was captured by the ecclesiastical authorities at Avignon, tortured and decapitated in March 1644. Brusoni, after his friend's tragic death, wrote his biography (*La Vita di Ferrante Pallavicino*, Venezia 1651) and retreated from his libertinism, most probably, scared – or, even, threatened – that he might have the same fate.

[41] De Caro 1972, esp. pp. 712-15 provides a detailed analysis of all this, including examples from many of Brusoni's fictional works.

[42] Misevaluation of sources is a common phenomenon (the Valiero-Brusoni case that we have just seen is by no means the only one). A recent example relates to a German edition printed in Frankfurt (Serlin, 1669), which is a compilation/translation from mainly Venetian sources. This edition has been presented as "A rare edition about the Cretan War" (Pretselakis 2000), despite the fact that there were many similar editions in German and many of them have been preserved to the present day. The author of the article was aware of the fact that just in Frankfurt in the years 1668-9 four such editions were printed (Pretselakis 2000: 219, n. 3), but he still presents the edition in question as a "rare" and "unique"

another to provide a coherent narrative of the war and/or to discuss the disagreements of the sources (which certainly exist[43]) – let alone to edit the most important of them.[44] Brusoni's case proves that all stages of research – including the most basic one (that of locating existing sources) – are still far from satisfactory and, clearly, undertaking any of the tasks described earlier, in an effort to fill in the gaps for the purposes of my Cambridge PhD dissertation or even for the edition of Ioakeim's *Struggle* would have far exceeded their scope, objectives and limitations. If this is a disadvantage of my research, however, it is no less a reflection of the shortcomings of relevant scholarship in general.

As one might expect, these shortcomings are not only restricted to the "descriptive" part of the "Cretan War" (sources and their evaluation, discussion of their disagreements, etc.), but they also extend to its "explanatory" part (exegetical frameworks and applicable theories). There are various interpretative tools that could have been used – not necessarily only to offer explanations or answers, but even to raise questions and provoke discussions – and the fact that research has not yet embarked in this direction, does not, of course, exclude the possibility of its doing so in the

---

one. What exactly it is that constitutes the "rarity" and "uniqueness" of this source remains unclear, at least to me.

[43] One famous example concerns the story of the Maltese Sultana, which supposedly gave the Ottomans the excuse for the war and of which both contemporary sources and later scholarship provide considerably different versions. On the issue see, among others, the articles of Vincent (1970), Tomadakis (1976) and, more recently, Gryntakis (1991); cf. Setton 1991: 110-27; impressively enough, they all make use of different sources.

[44] It seems that Italian scholarship, in particular, has long given up on the issue: the matter of modern editions of 16th-/17th-century sources seems to be, bluntly, out of the question and what most Italian scholars do nowadays is to provide their readers with the exact location of the rare editions they use (including the infamous *collocazione*), in order to facilitate researchers who might be willing to go to the trouble of checking these sources for themselves. Of course, the preserved material from the 16th and 17th centuries is so much as to prohibit easy solutions: it would, indeed, be pointless, if not practically impossible, to prepare modern editions of all these sources. Having said that, not editing *any* of them is quite a different – and, in my view, unacceptable – matter.

future nor does it annul the validity of approaches of this kind. I will provide here some examples, which must be viewed as possible directions for future research rather than anything else. As stated earlier,[45] the bulk of surviving sources of the "Cretan War" testifies to the interest of the European public of its time in the subject. On a political level, the involvement of some European princes/powers in the war could explain the interest that the war presented for them, but one still needs to explore the reasons that forced them to get involved in it in the first place. Undoubtedly, an approach like this would have to take into account a complex set of factors (economic, religious, ideological, etc.), but, most of all, I think, it would require a good knowledge of the European political scene of the 17th century,[46] since in many cases it seems that it was mostly the European states' political antagonisms – both internal and external – that led the time's decision-making.[47]

Having said that, one should not neglect the fact that war – that is any war in general – is a phenomenon which profoundly affects all aspects of human and social life (demography, the economy, daily and family life, ideologies, culture, etc.) and a reduction just to its political dimensions would fail to offer a proper explanation both for the phenomenon itself and, more importantly, for its impact. And the impact of the "Cretan War" was so immense as to lead at least one scholar, E. Eickhoff, to describe it as the "backbone of the narrative" of the European 17th century. His observations deserve more attention, because they

---

[45] See p. 94 above.

[46] It would be excessive to provide here even a basic bibliography on the matter; the reader is referred, most conveniently, to the relevant volume of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

[47] The Habsburg monarchy would be a good example (and it has been discussed at length in J. Stoye's classic *The Siege of Vienna* (Stoye 1964); for more recent accounts see, most conveniently, Bérenger 1994, esp. pp. 289-337 and Ingrao 1994, esp. pp. 53-104); however, all European states, not to mention the Ottomans, operated in a similar way.

epitomize in a brilliant way the perception of the war by its contemporaries (I quote from the Italian edition):[48]

> Gli uomini dell'epoca scorsero nei drammatici scontri dell'Egeo altrettanti fatti di importanza secolare che provocarono un profluvio di incisioni e di opuscoli fin nella Germania settentrionale. E l'ultimo triennale assedio della capitale cretese, dal 1667 al 1669, per il quale il Re Sole, il Papa e numerosi principi italiani e tedeschi mandarono contingenti di soccorso, fu considerato nel Seicento *l'assedio* per antonomasia [...]. Perciò gli eventi dell'Egeo non saranno considerati come una serie di episodi marginali, costituiranno invece il nerbo del racconto.

What needs to be underlined here is that, according to Eickhoff, the importance of the war for the Europeans was mainly based on the fact that "they would see in the dramatic battles of the Aegean many other things of secular importance", i.e. they would relate the war's events to their own experiences and fears. This line of thinking may lead to a comprehensive interpretation of the European interest in the war and even of the war itself, provided that we do not miss two major points. The first one is that the "Cretan War" not only broke out at a time – the decade of the 1640s – which has been described by some modern historians as the core of the "general crisis of the 17th century",[49] but was, indeed, part of it. The second point is that for Europeans, Easterners and Westerners alike, the war was also part of a broader subject-matter which could be classified under the general rubric "Europe and the Turks". I will briefly elaborate on both points.

The "general crisis of the 17th century" has been a major issue for European historiography since the 1950s,[50] and the fact

---

[48] Eickhoff 1991: 16; the Italian edition is based on the 2nd revised German edition, which was not available to me.

[49] By Trevor-Roper (1965: 68), for example.

[50] From the rich literature on the subject one may consult the various contributions in the collective volumes Aston 1965 and Parker and Smith 1997; cf. Goldstone 1991. For an analysis of the historiography of the "general crisis" see the illuminating "Introduction" of the editors in

that the "Cretan War" was part of it was known to modern European scholarship from at least the 1970s,[51] but too little, if any, attention was paid to it. On the other hand, the "general crisis" has been regarded as such an important issue as to become not only the hallmark of the 17th century, but even, according to N. Steensgaard, "a synonym for what historians concerned with other centuries call 'history'".[52] This does not mean, however, that scholarship has reached an agreement on what the specific elements constituting this crisis were; on the contrary, historians are only agreed about its existence, not about its character. However, there are four main different senses of the term (1. a general economic crisis, 2. a general political crisis, 3. a crisis in the development of capitalism and 4. a crisis comprising all aspects of human life[53]) and all four could find some application to the cases of both the Ottoman Empire and Venice – within and outside the context of the "Cretan War" –,[54] but also to the early modern Greek society of the Venetian-colonized island of Crete. If I choose to concentrate here on the "'multi-causal', but ultimately 'neo-Malthusian'"[55] "demographic/structural" model that Jack Goldstone provided in his 1991 book *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*, a model which forms a different mode of interpretation of the "general crisis" from the four ones

---

Parker and Smith 1997: 1-31; cf. Rabb 1975: 3-34 and Crummey 1998: 156-69.

[51] Crete appears as an "area affected by war" in the map of the "general crisis" provided in Parker and Smith 1978: 5 (with the wrong dating "1645-1664", which is repeated in the second edition; see Parker and Smith 1997: 5).

[52] Steensgaard 1997: 33.

[53] For a detailed analysis, including a critical review of previous elaborations on these four senses by various scholars, see Steensgaard 1997.

[54] Goldstone (1991: 349-415) has already attempted a similar approach for the Ottoman Empire, in relation to the *celali* revolts, and Faroqhi's observations seem to recognize both the validity and the importance of such approaches (Faroqhi 2000: 469-70). In Venice's case, republicanism's "crisis" has indeed been discussed (see various contributions in the recent "revisionist" volume Martin and Romano 2000), but not necessarily as being part of the "general crisis of the 17th century".

[55] According to Crummey's apt critique (1998: 156).

described earlier, it is because I find its similarities with the Cretan case striking.

Goldstone bases his explanatory model on two major premises:[56] the first one is that, in the early 17th century, the population of the major agrarian societies of the world rose steadily to unprecedented levels. The second is that "agrarian states of this period were not equipped to deal with the impact of the steady growth of population". This resulted in rising prices (increased demand "in excess of the productivity gains of the land"), which, in turn, resulted in rising taxes, since revenues from taxation were necessary in order for the state to meet its rapidly increasing military expenses too. "Yet attempts to increase state revenues met resistance from the elites and the populace and thus rarely succeeded in offsetting spiraling expenses. As a result most major states in the seventeenth century were rapidly raising taxes but were still headed for fiscal crisis." As the inflation rate was rising steadily and the taxation system was proving too inflexible to meet rapidly changing conditions, state bankruptcy was becoming just a matter of time. In parallel, "elites were seeking to secure their own relative position. Population growth increased the number of aspirants for elite positions, and their demands were difficult to satisfy given the fiscal strains of the state. Elites thus were riven by increasing rivalry and factionalism", which, in combination with their resistance to state demands, resulted in elite groups that were restless and difficult to control. Population growth also led to "urban migration and falling real wages". Thus, next to the rural groups, exhausted by taxation and oppression, one should also expect to find starving young urban workers, all prone to violence and rebellion. According to Goldstone's model, when all these three parameters (state bankruptcy, uncontrollable rival elite groups and "high potential for mobilizing popular groups", e.g. a discontented young populace, both rural and urban) occur simultaneously, they may be expected to cause "state break-

[56] I summarize here his own description (Goldstone 1991: 24-5; quotations refer to these pages).

down" in the form of regional and national rebellions or, even, revolutions.[57]

In Crete, just before the "Cretan War", there was no revolution, but in all other respects Goldstone's model applies very well. The demographic change, which is the ultimate cause of all causes in Goldstone's model, was there: according to Trivan's census of the year 1644,[58] the population of the island was 287,165 people (136,423 women and 150,742 men). This figure represents an increase of 38.06% in comparison with that of 1589 (208,000 inhabitants[59]) and an increase of 47.69% in comparison with the Kastrofylakas census of 1582-4 (194,341 inhabitants[60]). Whether there was, indeed, an increase in taxation in the same period is something that requires *ad hoc* research, but the extensive restoration works on the island's fortifications that the *provveditor general* Andrea Corner had undertaken just before the war, mainly in 1645,[61] make it seem more than likely. As for rival elite groups and factional fighting, that is something that one should expect to find on the island in any period of the Venetian occupation, or even later,[62] whereas the discontent of the rural

---

[57] Goldstone's theory is mostly a theory of revolutions and that is why his case studies are not restricted to the 17th century, but also include the French Revolution.

[58] Manoussakas 1949: 59.

[59] According to Z. Mocenigo (see Vlassopoulou 2000: 182, where there is also a table of censuses from 1571 up to 1644, along with information about others, preceding and following these dates).

[60] Xirouchakis 1934: 45.

[61] For details on Corner's attempts and his "ever-increasing expenses" see Setton 1991: 120-1.

[62] McKee 2000: 151-67, reports many incidents from the 13th and, mainly, the 14th century. For "dangerous and insubordinate families" – as reported in Venetian sources – and their involvement in all later major revolts see Manoussakas 1960 (15th century) and Papadia-Lala 1983 (early 16th century; cf. Ploumidis 1974). For the revolt of 1571 and the situation on the island until the outbreak of the "Cretan War" see Vakalopoulos 1968: 297-328 and 474-83. Finally, it would not be irrelevant to mention that the Venetian "heritage" of *vendetta* has survived in Crete up to the present day.

populace has been recorded in contemporary sources.[63] Of course, the whole point in Goldstone's "demographic/ structural" theory is to check the impact of demographic trends on economic, political and social institutions and for this, undoubtedly, a much more detailed analysis than the very sketchy one provided here would be required. Even so, it seems to me that his model, as described above, could be used to explain well-known – but insufficiently studied – phenomena, such as the lack of resistance or even collaboration of the Greek population of the island with the Turks against the Venetians.[64] Following Goldstone's model, one may argue that if revolution did not come in Venetian Crete in the mid-1640s, it is most probably because the Turks came first. But, of course, this is only a hypothesis.[65]

---

[63] It is very clear, for example, in the report edited in Sakellariou 1939: 146-52; for other references see Vakalopoulos 1968: 486. It needs to be added here that Vakalopoulos's analysis for the pre-war period (see previous note) proves not only that factions were as active as ever in the late 16th-early 17th centuries, but also, and more importantly perhaps, that popular discontent too, both rural and urban, had increased in the same period.

[64] That the Greek rural population "hardly raised a finger to oppose the Turks when they landed west of Canea in late June 1645" (Setton 1991: 107) is well-known. Vakalopoulos, based on contemporary reports, both Venetian and Greek, claims that this reaction (or rather non-reaction) of the natives was due to the hope "that they would change the old conquerors with new, milder ones" (Vakalopoulos 1968: 486) and Vlassopoulou gives an account of recorded Turkish promises that things would indeed be so (Vlassopoulou 2000: 171-4). Many incidents and general accusations of active collaboration of the Greeks with the Turks during the whole course of the war are reported in many sources and, what is more interesting, they refer not only to the rural, but also to the (non-patrician) urban population; if the latter has been exemplified in the person of Andreas Barozzi, the "grand traitor of Candia" (Stavrinidis 1947), because of his betrayal's decisive significance for the war's conclusion, it was by no means the only one (the few examples of treachery given by Bounialis and recorded in Vlassopoulou 2000: 169-71 could easily be extended from other sources).

[65] To my knowledge, Greek scholarship has never embarked on a similar approach; a very vague analysis of the revolutionary phenomenon in Greek lands under Venetian occupation – which ignores both Goldstone's model and the theory of the "general crisis of the 17th century" – may be found in Leontsinis 1995 (with basic Greek bibliography).

Finally, as regards the connection of the "Cretan War" with the general subject-matter "Europe and the Turks", it may indeed appear to be obvious, and one may also claim that the fact that the interest of contemporaries in the war was amalgamated with their interest in the Turks themselves is at least understandable, if not quite to be expected. However, it has not been previously observed that this amalgam has produced "mixed" works, such as the *Compendio dell'Historie Generali de' Turchi*, which was accompanied by the *Continuatione de' Successi della Guerra di Candia*, or the *Ιστορικόν των εξ αρχής βασιλέων Τουρκών*, which included the *Διήγησις του νησίου της Κρήτης*.[66] The realization of this fact opens up new horizons, since it may turn research in the unexplored direction of a totally different category of texts, namely, those broadly dealing with "images of the Turk" rather than with the "Cretan War" as such. Texts of the kind, even when not directly related to the "Cretan War", may prove very useful for the examination of the delicate matter of the formation of identities and stereotypes – and a more detailed analysis, emphasizing the "image of the Turk" as exemplified in Ioakeim's text, with the use of the theoretical tools of *imagologie*,[67] has already been provided elsewhere.[68] As one may expect, however, the subject "images of the Turk" in early modern European literature is very broad; even if we restricted it to its Greek and Italian dimensions – which are the most relevant in our case – we would still find literally dozens of texts that could be used for its proper definition,[69] texts that have never been touched upon either by this

---

[66] Both cases have already been examined; for the *Compendio* see pp. 98-101 and for the *Ιστορικόν* see pp. 97-8 above.

[67] As defined in Pageaux 1989 and Abatzopoulou 1998.

[68] See Kaplanis 2004.

[69] The cases of both the *Compendio* and the *Ιστορικόν* (see note 66 above) are, most probably, marginal as regards the formation of the image of the Turk – especially if we take into account other texts, much more influential and widely disseminated in the 16th and 17th centuries, such as the works of Francesco Sansovino, Guglielmo Postello and Giovanni Sagredo. Sansovino's *Gli Annali Turcheschi overo Vite de' Principi della Casa Othomana* (Venezia 1573), a very famous work of the 16th century – for a Greek text which draws heavily upon it see

or by any other research. And if the state of research concerning the sources of the "Cretan War" is still far from satisfactory, as regards the "image of the Turk" in European literature it is simply embryonic[70] – the analysis I provided recently mainly aimed to contribute to the theoretical stage of the subject's development.[71]

When, in 1870, Ipsilantis wrote that "αν αυτός ο πόλεμος [i.e. the "Cretan War"] ακολουθούσεν επί των πάλαι ποιητών, ήθελεν γυμνάσει τους καλάμους όλων των τότε συγγραφέων, και ο Παρνασσός ήθελεν εύρει ύλην μεγαλυτέραν από της του εν Τρωάδι πολέμου",[72] he probably did not realize how close to the actual facts he was. Indeed, the volume of existing material which is related, in one way or another, to the "Cretan War" is immense and it seems that its vastness, instead of attracting scholarly attention, has actually discouraged scholars from dealing with it. This paper has suggested that there is still a lot that needs to be

---

Zachariadou 1960 – was re-elaborated in the 17th century by *Conte* Maiolino Bisaccioni and was published in Venice (Combi & La Noù., 1654) under the title *Historia universale dell'origine, guerre et imperio de Turchi* (for a bibliography see Kaklamanis 2001, 124, note 51); Guillaume Postel or Guglielmo Postello, as he was better known in Venetian literary circles, was one of the most famous "orientalists" of his time and also one of the most prolific French authors of the 16th century (on his life and works see Kuntz 1981; on his orientalism in connection with his Venetian experience see Kuntz 1987; on his *République des Turcs* (Poitiers: Marnef, 1560) and his "historical imagination" see Bailbe 1988 and Dubois 1988 respectively); Giovanni Sagredo, to whom the manuscript version of the *Compendio* was dedicated (see note 32 above), was the author of the *Memorie istoriche de' Monarchi Ottomani* (Venezia 1673), a work that modern scholars (e.g. Eickhoff 1991) still consult – along with the works of Rycaut and Cantemir – due to the absence of a modern, reliable history of the Ottoman empire. For more texts see next note.

[70] References to Italian material may be found in Benzoni 1985, Preto 1985 and Soykut 2001 (no matter how rich these references may seem, esp. in Preto 1985, none of these works could actually have claims to completeness – let alone to sufficient analysis of the subject). For a collection of German sources and an analysis emphasizing "exoticism/ eroticism" see Kleinlogel 1989.

[71] See Kaplanis 2004 – this analysis will be expanded in my forthcoming edition of *Struggle*.

[72] Ipsilantis 1870: 163.

done at all levels of research – location, evaluation and edition of sources, production of coherent narratives by the use of new exegetical frameworks and applicable theories. Nonetheless and notwithstanding the difficulties, I do believe that historical syntheses concerning the "Cretan War" may – and should – be attempted in the future. In order to overcome the problem of the seemingly endless material, it would be wise to agree in advance on the necessarily limited viewpoint of such syntheses: they need to concentrate on the history of the "Cretan War" from, say, the Venetian and/or, more generally, Italian,[73] French, German, Ottoman, Slavic, English, Dutch or Greek[74] point of view. The benefits of this "national" perspective that I am proposing – which by no means should be understood as suggesting or indicating

---

[73] Clearly, the bulk of the Venetian sources would require an independent research project focusing on archival material – and, most probably, limited to periods of the war (e.g. 1645-1650, 1651-1666, 1667-1669), whereas Italian historiographical works of the time, both Venetian and otherwise, may be the subject of another independent study.

[74] Although unedited Greek texts do exist (see pp. 96-8 above; note also the various pamphlets like the one mentioned in Alexiou and Aposkiti 1995: 95, for which no specialized research has been undertaken so far, and the texts mentioned in Mavromatis 2005: 81-2), most major histories of the "Cretan War" in Greek – with the exception of Ioakeim's *Struggle* – are available in 20th-century editions. More specifically, Bounialis's *Διήγησις* (Venice: Giuliani, 1681) has been recently edited by S. Alexiou and M. Aposkiti (1995) – philologically speaking, this edition is not entirely satisfactory (for reasons I explain in Kaplanis 2002: 212), but it is certainly more easily accessible than those of Xirouchakis (1908) and Nenedakis (1979). Diakrousis's *Διήγησις* (Venice, 1667 – no extant copy; Venice: Mortale(?), 1679) is available only in Xirouchakis's edition (1908) and needs to be re-edited. Kaklamanis (2005: 242) points out this need; his paper also argues, convincingly, that Diakrousis's historical value is limited, because for the description of the war events he "borrows" almost exclusively the descriptions of Achelis in *The Siege of Malta* (Pernot 1910). Other texts, such as the (archaistic) composition of Pikros and the lament of Palladas are also available in 20th-century reprints/editions (Mavroidi 1984 and Petrou-Mesogeitis 1939 respectively). In general, the editorial state of Greek sources should be considered satisfactory, especially if we take into account the state of other sources (see note 44 above).

"national homogeneity" – are evident: not only does it bring the vastness of the preserved material to more manageable dimensions, but it also requires researchers to have a specialized palaeographical training and a good knowledge of only *one*, not all, of these languages. Anything else, it seems to me, would be wishful thinking and has so far produced very little. Ideally, approaches like these will lead to a better evaluation of the sources and, eventually, to the edition of the most important of them. From this point of view, after the completion of my research and the publication of Ioakeim's *Struggle*, scholars who would like to explore the "Cretan War" from a Greek point of view will be in the advantageous position of having most of the Greek sources available in recent – and, thus, easily accessible – editions.

References

Abatzopoulou, F. (1998). *Ο Άλλος εν διωγμώ. Η εικόνα του Εβραίου στη λογοτεχνία. Ζητήματα ιστορίας και μυθοπλασίας*. Athens: Themelio

Alexiou, S. and Aposkiti, M. (eds.) (1995). *Μαρίνου Τζάνε Μπουνιαλή του Ρεθυμναίου "Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος" (1645-1669)*. Athens: Stigmi

Anticano, S. (1647). *Frammenti istorici della guerra di Candia: Invasione del Regno; [P]resa di Canea; Successi di terra; Presa di Retimo; Morte del gener[al] Corn[er]; Successi di mare; Morte del capitan delle navi Morosini.* Bologna

Argyriou, A. (ed.) (2004). *Η Ελλάδα των νησιών από τη Φραγκοκρατία ως σήμερα. Πρακτικά του Β΄ Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ρέθυμνο, 10-12 Μαΐου 2002)*. 2 vols. Athens: Ellinika Grammata

Aston, T. (ed.) (1965). *Crisis in Europe 1560-1660. Essays from "Past and Present"*, with an introduction by C. Hill. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Bailbe, J. (1988). "Postel conteur dans 'La République des Turcs'", in: Kuntz 1988, pp. 45-63

Benzoni, G. (1985). "Il 'farsi Turco' ossia l'ombra del rinnegato", in: Pirovano 1985, pp. 91-133

Bérenger, J. (1994). *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1273-1700*, translated by C. A. Simpson. London and New York: Longman

Bernardy, A. A. (1902). *Venezia e il Turco nella seconda metà del secolo XVII, con documenti inediti*. Florence: Civelli

Bostan, I. (1992). *Osmanlı Bahriye Teşkilâtı: XVII. Yüzyılda Tersâne-i Âmire*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi

Brunel, P. and Chevrel, Y. (eds.) (1989). *Précis de littérature comparée*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France

Brusoni, G. (1673). *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Veneziani e Turchi di Girolamo Brusoni nella quale si contengono i successi delle passate guerre nei Regni di Candia e Dalmazia dall'anno 1644 fino al 1671*. Venice: Curti

Camariano, N. (1940). *Catalogul manuscriselor greceşti, II*. Bucharest: Biblioteca Academiei Române

Carter, F. W. (1972). *Dubrovnik (Ragusa): A classic City-State*, London and New York: Seminar Press

Chasiotis, I. M. (1974). "Ο κρητικός πόλεμος (1645-1669) και η εποποιΐα της πολιορκίας του Χάνδακος (1648-1669)", in: Vakalopoulos et al. 1974, pp. 334-50

Chasiotis, I. M. (2001). *Μεταξύ οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης. Ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της τουρκοκρατίας*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press

Cicogna, E. A. (1847). *Saggio di bibliografia veneziana*. Venice: Merlo

Concina, E. (1988). *L'Arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia*. Milan: Electa

Crummey, R. O. (1998). "Muscovy and the 'General crisis of the seventeenth century'", *Journal of Early Modern History* 2/2, 156-80

Danîsman, Z. (1964-9). *Ravzat el-Hüseyn fi Hulâsat Ahbar el-Hâfikayn (Târihi Naîmâ)*. 5 vols. Istanbul: Zuhuri Danişman Yayınevi

De Caro, G. (1972). "Brusoni, Girolamo", in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 14. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, pp. 712-20

Detorakis, Th. and Kalokairinos, A. (eds.) (2004). *Πεπραγμένα Θ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Ελούντα, 1-6 Οκτωβρίου 2001. Τόμοι Β1/Β2: Βυζαντινή και μεσαιωνική περίοδος*. Irakleio: Etairia Kritikon Istorikon Meleton

Detorakis, Th. and Papadaki-Oekland, S. (eds.) (2000). *Πεπραγμένα Η΄ Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Ηράκλειο, 9-14 Σεπτεμβρίου 1996. Τόμος Β2: Βυζαντινή και μεσαιωνική περίοδος*. Irakleio: Etairia Kritikon Istorikon Meleton

Dubois, C.-G. (1988). "L'imagination historique chez Guillaume Postel (autour de l'expérience vénitienne: 1547-1552)", in: Kuntz 1988, pp. 65-80

Dujčev, I. (1935). *Avvisi di Ragusa. Documenti sull'Impero Turco nel sec. XVII e sulla guerra di Candia* [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 101]. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum

Dujčev, I. (1968). "La guerra di Candia e gli avvenimenti balcanici del secolo XVII", *Πεπραγμένα του Β΄ Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Γ΄. Τμήμα μεσαιωνολογικόν*, Athens: Filologikos Syllogos "O Chrysostomos", pp. 60-9

Eickhoff, E. (1991). *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi. Bufera nel sud-est Europeo 1645-1700*, with the collaboration of R. Eickhoff, translated from the German by A. Audisio. Milan: Rusconi

Eideneier, H., Moennig, U. and Toufexis, N., (eds.) (2001). *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημώδους γραμματείας. Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi IVa, Αμβούργο 28-31.1.1999*. Irakleio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis

Ekkekakis, G. P. (1990). *Τα κρητικά βιβλία. Ένα πρώτο σχεδίασμα κρητικής βιβλιογραφίας. Β΄ 1864-1913*. Rethymno: Typospoudi

Ekkekakis, G. P. (1991). *Τα κρητικά βιβλία. Σχεδίασμα κρητικής βιβλιογραφίας. Α΄ 1499-1863*. Rethymno: Grafotechniki Kritis

Faroqui, S. (2000). "Crisis and change 1590-1699", in: İnalcık and Quataert 2000/2, pp. 411-636

Gerola, G. (1905-32). *Monumenti veneti nell'isola di Creta*. 4 vols. Venice: Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti

Goldstone, J. A. (1991). *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press

Greene, M. (2000). *A shared world. Christians and Muslims in the early modern Mediterranean*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Gryntakis, G. (1991). "Η αφορμή του κρητικού πολέμου (1645-1669)", *Κρητολογικά Γράμματα* 1/3-4, 191-3

Holton, D. (ed.) (1991). *Literature and society in Renaissance Crete.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

İnalcık, H. and Quataert, D. (eds.) (2000). *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire.* 2 vols. (Vol. 1: 1300-1600, vol. 2: 1600-1914.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ingrao, C. (1994). *The Habsburg Monarchy 1618-1815.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ipsilantis, A. C. (1870). *Εκκλησιαστικών και πολιτικών των εις δώδεκα βιβλίων Η΄, Θ΄ και Ι΄, ήτοι Τα μετά την Άλωσιν, 1453-1789, Α. Κ. Υψηλάντου. Εκ χειρογράφου ανεκδότου της ιεράς μονής του Σινά. Εκδιδόντος Γ. Αφθονίδου.* Istanbul: Vrettos

Jeffreys, E. and Jeffreys, M. (eds.) (2005). *Neograeca Medii Aevi V. Αναδρομικά και Προδρομικά. Approaches to texts in Early Modern Greek.* Oxford

Kaklamanis, S. (2001). "Από το χειρόγραφο στο έντυπο: το παιχνίδι των γραφών. Τα ιδιαίτερα εκδοτικά προβλήματα κειμένων που έχουν παραδοθεί σε χειρόγραφη και έντυπη μορφή", in: Eideneier, Moennig and Toufexis 2001, pp. 101-86

Kaklamanis, S. (2005). "Ο Άνθιμος Διακρούσης αναγνώστης της *Μάλτας πολιορκίας* του Αντωνίου Αχέλη", in: Jeffreys and Jeffreys 2005, pp. 241-57

Kaplanis, T. A. (2002). "Εκδόσεις κειμένων της νεοελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας και μονοτονικό σύστημα", *Κονδυλοφόρος* 1, 205-35

Kaplanis, T. A. (2003). "Ioakeim Kyprios' *Struggle* (mid-17th century). A study of the text with an edition of selected passages". Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge

Kaplanis, T. A. (2004). "Κατασκευάζοντας την εικόνα του Εαυτού και του Άλλου: η περίπτωση της Πάλης του Ιωακείμ Κύπριου", in: Argyriou 2004, 1, pp. 129-50

Kaplanis, T. A. (2005). "Towards a critical edition of Ioakeim Kyprios' Struggle", in: Jeffreys and Jeffreys 2005, pp. 33-46

Kapsalis, D. (ed.) (2005). *Candia/Creta/Κρήτη. Ο χώρος και ο χρόνος, 16ος-18ος αιώνας.* Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis

Karathanassis, A. E. (2000). *Οι Έλληνες λόγιοι στη Βλαχία (1670-1714). Συμβολή στη μελέτη της ελληνικής πνευματικής κίνησης στις παρα-*

δουνάβιες ηγεμονίες κατά την προφαναριωτική περίοδο. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis

Kitromilides, P. (2002). *Κυπριακή λογιοσύνη (1571-1878). Προσωπογραφική θεώρηση*. Nicosia: Kentro Epistimonikon Erevnon Kyprou

Kleinlogel, C. (1989). *Exotik-Erotik. Zur Geschichte des Türkenbildes in der deutschen Literatur der frühen Neuzeit (1453-1800)*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang

Kretschmayr, H. (1934). *Geschichte von Venedig*. Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Perthes

Kriaras, E. (1962). "Ιωακείμ ο Κύπριος και το ποίημά του για τον τουρκοβενετικό πόλεμο του 1645-1669", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 15-16/2, 399-405

Kuntz, M. L. (1981). *Guillaume Postel. Prophet of the Restitution of All Things. His life and thought*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff

Kuntz, M. L. (1987). "L'orientalismo di Guglielmo Postello e Venezia", in: Lanciotti 1987, pp. 207-27

Kuntz, M. L. (ed.) (1988). *Postello, Venezia e il suo mondo*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki

Lanciotti, L. (ed.) (1987). *Venezia e l'Oriente*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki

Leontsinis, G. N. (1995). "Επαναστατικό φαινόμενο και ιδεολογία στην Κρήτη, την Κύπρο και τα Ιόνια νησιά κατά τη βενετική περίοδο", *Πεπραγμένα Ζ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Β2: Τμήμα βυζαντινών και μέσων χρόνων*. Rethymno, pp. 423-31

Litzica, C. (1909). *Catalogul manuscriptelor greceşti*. Bucharest: Biblioteca Academiei Române

Mallett, M. E. and Hale, J. R. (1984). *The military organization of a Renaissance state: Venice, c. 1400-1617*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Maltezou, C. (ed.) (1993). *Venetiae quasi alterum Byzantium. Όψεις της ιστορίας του βενετοκρατούμενου ελληνισμού. Αρχειακά τεκμήρια*. Athens: Elliniko Institouto Vyzantinon kai Metavyzantinon Spoudon tis Venetias

Manoussakas, M. (1949). "Η παρά Trivan απογραφή της Κρήτης (1644) και ο δήθεν κατάλογος των κρητικών οίκων Κερκύρας", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 3, 35-59

Manoussakas, M. (1960). *Η εν Κρήτη συνωμοσία του Σήφη Βλαστού (1453-1454) και η νέα συνωμοτική κίνησις του 1460-1462*, Athens

Manoussakas, M. (1968). "Προγραμματισμός για τη συστηματική έκδοση του Αρχείου του Δούκα της Κρήτης: ο πρώτος τόμος των 'Missive e Responsive'", *Πεπραγμένα του Β΄ Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Γ΄. Τμήμα μεσαιωνολογικόν*, Athens: Filologikos Syllogos "O Chrysostomos", pp. 163-72

Manoussakas, M. (1971). "Σύντομος επισκόπησις των περί την βενετοκρατουμένην Κρήτην ερευνών", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 23, 245-308

Manoussakas, M. (1998). "Cultura e letteratura greca nella Creta veneziana", in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 443-58

Martin, J. and Romano, D. (eds.) (2000). *Venice reconsidered. The history and civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press

Mavroidi, F. (ed.) (1984). *K. N. Σάθας, Ελληνικά Ανέκδοτα, τόμος Β΄, 1867*. Φωτομηχανική ανατύπωση με εισαγωγή και πίνακα της Φ. Μαυροειδή. Athens: Karavias

Mavromatis, G. K. (2005). "Ο κρητικός πόλεμος (1645-1669) στη γραμματεία του 17ου αιώνα", in: Kapsalis 2005, pp. 71-84

McKee, S. (2000). *Uncommon Dominion. Venetian Crete and the myth of ethnic purity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Nenedakis, A. N. (ed.) (1979). *Μαρίνος Τζάνες Μπουνιαλής, "Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος" (1645-1669)*. Athens: Nenedakis

Norwich, J. J. (1983). *A history of Venice*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Ortalli, G. (ed.) (1998). *Venezia e Creta. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi. Iraklion-Chania, 30 settembre–5 ottobre 1997*. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti

Pageaux, D.-H. (1989). "De l'imagerie culturelle à l'imaginaire", in: Brunel and Chevrel 1989, pp. 133-61

Panagiotakis, N. M. (ed.) (1988). *Κρήτη: Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός*. Vol. 2. Irakleio: Vikelaia Dimotiki Vivliothiki

Papadia, A. (1976). "Έκθεση του Camillo Gonzaga για τα πρώτα χρόνια (1645-1647) του κρητικού πολέμου", *Θησαυρίσματα* 13, 152-89

Papadia-Lala, A. (1983). *Αγροτικές ταραχές και εξεγέρσεις στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη (1509-1528) – Η «επανάσταση» του Γεωργίου Γαδανολέου-Λυσσογιώργη*. Doctoral thesis. Athens: Parousia

Parker, G. and Smith, L. M. (eds.) (1978). *The general crisis of the seventeenth century*. London, Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Parker, G. and Smith, L. M. (eds.) (1997). *The general crisis of the seventeenth century*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge

Pernot, H. (1910). *P. Gentil de Vendosme et Antoine Achélis, Le Siège de Malte par les Turcs en 1565. Publié en français et en grec d'après les éditions de 1567 et de 1571*. Paris: Honoré Champion

Petrou-Mesogeitis, C. (ed.) (1939). "Θρήνος της Κρήτης", *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Κρητικών Σπουδών* 2, 348-54

Pirovano, C. (ed.) (1985). *Venezia e i Turchi*. Milan: Electa

Ploumidis, G. S. (1974). *Οι βενετοκρατούμενες ελληνικές χώρες μεταξύ του δευτέρου και του τρίτου τουρκοβενετικού πολέμου (1503-1537)*. Ioannina: Panepistimio Ioanninon

Politis, A. (2006). "Το ψηφιακό ξετύλιγμα της «Ανέμης». Ο κόμβος του Πανεπιστημίου Κρήτης φωτίζει υποδειγματικά τη νεοελληνική ιστορία", *Καθημερινή* (3.12.06)

Preto, P. (1975). *Venezia e i Turchi*. Florence: Sansoni

Preto, P. (1985). "Il mito del Turco nella letteratura veneziana", in Pirovano 1985, pp. 134-43

Pretselakis, G. E. (2000). "Μια σπάνια έκδοση για τον Κρητικό Πόλεμο (1645-1669)", in: Detorakis and Papadaki-Oekland 2000, pp. 217-28

Rabb, T. K. (1975). *The struggle for stability in Early Modern Europe*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press

Rossi, F. (1998). "Rifornimenti marittimi agli arsenali veneziani del Levante", in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 415-42

Sakellariou, M. (1939). "Χειρόγραφος έκθεσις περί της πολιορκίας και αλώσεως των Χανίων υπό των Τούρκων (1645)", *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 15, 141-76

Setton, K. M. (1991). *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the seventeenth century*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society

Shaw, S. (1976). *History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The rise and decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808*. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press

Soykut, M. (2001). *Image of the "Turk" in Italy. A history of the "Other" in early modern Europe: 1453-1683* [Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 236]. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz

Stavrinidis, N. (1947). "Ανδρέας Μπαρότσης. Ο προδότης του Μεγάλου Κάστρου", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 1, 393-430

Steensgaard, N. (1997). "The seventeenth-century crisis", in: Parker and Smith 1997, pp. 32-56

Stoye, J. (1964). *The Siege of Vienna*. London: Collins

Tiepolo, M. F. (1998). "Le fonti documentarie di Candia nell'Archivio di Stato di Venezia", in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 43-71

Tomadakis, N. B. (1947). "Συγγραφείς του «Κρητικού Πολέμου» (Μικρά προσθήκη εις Α΄ σ. 124)", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 1, 618-19

Tomadakis, N. B. (1976). "Συμβολή εις τους ναυτικούς όρους του ΙΖ΄ αιώνος και ιδία εις τους παρ' Αθανασίῳ Πικρῷ και Μ. Τζάνε Μπουνιαλῆ και αι ονομασίαι των σκαφών παρ' αυτοίς", *Κρητολογία* 3, 5-46

Trevor-Roper, H. R. (1965). "The general crisis of the seventeenth century", in: Aston 1965, pp. 59-95

Vakalopoulos, A. E. (1968). *Ιστορία του νέου ελληνισμού. Γ΄. Τουρκοκρατία 1453-1669. Οι αγώνες για την πίστη και την ελευθερία*. Thessaloniki: Sfakianakis

Vakalopoulos, A. E. (1976). *The Greek Nation, 1453-1669. The cultural and economic background of modern Greek society*. Translated from the Greek by I. and P. Moles. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

Vakalopoulos, A. E. et al. (eds.) (1974). *Ιστορία του ελληνικού έθνους. Τόμος Ι΄. Ο ελληνισμός υπό ξένη κυριαρχία (περίοδος 1453-1669). Τουρκοκρατία-Λατινοκρατία*. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon

Valiero, A. (1679). *Historia della guerra di Candia*. Venice: Baglioni

Valiero, A. (1859). *Storia della guerra di Candia*. Trieste: Coen

Vellaio, N. (1647). *La guerra cretense*. Bologna: Zenero

Vincent, A. (1970). "The Two Sultanas: The Cretan War (1645-1669) in South Slav heroic songs", *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12/2, 237-42

Vitti, M. and Spadaro, G. (eds.) (1995). *Τραγωδία ονομαζομένη "Ευγένα" του κυρ Θεοδώρου Μοντσελέζε, 1646*. Athens: Odysseas

Vlassopoulou, M. (2000). "Literary writing and the recording of history: A study of Marinos Tzanes Bounialis' 'The Cretan War' (17th Century)". Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge

Xanthoudidis, S. (1909). *Επίτομος ιστορία Κρήτης από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι των καθ' ημάς*. Athens: Elliniki Ekdotiki Etaireia

Xirouchakis, A. (ed.) (1908). *Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος (1645-1669) ή συλλογή των ελληνικών ποιημάτων Ανθίμου Διακρούση, Μαρίνου Ζάνε*. Trieste: Lloyd

Xirouchakis, A. (1934). *Η βενετοκρατούμενη Ανατολή. Κρήτη και Επτάνησος*. Athens: Foinix

Zachariadou, E. (1960). *Το "Χρονικό των Τούρκων σουλτάνων" (του Βαρβερινού ελληνικού κώδικα 111) και το ιταλικό του πρότυπο*. Thessaloniki: Etaireia Makedonikon Spoudon

Zordan, G. (1998). *Repertorio di storiografia veneziana. Testi e studi*. Padova: Poligrafo

Two surveys of Modern Greek literature: Stephanos Kanelos (1822) and Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos (1826)

Marc Lauxtermann
Exeter College, Oxford

Is there a better way to start than *in medias res*? Especially in this particular case, for the *mediae res* into which we wholeheartedly jump are the lovely shores of the Bosphorus, where two Phanariots, Stephanos Kanelos and Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, will be our guides on a literary peregrination through time and space. So *in medias res* then:

> εις τον ωραίον Βόσπορον, εις της Τρυφής τα στήθη,
> η ποίησις της νέας μας Ελλάδος εγεννήθη.[1]
>
> in Luxury's bosom, on Bosphorus' shores,
> the poetry of our new Hellas sprang forth.

These beautiful verses stem from the pen of yet another Phanariot, Alexandros Soutsos, and form part of a poem entitled "Letter to Otto, King of the Hellenes".

---

[1] The poem "Προς τον Βασιλέα της Ελλάδος Όθωνα" can be found in Soutsos's collection of poems: *Πανόραμα της Ελλάδος* (Nafplio 1833). The poem has been reprinted on numerous occasions, e.g. A. Soutsos, *Άπαντα* (Athens 1916), pp. 96-100. On Alexandros Soutsos, see G. L. Lefas, *Ο Αλέξανδρος Σούτσος και οι επιδράσεις του στους συγχρόνους του* (Athens 1979), K. Th. Dimaras, *Ελληνικός Ρωμαντισμός* (Athens 1982), pp. 242-54, P. Moullas, *Ρήξεις και συνέχειες. Μελέτες για τον 19ο αιώνα* (Athens 1993), pp. 233-62, and N. Vayenas, "Ο ουτοπικός σοσιαλισμός των αδελφών Σούτσων", in: N. Vayenas (ed.), *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880* (Irakleio 1997), pp. 43-58.

It is 1833, and Otto has only just arrived from his native Bavaria, full of philhellenic zest, and obviously very pleased to have become king of Greece. The Greeks are equally excited about the arrival of this young man, who will reign over Greece, like another Hercules, another Achilles, another Alcibiades, etc. Otto sets foot on Greek ground, welcoming committees deliver ardent speeches, the people cheer. The resurrection of Greece has commenced, the Ancient Greeks are rising from their graves, and the Parthenon looks benevolently upon the inhabitants of the village of Athens, who have suddenly become aware once more of their illustrious past. Alexandros Soutsos jumps at the occasion to explain to the young king the status quo on the literary front, pointing out who matters and who does not. His viewpoint is blatantly modern: he is not interested in earlier periods; instead, it is the now and here that is of importance.

The first poet Soutsos mentions as a shining example of Modern Greek poetry, with emphasis on both the words "modern" and "Greek", is Athanasios Christopoulos, whose anacreontic songs were extremely popular along the shores of the Bosphorus. The second poet Soutsos mentions is his own uncle, Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, whom he praises for the "ancient" character of his verses: "He sounded such a magnificent melody that we saw once more the monuments of the Ancients; it is nothing short of a miracle that already in those forlorn days of slavery, he expressed ideas of liberty." Two things are striking in this passage: the ideological appeal to Antiquity as a valid standard by which to measure Modern Greek literature, and the notion that literature can only flourish in a free and independent Greece. The third poet in Soutsos's pantheon of Modern Greek poetry is Rigas Velestinlis, the archetypal revolutionary whom the Turks had tried and sentenced to death in 1798. It is interesting to note that Soutsos is otherwise rather negative about the kind of vulgar language used by Rigas and others, which was rather different from the kind of archaistic Greek Soutsos himself favoured. But in the case of a national martyr, it was of course not done to point out such flaws and shortcomings. Living poets, of course, were a different matter,

and Soutsos does not hesitate to scold Kalvos and Solomos for dressing "grand ideas in poor garments". The rest of Soutsos's poem is unimportant, because he basically repeats what by now has become more than clear: the new poetry harks back to Antiquity, is impassioned with an ardent nationalistic zeal, and strives to purify the language.

In modern discussions of this poem the verses that refer to Kalvos and Solomos are usually quoted with disbelief. How could Soutsos be so dumb as to disregard the greatness of the two poets? Such angry reactions are of course inspired by the radical turning point in literary thought that took place around 1880, after which the common language started to be regarded as the appropriate means for literary self-expression.[2] But before 1880 things were very different, at least in Athens. In the 19th century, from the establishment of the Greek state until the generation of 1880, the general view was that Modern Greece – as the direct heir to Ancient Greece – had an obligation to make its language as archaistic as possible. To understand this reasoning, we must realize that the formation of Greek national consciousness differs significantly from that of other nations. While the other European nations largely had to create their own national symbols, stories and monuments (which Hobsbawm has aptly labelled "invention of tradition"), the Greeks on the contrary received their national identity from Western Europe as a ready-to-use package.[3] The humanists, the Enlightenment thinkers and the philhellenes had all had well-defined ideas about the so-called cradle of European civilization; the only thing the Greeks had to do – as direct descendants of Pericles and Sophocles – was to live up to the idealized picture that Western Europe had painted of the Ancient

---

[2] See V. Apostolidou, *Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς ιστορικός της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας* (Athens 1992) and D. Tziovas, *The Nationism of the Demoticists and its impact on their literary theory (1888-1930)* (Amsterdam 1986).

[3] See S. Voutsaki, "Archaeology and the construction of the past in nineteenth-century Greece", in: H. Hokwerda (ed.), *Constructions of Greek past: Identity and historical consciousness from Antiquity to the present* (Groningen 2003), pp. 231-55, esp. pp. 232-41.

Greeks. But of course, reality is always much more complex, as all those inspired romanticists experienced when they rushed to reborn Hellas, only to find out that Giannis, Kostas and Dimitris, however hard they tried, were no Ancient Greeks. All this resulted in a rarely voiced sense of guilt on the part of the Greeks, for not living up to this superimposed ideal. And the less Giannis and Kostas conformed to the requirement of being Ancient Greeks, the more they tried to be like them. The *katharevousa* is a direct consequence of this obsession.

To return to Soutsos's versified letter: one cannot but notice that he forges a direct link between Modern Greek literature and the birth of the independent state. Only then could something new come about. This implies that the boundaries of Modern Greek literature are set by the boundaries of the new state. At the same time Soutsos projects the nascence of Modern Greek literature upon a slightly earlier period: that of Phanariot poetry. "In Luxury's bosom, on Bosphorus' shores, the poetry of our new Hellas sprang forth." Now this is typical of all literary histories: as they are written from the perspective of the nation state, they search for life forms of the same nation state in earlier periods. And very few people seem to care that, in doing so, they paint a distorted picture of the historical reality. This fixation on the nation state and its mythical past is a typically Romantic view.[4] The nation cannot be defined. Because the nation is in fact a metaphysical concept, it detracts from any sensible discussion and lends itself to all purposes and ends, some innocent and some not so innocent. Most attempts to get a hold on the intangible nation think in terms of the characteristics of the – usually much later – unitary states, which are then projected upon earlier historical phases.[5]

---

[4] For the Greek Romantic movement, see A. Politis, *Ρομαντικά χρόνια. Ιδεολογίες και νοοτροπίες στην Ελλάδα του 1830-1880* (Athens 1993).

[5] For the Greek case, see P. M. Kitromilides, *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy. Studies in the culture and political thought of South-Eastern Europe* (Aldershot 1994), *passim*, esp. no. XI.

A few years ago, a conference was held in Venice, where the most authoritative Neohellenists were assembled; the theme of the conference was the beginnings of Modern Greek literature.[6] I will not tire you with a survey of the opinions that were defended arduously and with strength of argument: some maintained that they could hear the infant cry in the 12th century, others were quite convinced that the birth of this *Wunderkind* must have coincided with the invention of the printing press, and still others thought that the Byzantine literature in the vernacular was not to be taken into consideration and that the infant's first tentative burps could not be heard until after 1453. As a cultural historian, I am not sure what to make of all these birth certificates, and to be truthful, they are of little interest to me. Periodization is a modern disease; we define our identity by compartmentalizing the past in various eras, each of which heralds a breach with the preceding one, just as our own era supposedly differs in its very essence from that of our fathers and forefathers.[7] But in fact it is a desperate headlong flight towards an uncertain future that will inevitably catch up with us, only to leave us behind as desperate as we ever were. But the truth must be told: the clinical picture of panting modernity, forever trying to catch up with itself, is an interesting phenomenon that deserves to be diagnosed.

* * *

---

[6] See the contributions by Savvidis, Eideneier, Vitti, Alexiou, Kapsomenos, Kechagioglou and Irmscher, in: N. M. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca. Atti del secondo congresso internazionale "Neograeca Medii Aevi"* (Venice 1993), vol. I, pp. 35-105. See the critical reviews by: G. Kechagioglou, *Ελληνικά* 44 (1994) 513-40, esp. 515-19, and A. Politis, *Μαντατοφόρος* 39-40 (1995) 185-92 (reprinted in: A. Politis, *Το μυθολογικό κενό* (Athens 2000), pp. 131-42). For recent contributions to the debate on the origins of Modern Greek literature, see G. Danezis, "Οι αρχές της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας", in: *Νέα Εστία* 159, τεύχος 1788 (2006) 784-8, and the reply by N. Vayenas, "Για τις αρχές της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας", in: *Νέα Εστία* 161, τεύχος 1797 (2007) 296-313.

[7] See J.-Fr. Lyotard, *The inhuman: reflections on time* (Cambridge 1991), p. 25.

In what follows I shall examine two surveys of Modern Greek literature written by two Phanariots during the War of Independence.[8] It is important to note that both authors, Kanelos and Rizos Neroulos, wrote what they wrote not with the Greek public in mind, but for a public of philhellenes: Kanelos wrote on behalf of the German philhellene Carl Iken and Neroulos addressed the philhellenic circles of Geneva.[9]

---

[8] For 19th-century literary histories, see: A. Angelou, "Δοκιμές για απογραφή και αποτίμηση της Νεοελληνικής Γραμματείας στην ευρυχωρία του Νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού", *Ο Ερανιστής* 11 (1974) 1-16 (reprinted in: idem, *Των Φώτων* (Athens 1988), pp. 337-52); Apostolidou, *Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς*, pp. 27-90; M. D. Lauxtermann, *De natie als project, of hoe de Grieken in de negentiende eeuw aankeken tegen hun nationale literatuur* (Amsterdam 2004); A. Politis, "Γραμματολογικές απογραφές και συνθετικές θεωρήσεις της λογοτεχνίας. Η σταδιακή πορεία. Α΄ 1821-1871", in: P. M. Kitromilidis and T. E. Sklavenitis (eds.), *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας 1833-2002* (Athens 2004), vol. I, pp. 321-42. For 20th-century literary histories, see: G. Kechagioglou, "Οι ιστορίες της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας", *Μαντατοφόρος* 15 (1980) 5-66. For the whole period, see G. Jusdanis, *Belated Modernity and aesthetic culture. Inventing national literature* (Minneapolis 1991), pp. 108-13 and 119-21. See also the contributions by Dimaras, Vitti, Veloudis, Apostolidou and Beaton in: *Ζητήματα ιστορίας των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων. Αφιέρωμα στον Κ. Θ. Δημαρά* (Thessaloniki 1994), pp. 13-55; and the contributions by Apostolidou, Kargiotis, Lambropoulos and Paschalidis, in: *Μνήμη Άλκη Αγγέλου. Τα άφθονα σχήματα του παρελθόντος. Ζητήσεις της πολιτισμικής ιστορίας και της θεωρίας της λογοτεχνίας* (Thessaloniki 2004), pp. 277-331.

[9] When this paper was ready to go to press, I discovered that there is even a third survey of Modern Greek literature written between 1821 and 1830, once again intended for a foreign audience, this time the French: G. A. de Mano [=Γεώργιος Α. Μάνος, 1792-1869], *Discours d'introduction au cours de littérature grecque moderne, prononcé à l'Athenée de Paris, dans sa séance du 9 février 1825* (Paris 1825). The "cours" consisted of three lectures: (1) on language, (2) pronunciation and (3) literature. In the first lecture, the only one to be published, Manos deals with education, Phanariots (among others, Christopoulos) and Korais. We can only guess what he may have said in the other two lectures. I owe this reference to: Politis, "Γραμματολογικές απογραφές", p. 324.

The first Phanariot is Stephanos Kanelos.[10] His life was short, his death tragic. Having studied medicine in Germany he died from the pest at Crete in 1823 while trying to cure his patients; he was only 31 years old. He was born in Constantinople in 1792, studied at the school of Proios at Kuruçeşme, was involved in the first edition of Christopoulos's *Λυρικά* in 1811, studied in Germany until 1817, lived in Paris for two years, returned to his home city in 1819, was appointed at the Princely Academy in Bucharest in 1820, joined Ypsilantis when he entered the Danubian principalities in 1821, had to flee to Germany in the same year, and went to Paris in 1822. In the same year 1822, in the month of June, he set sail for Greece together with his friend Pikkolos; upon arriving in the Peloponnese, they were robbed of all their belongings and the money donated to the Greek cause by European philhellenes, and finally made it to Hydra. There they parted company: while Pikkolos went to the Ionian Islands, Kanelos joined the forces of Admiral Tombazis and went to Crete. Kanelos's literary output in Greek is small: firstly, the *Dream* (*Όνειρον*), included in the 1811 edition of Christopoulos's *Λυρικά*, a hilarious defence of the spoken language as a medium of literary expression;[11] secondly, his contributions to *Λόγιος Ερμής*, the most important pre-revolutionary Greek periodical;[12] thirdly, a

---

[10] For the life of Kanelos (alternatively spelled Kanellos), see: Carl Iken, *Leukothea. Eine Sammlung von Briefen eines geborenen Griechen über Staatswesen, Literatur und Dichtkunst des neueren Griechenlands* (Leipzig 1825), vol. I, pp. 257-88 and N. K. Vlachos, "Στέφανος Κανέλλος (1792-1823)", *Παρνασσός* 17 (1975) 257-76.

[11] The authorship of the *Όνειρον* is disputed: see V. Rotolo, "Il problema dell'autenticità del Sogno di A. Christopoulos", *Folia Neohellenica* 1 (1975), 125-42 and E. Tsantsanoglou, "Το πορτρέτο του Αθανάσιου Χριστόπουλου στην έκδοση των *Λυρικών* του 1833 και η πατρότητα του Ονείρου", in: *Ζητήματα ιστορίας των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων. Αφιέρωμα στον Κ. Θ. Δημαρά* (Thessaloniki 1994), pp. 243-55.

[12] As most contributions in *Logios Ermis* are signed just with an initial, it is not always possible to distinguish K(anelos) from K(okkinakis) and other K's, so the following list is probably not complete: *LE* 6 (1816) 222; 7 (1817) 36-9; 7 (1817) 153-63, 185-92, 413-28 & 437-43; 8 (1818) 409-17; 8 (1818) 633-52 & 9 (1819) 159-67 & 193-203; 9 (1819) 73-92; 10 (1820) 2-16; 10 (1820) 152-60; 10 (1820) 185-92; 11 (1821) 264-70.

number of patriotic poems: war songs (θούριοι) and laments;[13] and fourthly, a translation of a radical pamphlet on the constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens.[14]

Unfortunately, his most important contribution to Modern Greek literature appears to be lost for good and the translation made of it is rarely mentioned, because most Neohellenists do not read German. I am referring to the philological letters Kanelos wrote and which can be found in: Carl Iken, *Leukothea. Eine Sammlung von Briefen eines geborenen Griechen über Staatswesen, Literatur und Dichtkunst des neueren Griechenlands*, that is: "Leukothea (the White Goddess). A compilation of letters from a born Greek concerning society, literature and poetry of Modern Greece".[15] The book, which appeared in two volumes in 1825, is based on ten letters Stephanos Kanelos sent to Iken in the years 1821 and 1822, first from Heidelberg and then from Paris.[16] In

---

Cf. E. N. Frangiskos, *Τα ελληνικά προεπαναστατικά περιοδικά. Ευρετήρια, Β΄. Ερμής ο Λόγιος 1811-1821* (Athens 1976).

[13] For the θούριοι, see Vlachos, *Ο Στέφανος Κανέλλος*, pp. 264-5, and A. Politis, "Ν. Σ. Πίκκολος και Φοριέλ – και ένα αυτόγραφο του Στέφανου Κανέλου", *Ο Ερανιστής* 16 (1980) 1-27, at pp. 8-12. For the elegies, see Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. II, pp. 93-4. Another poem by Kanelos is the opening address in the 1811 edition of Christopoulos, the so-called Προσφώνημα.

[14] *Βιβλιαράκι κατ' ερωταπόκρισιν. Περί λογής λογιών πραγμάτων αναγκαίων μάλιστα εις την Πατρίδα των Γερμανών, δι' όλους τους Γερμανούς Πολίτας και Χωριανούς.* Εν παρέργω μεταφρασμένον εκ του Γερμανικού υπό Στεφάνου Κανέλλου, προς χρήσιν των Ελλήνων. Ετυπώθη διά δαπάνης Ν.Κ. εις μνήμην φιλίας προς τον μακαρίτην μεταφραστήν. Εν Ύδρα 1 Ιανουαρίου 1824. The original is a leaflet by Wilhelm Schulz (1797-1860), which appeared anonymously in 1819: *Frag- und Antwortbüchlein über Allerlei, was im teutschen Vaterlande Noth thut. Für den Bürgers- und Bauersmann* (Teutschland 1819).

[15] See the review in the Geneva periodical: *Bibliothèque universelle des sciences, belles-lettres et arts* 32 (1826) 34-52, 149-69 & 249-59: the anonymous reviewer quotes extensively from letters 1-2, 4-7 and 10 (in French translation) and criticizes Iken for the disorderly presentation of his data.

[16] Iken presents letters 3 to 10 as one long letter, divided in eight parts; but I fail to understand how Kanelos can possibly react in letter 9 to a comment made by Iken concerning letter 3 (cf. letter 3, vol. I, pp. 214-16 and letter 9, vol. II, p. 91) if these two letters were sent together. Another

these letters, Kanelos tried to sketch a lively portrait of education, literature and intellectual life on the eve of the Greek Revolution. As he declares in his tenth and last letter, his aim was to describe "the most important period of our culture, when our awareness awakened and we realized that only enlightenment and schooling could ameliorate our situation", to indicate the causes and circumstances that had led to this awareness, and to trace the path of progress that had eventually led to the miracles that were now being performed.[17]

However, Kanelos was a young man with a mission and, therefore, in a hurry. It was no time for philology, but for serious action – and it is obvious that he was growing more and more impatient with Iken and all his questions about the state of affairs in Greece. That is why the letters are written in a somewhat hasty and flippant manner; he sometimes repeats himself, he sometimes contradicts himself and, as he had to admit in his last letter, he had had no time to write about authors like Korais, Rizos Neroulos and Rigas.[18] His letters deal mainly with the Phanariot literary and intellectual milieu, with schoolmasters, language reformers, philosophers and scientists, the Enlightenment thinkers and the reactionaries, the liberals and the clerics. He is not afraid to express his personal views: for instance, about Evgenios Voulgaris and his treatise on Logic. The book is unreadable, he says, not just because of the archaistic language, but also because of the lack of clarity in the presentation of Voulgaris's arguments. The older generation are full of praise for this work, but that is because no one dares to admit that he fails to understand it. The younger

---

problem is that it is not always clear who is talking: does a piece of information derive from Kanelos himself, or it is a comment by Iken? And a third, insoluble, problem is that we do not know whether Iken provided a faithful and reliable translation of Kanelos's Greek, or coloured the text by adding tell-tale adjectives, adverbs, nouns, etc., and using a semantically more expressive lexicon. Seeing how freely the French translator (in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, see previous footnote) rendered Iken's German, one may seriously question the metaphrastic ethics of the early 19th century.

[17] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. II, pp. 98-9.

[18] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. II, pp. 96-7 and 99-100.

generation, on the contrary, think it is a total waste of time to read Voulgaris.[19] One of the many reasons why Kanelos's letters are so interesting is because they show the coming of age of a new generation, restless, eager to explore the unknown, prone to flights of imagination – almost romantic, one would say. He tells us about life at school, those early days of patriotism: he and his fellow students would listen in rapture to Stephanos Dounkas, their headmaster, who introduced them to modern science and philosophy, and they would wax enthusiastic about the *Aeolodoric Grammar* of Christopoulos, the *Stochasmoi* of Korais, the *Modern Geography* of Philippides and Konstantas, the *Introduction to Philosophy* by Soave in the translation of Konstantas, and the songs of Rigas. In another passage, he recounts how he and his friends, at the tender age of 12, would gather before the icon of Christ and sing the *Thourios* of Rigas. His sisters would look at them and share their enthusiasm. Older people, on the contrary, did not understand the meaning of Rigas and were indifferent to their juvenile aspirations.[20]

Although the letters have obviously been written in much haste and do not pretend to form an adequate overview of Greek literature in the 18th and early 19th centuries, they provide some keen insights into the pre-national literary culture of the Greeks, such as, for instance, the obvious generation gap Kanelos alludes to, the function of schools not just as educational, but also as literary institutions, and the language debate, in which he, a true Phanariot, chooses the side of Katartzis and Christopoulos. It must be said that in general, Kanelos's perspective on things is coloured by his cultural background and his political views. That is to say, as the regeneration of the Greek nation and its political independence are of paramount importance to him, his letters centre on the

---

[19] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. II, pp. 7-9. However, it is interesting to note that a representative of the "older generation", Neroulos (see note 25), pp. 34-7, is not very complimentary either, when he discusses the merits of Voulgaris.

[20] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, pp. 243-4; vol. II, 7-9, 81 and 100. Cf. Vlachos, *Στέφανος Κανέλλος*, pp. 267-8.

crucial role played by schools in Constantinople, Bucharest, Smyrna, Chios, and elsewhere, in the last fifty or so years before the Greek Revolution of 1821. The fact that he forgets Korais until the last moment is a tell-tale omission. As Kanelos is an ardent supporter of Korais, it is not a matter of wilful concealment. It is simply that Korais is living far away, in civilized Europe and not in Ottoman Turkey, and resides beyond the cultural horizon of the Phanariot class to which Kanelos belongs.

Kanelos has remarkably little to say about literature written before the commencement of the Greek Enlightenment. It is clearly of little interest to him. In the third letter he makes the sweeping statement that not a single decent work had been written since the Fall of Constantinople and that literature in those dark ages of repression and servitude had not diminished, but rather added to, the general misery of the Greeks. The context makes it clear that he is referring to the learned, not the vernacular tradition.[21] But it must be said that Kanelos is not at all interested in texts written in demotic Greek. Only when he was pressurized by Iken to write about what the latter, not Kanelos himself, considered to be the "Nationalgedicht der Griechen" (the national epic of the Greeks), namely the *Erotokritos*, did he deign to give some information on the poem. His assessment is very positive: the poem excels in narrative structure, ornate rhetoric and poetic language, and provides a good picture of the customs and beliefs of the common people in Venetian Crete. Its only shortcomings are the many Italian loanwords and dialectal forms which are difficult to understand nowadays. Nonetheless, the poem is still popular and its two main characters have even become the subject of folk songs.[22]

---

[21] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, p. 208.

[22] Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, pp. 164-9. Incidentally, the two examples given by Kanelos (or Iken?) in a footnote on p. 171 are emphatically not folk songs. It is typical of the early 19th century that the distinction between folk poetry on the one hand and lyrical poetry (usually of Phanariot provenance) on the other was not entirely clear to Greek intellectuals.

Kanelos, this young revolutionary and one of the few intellectuals who actually gave his life for Greece, presents a highly politicized picture of – what shall we call it? – γράμματα, γραμματεία, *Schrifttum*, this general notion of educated writing on subjects that define a given culture.[23] In the end it is not literary worth, but political stance that determines whether an author is good or not – and "good" in a moral sense, not a literary one. Stephanos Dounkas, his beloved teacher, and Philippides, one of his favourite authors, are both criticized because they are not involved in the Greek struggle for independence and are minding their own business, and Christopoulos whose ideas on the Greek language Kanelos wholeheartedly embraced and the publication of whose poems he helped to accomplish, is portrayed as a machiavellian schemer, as someone without morals, a traitor of the worst kind.[24]

The second Phanariot literary historian I would like to discuss is Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, whom we have met before as the uncle of Alexandros Soutsos, who tells us that Neroulos "expressed ideas of liberty in days of slavery". Neroulos had held high offices in the semi-autonomous principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, but was forced to flee to save his life in 1821, after the failure of Ypsilantis and his Sacred Battalion to incite a general revolution in the Balkans. After various peregrinations through Europe (Bessarabia, Germany, Italy) Neroulos ended up in Geneva, where he was asked to give a lecture on Modern Greece in 1826. But he had so much to say on the matter that one lecture turned into a series of lectures, not so much about Modern

---

[23] Like so many other languages (Dutch, for instance), English does not really have a term for this category of texts that is much wider and more comprehensive than the Romantic notion of "literature". Despite all the isms of the last two centuries, including the latest one, postmodernism, the way we think and feel is still determined by the Romantic paradigm – which makes it very difficult to understand the concept of literature in the pre-Romantic age.

[24] Philippides: vol. II, pp. 79-80; Dounkas: vol. II, pp. 84-5; Christopoulos: vol. II, pp. 87-8.

Greece itself, but about the intellectual developments and the literature of the nascent Greek nation.[25]

Rizos Neroulos's *Cours de littérature* starts off with Homer – who else? He then sketches briefly the literature of the illustrious ancestors until Philip and Alexander the Great, the Macedonian brutes who were to enslave the Greek people. When the Greeks lost their freedom, decay set in – a decay that was to last for no less than 2,000 years, until the love of freedom gave the Greeks wings once more and made the nation rise like a phoenix from its ashes. According to Rizos Neroulos, the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods offer nothing worth reading, because everything that was written in those hard times of slavery was written in "grec littéral" instead of "grec moderne". Only around 1700 did the tide turn, when the Greeks (thanks to the Church and the Phanariots) regained some form of autonomy. Only then can one begin to speak of a Greek national literature.[26]

At this point, some comments are in order. First of all, we see a complete and utter identification with the Ancients: in a certain sense, Homer is already a Modern Greek poet. Secondly, we read that literature cannot flourish under foreign rule – and this foreign

---

[25] *Cours de littérature grecque moderne*, donné à Genève par Jacovaky Rizo Néroulos, ancien premier ministre des hospodars grecs de Valachie et de Moldavie, publié par Jean Humbert (Geneva 1827). The book was reprinted one year later: *Cours* etc. Seconde édition revue et augmentée (Geneva-Paris 1828). The book was translated into other European languages: German 1827 and Dutch 1829 (Politis, "Γραμματολογικές απογραφές", pp. 326-8, also refers to Italian and Polish translations, which I have not been able to find); but it was translated into Greek only in 1870. For a short biography of Neroulos, see the introduction to the *Cours de littérature*, officially written by Jean Humbert (pp. V-XXV), but probably dictated by Neroulos himself; cf. the autobiographical text written in 1842 by Neroulos and published by N. I. Laskaris, *Ιστορία του νεοελληνικού θεάτρου* (Athens 1938), vol. I, pp. 133-5. It is interesting to note that in 1842 Neroulos refers to his *Cours* as an ιστορία της ελληνικής φιλολογίας, just as his *Histoire de la révolution grecque* (Paris 1829) is called an ιστορία της ελληνικής επαναστάσεως (see Laskaris, *Ιστορία*, p. 135). This indicates that at least in 1842 Neroulos is aware of the fact that he has written, not just an ordinary account of intellectual life on the eve of the Greek Revolution, but a *literary history*.

[26] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 1-21.

rule includes, at least for Neroulos, Alexander the Great (who acquired Greek citizenship only in the second half of the 19th century) and the Byzantine emperors (ditto).[27] Thirdly, we see that the standard for true literature is the vernacular, "grec moderne" (as opposed to "grec littéral", "learned Greek"); however, Neroulos does not opt for the language of the common people, but in fact supports the language of the Constantinopolitan elite.[28] Fourthly, it is abundantly clear that he aims to present the Phanariot elite, to which he himself belonged, as pioneers who actually made the revolution of 1821 possible.[29] And fifthly, Neroulos is refreshingly modern: for him Modern Greek literature starts around the year 1700.

Neroulos divides the approximately 125 years of Modern Greek literature into three periods: the dawn of the Greek rebirth (1700-1750), the creation of schools and the flourishing of the sciences under Western European influence (1750-1800) and the pre-revolutionary period characterized by the liberal ideas and the language reforms initiated by Korais (1800-1821).[30] Like Kanelos before him, Neroulos is basically interested in schools and intel-

---

[27] For the "Greek" identity of Alexander the Great, see Politis, *Ρομαντικά χρόνια*, pp. 39-47. For the reception of Byzantium, see D. Ricks and P. Magdalino (eds.), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek identity* (Aldershot 1988).

[28] Because of the vehement language debate in the later 19th and 20th centuries, we have been hampered in our understanding of the true nature of the language debate that went on before the creation of the Greek nation state. It is time to reassess people like Korais and Kodrikas and Doukas, not from the viewpoint of post-junta Greece, but within their historical contexts.

[29] Kanelos, on the contrary, is highly critical of the Phanariot elite. For instance, he bluntly accuses prince Alexandros Soutsos of plundering Wallachia and thinking only of his own petty interests (in fact, he supported Greek schools only because it was good for his image): Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, pp. 254-6, cf. pp. 6-9. But see the passionate plea by Neroulos in defence of the Phanariots: Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 67-87.

[30] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 103-14, writes an encomium of Korais and his proposals for the Greek language. For those who find this accolade hard to believe, coming from the author of the *Korakistika*, Neroulos points out that the target of his satire was not Korais himself, but his followers (p. 113).

lectuals: he enumerates a long list of principals, headmasters and teachers, and their various publications ranging from the sciences to philosophical explorations. Like Kanelos, he is interested in teaching methods ("mutual instruction", the Bell-Lancaster method) and in the modernization of the curriculum; both Neroulos and Kanelos stress the fact that whereas previously the study of the Ancients centred on formal qualities, nowadays content has become crucial.[31]

As a true Enlightenment thinker, Neroulos is mainly interested in education and methods of spreading knowledge to as many people as possible in as little time as possible. This is why his highly illuminating comments on literary texts cannot be found in the main text of his treatise, but in the "appendice". This appendix is divided into generic categories: prose, consisting of theology, historiography, philosophy, translations, travel writing, and novels; and poetry, consisting of tragedies and lyric poetry.[32] I will single out four remarks by Neroulos.

(1) Question: why do the modern Greeks have no novels? Answer: they invented the genre, for which see Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, the medieval novels (no names given) and "le fameux roman de galanterie chevaleresque intitulé *Erotocritos*"; but despite these illustrious examples, there is simply not enough "urbanité" among contemporary Greeks and this is why "les sociétés ne sont ni assez fréquentes, ni assez variées pour fournir un ample matière à celui qui veut observer les moeurs et le jeu des passions." This is an important contribution to the sociology of the novel; basically, Neroulos is reminding us of the fact that the novel is a bourgeois kind of writing, which can only flourish in a society where men and women are free to meet each other without social strictures – otherwise, how can they fall in love?[33]

(2) Question: how come that we count syllables and stress accents, and why do we rhyme? Answer: somewhere, in the Middle Ages, we developed a new kind of versification (see

[31] See Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 48-50 and Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, pp. 252-3.
[32] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 126-56.
[33] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 137-40.

Manasses, Tzetzes, Ptochoprodromos), and then, from the 15th century onwards, some Cretan poets started to use the originally Arabic, but subsequently Italian and Frankish device of rhyme. It should be noted, however, that this rhyming poetry is very Italian. And this is why these literary works (including the *Erotokritos*, *Voskopoula*, *Thysia*, *Erophili*, etc.) "pèchent par la trivialité de leur style, par une servile imitation de la littérature italienne, et par leur fastidieuse prolixité. Ces premiers essais d'une poésie nouvelle manquent totalement de physionomie, de nationalité, de couleur locale; on n'y trouve aucune trace de l'étude des ancients, aucune notion des règles. Quelques étincelles de verve poétique font tout le mérite de ces compositions informes, tombées dans un juste oubli."[34] Let's not forget that in 1818 one of the βυζαντινά παλικάρια, as Korais used to call the Phanariots, Dionysios Foteinos, had rewritten the *Erotokritos* and turned it into decent Greek (entitled: *Ο Νέος Ερωτόκριτος*).

(3) Question: what about non-rhyming poetry, I mean: these folk songs recently published by Claude Fauriel? Answer: "Notre poésie non rimée pris naissance dans les cavernes de l'Olympe [...]. Creée par de libres montagnards, elle fut comme eux simple et rustique, mais pleine d'énergie et d'originalité [...]. Cette poésie simple et sans art se distingue par des beautés mâles et naïves [...]. Le genre *klephtique* date de très-loin, et remonte peut-être aux premiers temps de la conquête. Il existe une quantité de ces chansons nationales, conservées dans la mémoire des Grecs [...]."[35] Neroulos is one of the first to suggest that the folk songs may date back to times immemorial, and to view them as a genuine expression of the Greek nation. He is followed by Rizos Rangavis[36]

---

[34] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 141-142.

[35] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 142-143.

[36] A.-R. Rangabé, *Histoire littéraire de la Grèce moderne* (Paris 1877), vol. I, pp. 2-3. For the literary history of Rangavis, see G. Valetas, "Εκδόσεις και σύνθεση της νεοελληνικής γραμματολογίας του Αλέξανδρου Ραγκαβή", *Νέα Εστία* 10 (1936) 837-42, and E. Kovaiou, "Geschichte der Neugriechischen Literatur von A. R. Rhangabé und Daniel Sanders", in: A. Argyriou, K. A. Dimadis and A. D. Lazaridou

and by other authors of literary histories, who will treat folk poetry right at the beginning of their accounts in order to prove the continuity of the Greek nation.[37]

(4) Question: how should we judge those poems that have recently been translated into French by Stanislav Julien, namely: Solomos's *Hymn to Liberty* and Kalvos's *Odes*? Neroulos is dismissive of Kalvos's poetic merits and does not rate him highly because of his metrical oddities, his pompous language and his unusual images. He is more positive about Solomos: "Les poésies de Salomos de Zante sont parsemées d'expressions et de tournures dont l'emploi devrait uniquement appartenir à la conversation familière; elles ont cependant le rare mérite d'une verve énergique et entraînante, d'une imagination pleine de hardiesse et de fécondité [...]." Neroulos's book ends with extensive quotations from the *Hymn*, and concludes as follows: "Il faudrait le citer en entier, si l'on voulait faire remarquer tous les morceaux pleins de chaleur, d'énergie et d'entraînement." Just as in the case of Rigas, on whom Neroulos lavishes compliments, the patriotic character of the *Hymn to Liberty* outweighs any flaws in Solomos's writing.[38] Seven years later his nephew, Alexandros Soutsos, will hold the opposite opinion: great ideas are not great if they are poorly clad.

In comparison to Kanelos's philological letters, Neroulos offers not only a more thorough and comprehensive treatment of intellectual life on the eve of the Greek Revolution, but also a serious attempt to contextualize literary works historically. It cannot be denied, however, that the final result is rather dis-

---

(eds.), *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος ανάμεσα στην Ανατολή και τη Δύση 1453-1981* (Athens 1999), vol. I, pp. 353-67.

[37] On the reception of folk poetry in the 19th century, see M. Herzfeld, *Ours once more. Folklore, ideology, and the making of Modern Greece* (Austin 1982) and A. Politis, *Η ανακάλυψη των ελληνικών δημοτικών τραγουδιών* (Athens 1984). The chapter dedicated to folk songs in Dimaras's literary history has the brilliant title "Οι αρχαίοι ζουν ακόμη"! See K. Th. Dimaras, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας* (8th edition, Athens 1987), pp. 3-18.

[38] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 145-6 (on Rigas), 151 (Kalvos), and 151-6 (Solomos).

appointing: incapable of understanding the course of history, Neroulos presents literature as a static whole or, perhaps better, as a series of static wholes. For him a national literature thrives as long as there is autonomy and freedom. This was the case with the Ancient Greeks, who wrote superb works until they lost their independence at the Battle of Chaeronea. Then, for a very long time, close to two millennia, not a single decent literary work was written because of the dreadful Macedonians, the dreadful Romans, the dreadful Byzantines and the dreadful Turks. Thank God for the Patriarchate and the Phanariots, who eventually obtained a certain measure of autonomy from the Turks, which led to the rebirth of the national literature, and, of course, of the nation. The whole concept of development is alien to Neroulos; he sees changes, but he does not observe the flux of time, the way things evolve and grow, never being static or constant. Of course, Neroulos is not to be blamed for this lack of historical insight, for he would have been well ahead of his time, had he grasped the historicist notion of the organic succession of periods. Historicism did not reach Greece until the mid-19th century, and even then it took a long time for this paradigm to become dominant among the Greek intelligentsia: people like Koumanoudis rejected the Ζαμπελιοπαπαρρηγοπούλειος σχολή until their last breath.[39]

* * *

The Phanariots and all they stood for – η Βασιλεύουσα, η Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή, η καθ' ημάς Ανατολή – form an almost magical world that is lost forever. The Phanariots are losers in more than one sense: not only does their world no longer exist, but

[39] S. A. Koumanoudis, *Συναγωγή νέων λέξεων* (Athens 1900, reprinted Athens 1998, with an introduction by K. Th. Dimaras), *sub voce*. Koumanoudis claims to have coined the compound adjective in 1851, but, as Dimaras points out in his introduction, p. XXV, Zambelios's *Άσματα δημοτικά* dates from 1852 and the first edition of Paparrigopoulos's *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* from 1853 – which means that, unless Koumanoudis possessed powers of clairvoyance, he cannot have mocked ideas that had not yet been published.

posterity has been unfair to them and they have been vilified and denigrated by generations of demoticists, who kept kicking the corpse even long after its demise. It is about time for this to stop. As we all know, history is written by the winners. In the case of the literary canon and literary history, the winners are Kostis Palamas, Giorgos Seferis and Konstantinos Dimaras. Most of our common assumptions go back to theirs: the distinction between a learned and a vernacular tradition, the pivotal role played by the folk songs, *Digenis Akritis* as a national epic, the importance of the medieval romances, *Erotokritos* as an absolute masterpiece, Solomos as the national poet, and so on and so forth. It is basically because we are used to this story, which we have been told over and over again as students, that we find it difficult to understand that other stories, equally reasonable, are possible as well. The fascinating thing about 19th-century literary surveys and histories is that they provide alternative, almost subversive stories that undermine everything we hold to be true.

This is why I would invite you, reader, to indulge in some gymnastics of the mind and try to imagine what the literary horizon looked like in 1822 and 1826. If one compares the two literary surveys of Kanelos and Neroulos, one immediately recognizes that Kanelos does not mention Solomos, Kalvos or klephtic songs for the simple reason that in 1822 Solomos and Kalvos had not yet written anything of importance and the klephtic songs had not yet been advertised throughout Europe by that indefatigable advocate of the Greek cause, Claude Fauriel. However, in 1826, only four years later, Neroulos has to explain to his audience of Genevan philhellenes that Kalvos is not a very good poet. Solomos is on everybody's lip. And the whole of liberal Europe fantasizes about those fearsome klephts, those brave freedom fighters: Botsaris! Kolokotronis! and would you believe it, these noble savages even write poetry! (This is Edward Said all over again.) Personally I do not think that Neroulos, had he not been forced to leave his home, would have been much interested in Solomos or klephtic songs, but because he was adrift, flotsam on

the maelstrom of time, he found himself in a foreign environment of philhellenes who *were* interested.

The second thing that one may notice is the fact that Kanelos does not use the term "national", whereas Neroulos does: the klephtic songs are "des chansons nationales" and Rigas's *thourioi* "étincellent de beautés énergiques, qui sont puisées dans le caractère national", but the works of the Cretan Renaissance "manquent totalement de physionomie, de nationalité, de couleur locale" and Ioannis Zambelios's tragedies do not possess "toute la nationalité désirable" (because they are redolent of Alfieri).[40] The term "national" is a very complex one in this transitory period and can have various meanings. I have the impression that, with respect to the klephtic songs and Rigas's *Thourios*, "national" means "of the people", "popular", with a slight connotation of male Greek virtues, such as courage, honesty and trustworthiness. With respect to Cretan literature and Zambelios, the term "national" becomes somewhat xenophobic as it seems to indicate anything not tainted by foreign influences. Alexis Politis has recently pointed out that Neroulos obviously used Fauriel's introduction to the edition of the *Chants populaires*.[41] This is also true for the term "national". In his introduction Fauriel distinguishes two traditions, a literary tradition and a popular tradition – in short, *Erotokritos* versus the klephtic songs. About the *Erotokritos* he is not altogether complimentary: he recognizes that the work has literary merits, but he objects to its "prolixity" (his word, not mine) and the marked influence of Italian literature upon it. This is what he has to say about the other tradition, that of folk poetry:

> une poésie populaire dans tous les sens et toute la force de ce mot, expression directe et vraie du caractère et de l'esprit national, que tout Grec comprend et sent avec amour, par cela seul qu'il est Grec, qu'il habite le sol et respire l'air de la Grèce; une poésie enfin qui vit, non dans les livres, d'une vie factice et

---

[40] Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 142 (Cretan poems), 142-3 (klephtic songs), 144 (Zambelios) and 145-6 (Rigas).
[41] Politis, "Γραμματολογικές απογραφές", pp. 326-8.

> qui n'est souvent qu'apparente, mais dans le peuple lui-même, et de toute la vie du peuple.[42]

The identification of the "nation" with the "people", on which Fauriel's definition of folk poetry is predicated, is typical of the Romantic movement, and the almost Herderian preoccupation with the native soil seems to foreshadow the concept of ελληνικότητα.[43] Whereas Neroulos's ideas on what constitutes the "nation" have clearly been influenced by Fauriel, Kanelos does not view the Greek Insurrection in such terms. Kanelos is a Greek patriot, a revolutionary who believes in civil rights, social justice and democratic values, but he is not a nationalist. For Kanelos, in 1822, it is the people who are fighting; for Neroulos, in 1826, the nation is under arms.

Thirdly, Kanelos and Neroulos leave no doubt that whatever the respective merits of poets such as Kornaros, Solomos and *tutti quanti*, the two greatest are Athanasios Christopoulos and Rigas Velestinlis.[44] Of course, Rigas is much in the picture as the great revolutionary, the *ethnomartyras*, the poet of those divine *thourioi* that inspire the Greek people to acts of great bravery. But it is worth noticing that whereas Kanelos and Neroulos express their unreserved admiration for Rigas's poetry, there are others who are less impressed by the hype. Fauriel, for instance: "ces hymnes ne me semblent pas d'un grand mérite poétique" – but nonetheless, as Rigas's poems apparently move the Greeks to tears, he has

---

[42] C. Fauriel, *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne* (Paris 1824), vol. I, pp. x-xi (the two traditions), xi-xxiv (vernacular literature from the 12th century to 1669; pp. xix-xxi: *Erotokritos*) and xxv ff. (folk poetry; on p. xxv the passage quoted here).

[43] The notion of ελληνικότητα can be used in various ways: whereas the 1930s Generation used it to promote Solomos, Spyridon Zambelios, who, if he did not invent the concept, is the first I know to employ it regularly, condemned Solomos for his lack of Greekness; see his *Πόθεν η κοινή λέξις τραγουδώ; Σκέψεις περί ελληνικής ποιήσεως* (Athens 1859).

[44] For Rigas, see: Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. I, p. 244 and vol. II, pp. 99-100, and Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 145-7.

decided to publish the *Thourios*.[45] Or see Georgios Psyllas, in his famous 1825 review of Solomos's *Hymn to Liberty*: "The poems of immortal Rigas, although written with patriotic zeal, cannot set aglow the hearts of the peoples of Greece with the same fire as the poet felt burning within him, and yet even these poems do not fail to affect the sensitive hearts of the Greeks." That is why Psyllas does not consider Rigas's *thourioi* to be "national poems".[46] Most people would nowadays agree with Fauriel and Psyllas, and say that, with all due respect to Rigas, his *thourioi* do not qualify as great poetry. They would not convince Neroulos and Kanelos, however.

In contrast to Rigas, the poetic merits of Christopoulos are widely acknowledged in the 1820s. Fauriel is the only one to ignore him, because his survey of vernacular literature stops rather abruptly in 1669. Manos mentions him to the French, Kanelos to the Germans, Neroulos to the Swiss. And Psyllas to the Athenians: "In his charming songs Christopoulos celebrated the tender feelings of love and the sweet whispers of the wine barrel and the wine flask"; and these songs, he affirms, are truly "national poems".[47] Neroulos fully agrees: "Ces poésies ne cesseront pas d'être lues avec délices tant qu'il y aura des hommes qui parleront grec; elles ont eu un succès national et complet; elles font le charme de tous les habitants de la Grèce." As Kanelos is no longer interested in poetry, but in heroic deeds on the battle-field, he is rather reticent. He writes that the poems of Christopoulos are important because they bear witness to the beauty of the Greek language and because they put an end to "the unbearable tedium

---

[45] C. Fauriel, *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne* (Paris 1825), vol. II, p. 18.

[46] A. Koumarianou (ed.), *Ο Τύπος στον Αγώνα* (Athens 1971), vol. I, pp. 232-6: the review was published in the *Εφημερίς Αθηνών*, 11 November 1825. For the text quoted, see p. 233. See also G. Veloudis, *Ο Σολωμός των Ελλήνων. Εθνική ποίηση και ιδεολογία: μια πολιτική ανάγνωση* (Athens 2004), pp. 78-80, 84 and 133-40.

[47] Manos: see above, footnote 9. Kanelos: Iken, *Leukothea*, vol. II, p. 87. Neroulos, *Cours*, pp. 147-8. Psyllas: Koumarianou (ed.), *Ο Τύπος στον Αγώνα*, pp. 232-3.

of our former versification" (την αφόρητον αηδίαν της προτού στιχουργικής μας – for once Iken quotes the original). Is this a reference to what Kalvos called "το μονότονον των κρητικών επών"?[48] Perhaps, but the word "our" appears to refer to Phanariot versification, not to the political verses of Cretan poetry.

Fourthly, when we look at the two literary surveys of Kanelos and Neroulos, one cannot but notice that for both Phanariots, the democrat and the aristocrat, Modern Greek literature begins somewhere in the 18th century. Kanelos mentions the *Erotokritos* after being urged by Iken. Neroulos mentions a few names and titles of older literature, including *Erotokritos*, for which his source is obviously Fauriel. In his list of "national poems", Psyllas mentions the *Erotokritos* – but had he read the work? Or is he too influenced by Fauriel?[49] This is *ben poco* for a poem that we nowadays consider to be a masterpiece of the Cretan Renaissance. As the poem circulated in cheap Venetian editions, it must not have been too difficult for Greek intellectuals to lay their hands on a copy of the *Erotokritos*. And yet, they were simply not interested. I do not think it has anything to do with the language debate. Of course, language is used as an argument against the *Erotokritos* ("it is too Cretan, it has too many Italian loanwords"), but it is a matter of giving a dog a bad name in order to hang him. Earlier poetry simply did not exist for people like Kanelos and Neroulos. They had to be reminded by foreigners, Iken and Fauriel, that this too was part of their heritage and this too was something they could be proud of. It is only in the second half of the 19th century that the Greeks discover their own medieval and Renaissance literature as a result of the growing impact of historicism.[50]

---

[48] For the possible interpretations of this famous phrase, see E. Garantoudis, *Πολύτροπος Αρμονία. Μετρική και ποιητική του Κάλβου* (Irakleio 1995), pp. 16-19.

[49] Psyllas: Koumarianou (ed.), *Ο Τύπος στον Αγώνα*, pp. 232-3, only mentions the subject ("a love poem") and the dialect ("Cretan") – and fulminates in a footnote against Dionysios Foteinos's reworking of the text. I strongly suspect that Psyllas knew only Foteinos's version, not the *Erotokritos* itself.

[50] See Politis, "Γραμματολογικές απογραφές", pp. 335-7.

In fact, in the years 1822 (Kanelos) and 1826 (Neroulos), Modern Greek literature is a literature that is very modern and very Greek. It is a literature without a past; almost everything that is important enough to be recorded for posterity has happened within living memory. It is a literature of the here and the now. It is also a literature with a mission and a future: it will change the course of history. And how so, one may ask? By being Greek. By being very Greek. And here we have the paradox: Greekness is all about regaining autonomy and freeing oneselves from the Turks, but also about being, or pretending to be, Ancient Greeks. This attempt to be, or to be like, Ancient Greeks is not a thing of the past but of the future; it is not an attempt to retrieve a lost paradise, but to find a new eldorado. Early 19th-century literature is not nostalgic at all, it is forward-looking. The same goes for the two literary surveys I have presented, those of Kanelos and Neroulos. They are manifestos for the future.

"A faint sweetness in the never-ending afternoon"? Reflections on Cavafy and the Greek epigram*

David Ricks
King's College London

Cavafy invested a great deal in a well grounded claim to be a continuator – or, better, a reanimator – of the Alexandrian tradition, as conveniently bottled for posterity in the *Greek Anthology*.[1] The increasingly open homoerotic strain in his work, however, owes little or nothing to the much more risqué Book XII of the *Anthology*, the so-called *Musa Puerilis*.[2] A more developed textual relationship is found in Cavafy's reworking of the sepulchral epigrams of Book VII. An oblique response to the Great War, these are more unobtrusively original than Edgar Lee Masters's updatings in his *Spoon River Anthology* (1915).[3] That enduringly popular book was based on – as Cavafy was influenced by – J. W. Mackail's *Select epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, first published in 1890. Mackail's volume has a somewhat post-Pre-Raphaelite character (he was Burne-Jones's

* I am grateful to members of the audience at the University of Cambridge and at King's College London, and especially to Sir Michael Llewellyn Smith, for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

[1] See recently David Ricks, "Cavafy's Alexandrianism", in: Anthony Hirst and Michael Silk (eds.), *Alexandria, real and imagined* (Aldershot: Ashgate 2004), pp. 337-51.

[2] So, rightly, Christopher Robinson, "Cavafy, sexual sensibility, and poetic practice: reading Cavafy through Mark Doty and Cathal Ó Searcaigh", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 23.2 (2005) 261-79 (277, n. 2). It is a commonplace that some of Cavafy's unpublished poems, more recently supplemented by his unfinished poems, have a greater degree of candour, or at any rate explicitness, in the treatment of such themes.

[3] See summarily Ricks, "Cavafy's Alexandrianism" and references there.

son-in-law and William Morris's biographer), vividly expressed in the frontispiece, which shows a pale young woman – more English rose than Greek violet – engaged in gathering flowers.[4] And this preoccupation with the florilegium metaphor generates the last words of Mackail's preface to his volume, and the title of this paper: "a faint sweetness in the never-ending afternoon".[5] Does such flowery language fit the case of Cavafy?

Despite some valuable earlier contributions on the subject, starting with the shrewd insights of Timos Malanos, Cavafy's affiliation to the *Greek Anthology* (hereafter *AP*) requires further attention; and what appears here is only a first step, with reference to some particularly salient examples not discussed in the fullest account we have, by Valerie Caires as long ago as 1980.[6] In each case, we shall find that, far from producing the, so to speak, reproduction furniture of so many modern poems inspired by the *AP* – and, for that matter, of translations from it – Cavafy always provides a further turn of the screw, so that the new poem not only embeds the kernel of a corresponding ancient epigram or epi-

---

[4] My citations of Mackail are from the third (and last) revised edition (London: Longmans 1911). On Mackail's place in scholarship and culture, see the article by Cyril Bailey, revised by Richard Smail, in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004), vol. 35, pp. 492-3; further assessment in Christopher Stray, *Classics transformed* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1998), esp. pp. 242-6.

[5] Mackail, *Select epigrams*, p. 90. For Mackail's revaluation of the Alexandrians, and its consonance with Cavafy's (and indeed Eliot's) poetic, see briefly Ricks, "Cavafy's Alexandrianism", which discusses a number of important poems passed over here.

[6] Timos Malanos, *Ο ποιητής Κ. Π. Καβάφης*, 3rd ed. (Athens: Difros n.d.), esp. pp. 148-51, 155-62; Valerie Caires, "Originality and eroticism: Constantine Cavafy and the Alexandrian epigram", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 6 (1980) 131-56. For exhaustive reference see Dimitris Daskalopoulos, *Βιβλιογραφία Κ. Π. Καβάφη (1886-2000)* (Thessaloniki: Kentro Ellinikis Glossas 2003). The very useful study by Marianthi Palazi, "Cavafy's funerary epigrams and the tradition of the *Greek Anthology*" (MA dissertation, King's College London 1996) remains unpublished.

grams, but represents a second-order meditation on a poetic he values and vies with.[7]

* * *

As the reticence of the Greek epigrammatist "is especially prized" – to quote Pound on the Chinese short poem in 1915 – it will not be out of place to begin with one of Cavafy's deliberately driest poems, "Tomb of Lysias the Grammarian" (1914).[8] We may hold it up against the type of (fictional) sepulchral epigram it is based on, to show how further layers of history and poetry, harnessed by poetic adventurousness of a cryptic kind, make of the successor-poem something more complex than its ostensible model. A literary-historical warning always important in relation to Cavafy may be repeated: his dealings with the distant Greek past must be seen as consciously mediated by the refractions – indeed, at times the refractoriness – of all the literature that has followed in its wake.[9]

Let us hear what the two poems have to say:

---

[7] An interesting contrast with Cavafy's poetic is formed by the elegant, traditional translations of the scholar Simos Menardos's *Στέφανος* (Athens: Sideris 1924); valuable for its conspectus of English-language modes of translation in Cavafy's time and beyond is Peter Jay (ed.), *The Greek Anthology and other Ancient Greek epigrams: a selection in modern verse translations* (London: Allen Lane 1973).

[8] Ezra Pound, "The Jewel Stairs' Grievance", a translation first published in *Cathay*, now in *The translations of Ezra Pound*, ed. Hugh Kenner (London: Faber 1953), p. 194. The epigram is accompanied by a translator's note of equal length, concluding: "The poem is especially prized because she [the speaker] utters no direct reproach." Cavafy's poem is cited from K. P. Kavafis, *Τα ποιήματα* (2 vols., ed. G. P. Savidis, Athens: Ikaros 1981), 43 All references to Cavafy's poems hereafter appear by his name with volume and page number only.

[9] I have tried to make this point with reference to Cavafy's Homer in *The Shade of Homer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1989), pp. 85-118.

TOMB OF LYSIAS THE GRAMMARIAN

As close as can be, on the right as you enter, to the library
of Berytus we buried learned Lysias,
grammarian. The place is meet.
We laid him near those things of his which he recalls
even there, maybe – scholia, texts, analyses,
variant readings, all that commentary in volumes of Greek usage.
Plus, this way, his tomb will be visible to and given due honour
by us as we go on through to the books.

Your most authentic memorial, Theodorus, is not on your tomb,
but in the thousands of pages of your books,
in which, snatching them from oblivion, you redeemed
from destruction the labours of the thoughtful votaries of the Muses.
(*AP* 7.594)[10]

A scholarly poet, Cavafy can't have dissented – say, with the sarcasm of Yeats's poem "The Scholars" (1919) – from the somewhat stiffly expressed sentiments of this epigram by Julian, Prefect of Egypt.[11] Indeed, the idea that real scholarship outlasts the humdrum life that produced it can't have been other than congenial. But, as so often, Cavafy injects a new note of ambiguity, which in this case derives from re-reading such ancient epigrams through a celebrated later poem, Browning's "A Grammarian's Funeral" (1855). Apart from the title, the affinities of content and perspective are striking – and I've discussed elsewhere Cavafy's subtle capacity to transpose Browning's settings to locales and

[10] For the collocation of the two poems, see Malanos, *Καβάφης*, p. 159. All versions from *AP* and from Cavafy are my own; none claim any other value than expository.

[11] W. B. Yeats, *Collected poems* (London: Macmillan 1978), p. 158, with the poem's famous conclusion: "Lord, what would they say / Did their Catullus walk that way?"

periods both more congruent with his elective Hellenism and less familiar to the reader.[12]

"A Grammarian's Funeral", set by its subtitle "Shortly after the revival of learning in Europe", is an elusively complex account of the scholarly life, seen through the eyes of the pupils and associates of a celebrated grammarian as they bear his corpse to the summit of an Italian Renaissance hill town, away from the ignorant, pedestrian lives of those who will have none of the new learning.[13] The dead grammarian is a veritable athlete, an ascetic of learning, whose eremitic life of self-mortification and abnegation has its own grandeur, just as his desire "not to Live but Know" is an echo of the Aristotelian ideal with which the *Nicomachean Ethics* culminate.[14] What is most striking about Browning's grammarian is that in him a whole way of life has been based on the eschewing of metaphysics and a commitment to knowing the world through tough earthly and textual minutiae; above all, those of the Greek language. As the famous lines go:

> While he could stammer
> He settled *Hoti*'s business – let it be! –
> Properly based *Oun* –
> Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*...

The poem's odd, jaunty stanzas, as they move through its 148 lines, have the ring of a march, and deliberately so; just as the student body which announces, "This is our master, famous, calm and dead, / Borne on our shoulders" has all the hallmarks of a German student fraternity. For all his respect for the heroes of German scholarship such as Friedrich August Wolf, Browning

---

[12] David Ricks, "How it strikes a contemporary: Cavafy as a reviser of Browning", *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 11 (2003) 131-52.

[13] Robert Browning, *Poetical Works, vol. 5: Men and women*, ed. Ian Jack and Robert Inglesfield (Oxford: Clarendon Press 2002), pp. 454-62 (good notes). Some unease with the ambiguities of the poem is expressed in a valuable article by A. D. Nuttall, "Browning's Grammarian: accents uncertain", *Essays in Criticism* 51.1 (2001) 86-100.

[14] *EN* x.vii.

allows real doubts about his grammarian to creep into the poem, even through the words of his loyal students – as we can see by completing the lines just quoted: "Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*, / Dead from the waist down."[15] With all the fervour of the old Schoolmen, an Angelic Doctor at their head, yet without hopes of a hereafter, the unnamed, and doubtless forgotten, grammarian has led a life of renunciation which aridifies with the silt of knowledge rather than watering with the living word. Yet Browning's subtitle seems to indicate that such personal sacrifice yet has a historical value because of the grammarian's contribution to the world as we have it: though he scarcely tasted life, he has helped us to – not least through his providing a piquant subject allowing full rein to comic realism.

Cavafy's poem is tiny and flat-looking by comparison: a useful, but of course inadequate, analogy for his relation to Browning might be the Reduced Shakespeare Company. And, as we shall see in other examples later, the change of historical setting amounts to more than, so to speak, the mere transposition of a key. In "Tomb of Lysias the Grammarian" we find, to begin with, a difference of voice: instead of a lusty song rather raucously celebrating the joys of scholarly fraternity – on what may be a rare day away from the lecture-room or library – with no apparent addressee outside the band of brothers, we have a quieter interchange between what seem to be an older student and a new student in the intellectual centre of Berytus; nor do we know how long Lysias has been buried there. We also, of course, have the restoration of the subject to the concision of the ancient Greek epigram: Cavafy wishes to incorporate in his poem the indispensable layers of historical experience drawn attention to by Browning, but in a manner which is thoroughly Alexandrian in its working by reduction rather than accumulation.

---

[15] Here the figure of the Revd Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, and supposed model for Casaubon in *Middlemarch*, comes to mind. Pattison's *Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1889) celebrate feats of ascetic scholarship such as Browning himself respected: see the poet's letter cited in *Poetical Works*, p. 455.

Lysias's monument is in the most fitting place because it is right by the entrance to the library: even in death he will continue to live, as it were, over the shop. His truest monument will not be his books alone, but the relation – which the poem will in the end reveal to be an awkward one – between his books and his place of burial. The poem's opening words give a sense of immediacy: some corporate body has buried Lysias in a place to which many will be requiring directions: the great library of a school with a special reputation in the law. Yet Lysias is not addressed by name like Theodore, and "τον σοφό Λυσία, / γραμματικόν" could legitimately be translated "Professor Lysias", almost "Herr Doktor Lysias". The involvement of those who buried the professor continues with seeming affection: "we laid him"; but a glance at the derivation in Cavafy's own drafts of the phrase that follows is illuminating. Where is "there"?

For Browning's grammarian and his followers, discreet but firm deniers of a hereafter, the scholar's final resting place will be a height above which – and behind which – there is nothing. Cavafy's "even there, maybe", by contrast, could mean "in the tomb" or "in Hades". "Tomb of Lysias the Grammarian" in fact subsumes and supersedes the material of one of the most celebrated of Cavafy's unpublished poems, "The rest I shall tell the dead down in Hades" (1913). In this poem with Sophocles's Ajax's famous words as the title, the sceptical sophist ends by commenting: "if they talk of such things there, if it concerns them now".[16]

Theodorus – to look at things one way – disappears altogether behind the works of the greater writers he rescued from oblivion; or – to look at things another way – remains sturdily present to posterity in the editions he left. Lysias is, by contrast, foregrounded as, conceivably, a sentient being beyond the grave; and yet he really does appear to have been submerged by the settling of Hoti's business and all that. A catalogue of second-order material ("comment" as Browning has it), with nothing of the

---

[16] K. P. Kavafis, *Ανέκδοτα ποιήματα (1882-1923)*, ed. G. P. Savidis (Athens: Ikaros 1968), pp. 155-6.

Muse about it, and pretty tedious for the poor students, washes over the grave of the crabbed professor. Even his subject, propaedeutic to the more lucrative study of the law, is unlikely to have held a strong appeal for his pupils.[17]

The last two lines, moreover, make a sly addition: "plus" (επίσης) betrays a sense of mockery, as the *amour propre* of this no doubt legendarily pedantic instructor is exposed. One is irresistibly reminded of Bentham's remains, placed – at his express wish – in a prominently displayed case in University College London "in the attitude in which I am sitting when engaged in thought".[18] Do the students – as the poem's last words reveal them to be – really venerate the tomb, or are they having a quiet snigger over it? Lysias's historical fate is poignant: unlike his 5th-century B.C. Athenian namesake the orator, many of whose speeches survive as the model for pure Attic style, his name is lost and his whole milieu wiped away by the Arab conquests. It's less a faint sweetness than a sour aftertaste.

* * *

In stepping beyond Browning's poem, and some of its problems of interpretation, Cavafy stepped back into the late antique world and a mode of Greek epigram that on a hasty reading looks two-dimensional. The part of Browning's Grammarian's biography that does not resurface is his early forays into poetry.[19] Lysias is a more prosaic figure, seemingly never touched by the Muse; and the books of Greek verse which Theodore preserved for posterity

---

[17] Their finicky intelligentsia mentality comes out vividly in "Simeon": Kavafis, *Ανέκδοτα ποιήματα*, pp. 175-6, with my discussion, "Cavafy and the body of Christ", *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27.1-2 (2001) 19-32.

[18] In Bridget Cherry and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England, London 4: North* (London: Penguin 1998), p. 272. Cavafy might possibly have seen or known of this (most un-Greek) eccentricity during his childhood in London.

[19] As Jack and Inglesfield point out (Browning, *Poetical Works*, p. 455), these lines are easily overlooked.

are replaced by Cavafy with "books" in the most material sense, the set texts which the student needs today. But Cavafy filed away the Grammarian's early life for use in our next poem, also from 1914, which again seems to be based on a solid but not very enterprising ancient model:

> Paterius well-spoken and amiable has fallen to the lot of the tomb:
> dear son of Miltiades and of sorely grieved Atticia,
> offspring of the land of Cecrops, of the noble line of the Aeacids,
> full of knowledge of Roman law and of wide learning,
> bearer of all the brilliance of the four virtues;
> a youth of charm, snatched away by Fate's portion,
> just as a radiant sapling is uprooted by a violent wind,
> having attained the twenty-fourth year of life;
> and he leaves his dear parents mourning and a grief never to be forgotten. (*AP* 7.343)

TOMB OF EURION

> In this elaborate monument
> entirely of syenite,
> covered with so many violets, so many lilies,
> handsome Eurion is buried.
> An Alexandrian lad of twenty-five.
> On his father's side, of an old Macedonian line;
> of alabarchs his mother's lineage.
> He studied philosophy with Aristoclitus,
> rhetoric with Parus. At Thebes he made a study of the sacred writings. The Arsinoite nome was the subject
> of a history by him. That at least will last.
> But what we have lost is what was most precious – his form,
> which was the very vision of Apollo.[20]

The parallels between the two young men are clear enough: they may be summed up by saying that each has the perfect curriculum

[20] Cavafy 1.44.

vitae. Perhaps what most piqued Cavafy's interest, however, was the culturally mixed identity of both Paterius and Eurion: the former is of pure Attic descent but of Roman education, the latter of mixed Greek and Jewish descent (the alabarchs were Jewish magistrates). Yet the deviation of Cavafy's poem from its probable model is striking.

Part of this deviation, of course, lies in form: the ancient epigram, as relatively rarely, is in hexameters, which helps to account for the poem's slightly "repro" character; though it suits the archaic Attic references and the Homeric allusion of the sapling.[21] Cavafy's poem, by contrast, with its full but unpredictably occurring rhymes in lines of uneven length and frequent enjambment, has a more improvisatory air which is very far from lapidary. And the contemplation of the dead one is already a challenge because of an air of uncertainty which Cavafy has used to unsettle the genre of the poem on Paterius. That poem begins and ends with his parents: they gave him the best of birth and education, and his death leaves them bereft. "Tomb of Eurion", by contrast, gives due weight to the diversely distinguished ancestry of the young man's parents, yet it is clearly voiced neither by them nor on their behalf, as the *AP* poem reticently but unmistakably is. What was lost in Eurion was not parental investment, even investment of hope: it was, the last lines tell us, something elusive and not the possession of the parents in any case. In fact, the parents, for these other bereaved ones who voice the poem, even get in the way.[22] The poem's ending is in every way a breach of convention.

Look again at the syntax of the poem's opening: Eurion is buried by the luxurious and unavailing detail of the tomb, as "είναι θαμένος" grimly acknowledges. Eurion the bearer of the

---

[21] Most famously, *Iliad* 4.482-7. It is so characteristic of Cavafy to eschew such nature imagery, for all its deep roots and long ramifications in Greek tradition.

[22] So too "In the Month of Hathor" (Cavafy 1.78) which encapsulates Cavafy's most subtle responses to the precariousness of the ancient past: see briefly David Ricks, "C. P. Cavafy", in: Anthony T. Grafton, Glenn W. Most and Salvatore Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition: a guide* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2007, forthcoming).

name is buried here, yes, but the *handsome* Eurion *is* buried by all this clutter. ("Smothered in" would only just over-translate "covered in".) The lines that follow give due weight to his birth and all-round education, which embraces the pagan scriptures of Egypt and a historical work on that rich culture which will be of durable value. But what will last seems to interest the speaker but little, as he dwells – in a last couplet which definitively breaks with what can most naturally be read as paraphrase of the words on the tomb in lines 4 to 10 – on what was lost. For all we know, Eurion's history of the Arsinoite nome will last in the way "a good PhD" will last – yet this cannot be enough to stand for "a man born with thy face and throat, / Lyric Apollo".

The phrase, of course, is Browning's, from "A Grammarian's Funeral".[23] There it was clear that the grammarian's life had essentially been one of renunciation. Cavafy's poem is reticent about whether Eurion, like Ammones the Alexandrian (as I have discussed elsewhere) ever wrote poems himself – but his Apolline appearance was the most precious thing about him: "τίμιο", we may say, even in the sense of Precious Blood.[24] The poem's opening lines look initially like a slight variation and elaboration on the classic "Here lies", the lines that follow like an elaboration and qualification of the words on the tomb itself. (On a first reading, the violets and lilies could be seen as sculpted ornaments on the tomb: by the end, we think of them as a real and sickly presence, not only unable to conjure up, but positively obstructing, true vision.) But with the appearance of the grieving accents of a first-person plural voice in the last two lines, the poem severs all connection with the tomb and its verbal or even its corporeal contents. A vision of Apollo cannot be repeated, and memory (μνήμη) cannot be reconciled with the monumental (μνημείον). Once

[23] Lines 33-4; I note the theft in D. Ricks, "Ο βρετανικός Καβάφης", in: *Θέματα νεοελληνικής φιλολογίας. Μνήμη Γ. Π. Σαββίδη* (Athens: Ermis 2000), pp. 270-7.

[24] Savidis's glosses in his edition (e.g. Cavafy 1.120) correctly hold Cavafy to use "τίμιος" as synonymous with "πολύτιμος", but this should not exclude, in a place of heightened rhetoric, such as the ending of "Tomb of Eurion", further resonances.

again, then, Cavafy draws on the poignancy of ancient epigram only to add a new kind of poignancy, a faint sweetness very much his own confection.

* * *

The tomb as the enemy of learning; the tomb as the enemy of beauty. What about the Simonidean tradition of epigram: the tomb as monument to valour? This too is not absent from Cavafy; though it is handled with particular care, the consequence above all of his determination to liberate a sense of Greek cultural belonging from the ardours of any particular vein of nationalism. The *locus classicus* is this poem from 1922:

> WHO FOUGHT FOR THE ACHAEAN LEAGUE
>
> Valiant ye who fought and fell in glory;
> the everywhere victorious never fearing.
> Blameless ye, if Diaeus and Critolaus erred.
> When Hellenes seek to boast,
> "Such are our nation's men", they'll say
> of you. So high shall be your praises.
>
> Written in Alexandria by an Achaean;
> in the seventh year of Ptolemy Lathyrus.[25]

Compare Simonides (*AP* 7.254):

> Hail ye, champions who won through war great glory,
> sons of the Athenians, excellent in horsemanship,
> who for your homeland of fair dances lost your flower of youth
> doing battle against so many of the Greeks.

Simonides on the battle of Plataea celebrates a moment when, as so many saw it in retrospect, Greeks (Athenians, Lacedaemonians

[25] Cavafy 2.31.

and Tegeans) triumphed over barbarians – and over their worse selves in the form of the medizing Greeks.[26] Though perhaps less so than Marathon and Salamis, Plataea lent itself to a place in the nationalist mythology which could see the Great Idea as a re-run of the conflict between the Persians and the Greeks. Writing as the Asia Minor Campaign drew to a disastrous close, Cavafy identified a mode of great reticence, which could recreate the heroic plainness of Simonides without appropriating it to a questionable modern campaign or to an authorial voice suspicious of grand rhetoric.

Rather than taking a conflict from Greece's heyday, Cavafy, by a characteristic stroke, chooses the moment of the extinguishing of free Greece. The body of the epigram is addressed to the fallen of the Achaean League in their last campaign against the Romans. What is radically new in generic terms is the element of reproach against the dead generals, the donkeys who led these lions.[27] Critolaus, *strategus* of the League in 147-146 B.C., either poisoned himself or lost his life escaping over the salt marshes after defeat by the Roman general Metellus at Scarpheia near Thermopylae; Diaeus succeeded him as *strategus*, rashly sallied forth from besieged Corinth and, defeated by L. Mummius, fled to Megalopolis and there took poison.[28] But the reproach against them is here a laconic one – though perhaps the more devastating for that – and the poem quickly moves, in verses 4-6, to praise of the dead. Such praise is expressed in an idiom which, over the

---

[26] On the Achaean League, by contrast, the curt assessment by George Grote, *A History of Greece* (12 vols., London: Dent n.d.), vol. 12, p. 301, is for Cavafy likely to have been influential: "The Achaean league [...] developed itself afterwards as a renovated sprout from the ruined tree of Grecian liberty, though never attaining to anything better than a feeble and puny life, nor capable of sustaining itself without foreign aid." For the Greek poet's recourse to this work, see David Ricks, "Cavafy the poet-historian", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988) 169-83.

[27] The bearing of this Great War allusion on Greece's Asia Minor Campaign needs no explanation: see Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Ionian Vision*, 2nd ed. (London: Hurst 1998).

[28] See Malanos's summary of Cavafy's sources (notably Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos), *Καβάφης*, pp. 356-9.

poem's six lines, moves in dignified fashion from a relatively formal and lapidary style (marked especially by learned aorist participles) to a simpler idiom with a flavour of colloquial speech.

This might almost suggest the breaking out of the chiselled language of a monument into the voice of popular acclaim. But this is not so: the poem's last two lines show that it is a private *cri de coeur* committed to paper in exile in Alexandria by an anonymous veteran of the Achaean League. The reading of the body of the poem is completely reframed by the presence of the last two lines; though they can be read in more than one way. One can take the last two lines as being an authorial scholium or, so to speak, museum label: by its presence the historically based but time-transcending Simonidean type of epigram rendered (over-?) familiar by anthologies is de-monumentalized, shown as originating in contingencies of event and allegiance. An epitaph, even one celebrating timeless virtues of Hellenism, has to be written somewhere, and by someone: in this case, far from the theatre of action, but by one whose origins are in the land where the tragic dénouement has occurred.

A different reading, which I tentatively prefer, is to take the last two lines, not as an authorial comment from Cavafy, but as a cryptic statement by the Achaean himself. As a *Fecit* he signs his poem, not with his name, but with the place, his allegiance, and the date. A historical parallel, of which Cavafy would have been well aware, is with the Jacobites "over the water", or – with more topical sharpness – with the White Russians.[29] Here, doubtless in reduced circumstances, a man of the *ancien régime* – and, perhaps, one of the thousand and more Achaean leaders held in Italian provincial towns for seventeen years (167-150 B.C.) following the Battle of Pydna (168 B.C.: the subject of the succeeding poem, "To Antiochus Epiphanes" which strengthens this

[29] One would be tempted to detect the pale figure of the murdered Tsarevich (17 July 1918) behind Cavafy's "Caesarion" (completed 1918), at least as part of the "familiar compound ghost" Caesarion represents – were it not for the fact that the Cavafy poem, first written in 1914, is a tribute to his power to prophesy the impending.

supposition) – scratches out his epigram.[30] The date is given with precision, perhaps exhibiting the exile as counting the days; but also perhaps to indicate the unfriendliness of the surroundings. Hence, too, maybe, the anonymity: Ptolemy IX Lathyrus had another twenty-nine years to reign, and he did so with a, however duplicitous, pro-Roman tendency which might have made one of strong Achaean allegiances unwilling to trumpet them abroad.[31] At any rate – as George Seferis was quick to see – all this makes "Who fought for the Achaean League" one of the most penetrating artistic responses to the Asia Minor Disaster of 1922, even if it was written before the sack of Smyrna.[32] And that gives Cavafy's specification of Alexandria here a further poignancy: far from the theatre of action, disdainful of the leaders, the author is yet bound up with kith and kin. A quiet but more than faint bitterness is all-apparent.

The Simonidean type of epigram was not, of course, incapable of revival in 20th-century poetry: to look no further, there is Housman's "Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries" (1917) and Hugh MacDiarmid's furious retort (1935).[33] More pertinently still, we have Kipling's *Epitaphs of the War 1914-1918*. A contrast with the famous "Common Form" from that sequence is telling: "If any question, why we died, / Tell them, because our fathers lied."[34] Such a direct approach, powerful coming as it comes from a father himself mourning the loss of his son, was, we need hardly

---

[30] See conveniently Brian McGing, "Subjection and resistance: to the death of Mithradates", in: Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Blackwell 2005), pp. 71-89.

[31] McGing, "Subjection and resistance", p. 78.

[32] For a cautious discussion of Seferis's interpretation see Roderick Beaton's acute study, "The history man", *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 10.1-2 (1983) 23-44.

[33] A. E. Housman, *Collected Poems and Selected Prose*, ed. Christopher Ricks (London: Allen Lane 1988), p. 138 (see too p. 491); Hugh MacDiarmid, "Another Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries", *Selected Poems*, ed. David Craig and John Manson (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1970), p. 100.

[34] Rudyard Kipling, *Selected Poems*, ed. Peter Keating (London: Penguin (1993), pp. 168-75 (172).

emphasize, alien to Cavafy. (To Cavafy the poet, that is: his table talk about politics no doubt had as much animus as any Greek's in that turbulent period.) And for a Greek poet to have been able to dust down the textbook-bound form to illuminate not one but two historical periods was a considerable achievement. Such a preoccupation with the relation between poetry and patriotism is dramatized on an even larger canvas, and with even more controversial results, in the fourth and last poem to be examined here.

* * *

YOUNG MEN OF SIDON
(A.D. 400)

The actor they had engaged for their diversion
recited among other things some select epigrams.

The dining-room opened out onto a garden;
and in it a delicate odour of flowers
blent with the perfumes
of the five scented youths of Sidon.

Meleager, Crinagoras and Rhianus were read.
But when the actor came to recite,
"Aeschylus son of Euphorion, Athenian, lies hid"
(giving perhaps excessive emphasis
to "proven valour" and "grove at Marathon")
at once sprang to his feet a lively lad,
mad about literature, and shouted:

"Pah! I don't care for that quatrain one bit.
Expressions of that sort strike me as tantamount to cowardice.
Put all your might – I tell you solemnly – into your work,
your every striving, and in turn recall your work
in time of trial, or when your time sinks to its end.
Such are my expectations of you, my demands upon you.
And not to dispel completely from your mind
the glorious Style of Tragedy –
that Agamemnon, that wonderful Prometheus,
that presence of Orestes, of Cassandra,

> that Seven against Thebes – and for your memorial to set forth
> *merely* the fact that in the soldiers' ranks, the throng,
> you too did battle against Datis and Artaphernes."[35]

The lines quoted come from this epigram preserved in the ancient life of Aeschylus (Mackail 3.13):

> Aeschylus son of Euphorion, Athenian, lies hid
> under this tomb, having died in Gela rich in wheat;
> of his proven valour the grove at Marathon may tell,
> so too the long-haired Mede who learned it well.[36]

Cavafy's is a much-discussed and much misunderstood poem, which shows us not just Cavafy as reader but his circumspection about what reading is: what is it to be an authentic reader?[37] The poem – completed in 1920, so written, like the last one, during the Asia Minor Campaign – is a powerful but oblique commentary on the times, but on more than that. Once again, we have several historical strata which need carefully to be distinguished – and they exist in a single poem, not, as in *AP*, stratified cumulatively by the process of reception itself – though we should remember that for Cavafy attention to a palimpsest is less a dispassionate stratigraphical study than the opening of old wounds.[38] Working

---

[35] Cavafy 2.16.

[36] Mackail, *Select epigrams*, p. 153 (see too p. 362); with discussion by G. P. Savidis, "Cavafy versus Aeschylus" in his *Μικρά καβαφικά*, vol. 1 (Athens: Ermis 1985), pp. 361-79.

[37] For a conspectus of earlier critical views – rich in their variety, but for the most part impoverished in their engagement with the poem – see Vassilis Lambropoulos, "The violent power of knowledge: the struggle of critical discourses for domination over Cavafy's 'Young men of Sidon, A.D. 400'", *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 10.1-2 (1983) 149-66. Missing is the most important response, Manolis Anagnostakis's poem, "Νέοι της Σιδώνος, 1970", *Τα ποιήματα, 1941-1971* (Athens: Stigmi 1992), p. 167; one of his important differences is that the flower children he reproaches are of both sexes.

[38] As was pointed out by Karl Malkoff some time ago, "Varieties of illusion in the poetry of Cavafy", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 5.2 (1987) 191-205, excessive emphasis on Cavafy as ironist gives us a trun-

back in time, we have an author writing in Alexandria at the height of a campaign to recover places sacred to the Greek mind from foreign conquerors. We then go back 1,520 years to Sidon, a city of great Hellenic culture doomed to be overrun by un-Greek invaders. The poems which the young men read extend painlessly back through high points of the Hellenistic and early Roman erotic epigram, but then seem to hit a bump 856 years along the road with an epigram on the death of Aeschylus, tragedian and veteran of Marathon, dead at Gela in Sicily.

"Young men of Sidon" divides into two halves of thirteen lines, though Cavafy has craftily concealed this from an initial reading by breaking the first half into three shorter sections. The first half gives us the setting and its subsequent disruption. The atmosphere is indeed one in which "a faint sweetness in the never-ending afternoon" is seductively present. Sidon still offers its gilded youth a form of a traditional symposiastic setting; and the Greek tradition offers such young men, whatever their ethnic origins, access to the canon of beauty. That the beauty may cloy is hinted at by the chiming rhymes of "ανθέων"and "νέων", but its elements are not in themselves inauthentic: any garland of epigrams, however selectively culled, would probably embrace the authors mentioned.[39] The young men are, yes, viewed with a little of the older poet's condescension for their liberally applied after-shave (no doubt echoing Horace's *Odes* I.v: "quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa / perfusus liquidis urget odoribus") – yet perfumes, "μυρωδικά", are not a thing Cavafy's poetry ever asks us to renounce.[40] The problem essentially comes with the outsourcing

---

cated version of the poet. Were it not for its Irwin Howe ring, there would be a place for an essay on Cavafy with the title, "The agony and the irony".

[39] This fact is bizarrely ignored by Evangelos Papanoutsos's hyper-patriotic reading summarized by Lambropoulos, "The violent power of knowledge"; because Papanoutsos had a large influence as an educational policy-maker in Greece, this is of no small importance.

[40] Most famously of course in "Ithaca", which builds on Baudelairean *parfums*.

of reading, which should be a mentally and physically involving activity, to an actor.

Some of us have suffered so acutely, hearing Cavafy's poems read by actors, that it is nice to see this "prebuttal". Here a credibility gap between the performer and the material yawns, even if the bracketed comment – no doubt reflecting a consensus of the effete young connoisseurs – restricts itself to only mild criticism. At all events, the transition from literature to life, in the exacting form of battle, has proved a challenging one – a challenge for which just one of the young men is ready, even if not equal. Mad about literature, the youth expresses in the second half of the poem a Cavafian poetic which falls short only in its expressive means of the doctrine Cavafy seems to have held himself. But to fall short in expressive means is, for Cavafy, to fall a very long way short.

It is much in the young man's favour, whatever his manners, that he takes literature seriously: so seriously that he engages with it to the point of apostrophizing Aeschylus himself. His instinct that the famous quatrain is in some sense inauthentic is not wholly off the mark, if we reflect that material from Aeschylus's *Vita*, as from other ancient Lives, is often such; and if we note that the epigram, to whose Aeschylean authorship only Athenaeus attests, does not in fact appear in *AP*. The young man's gloss on the epigram is of course tendentious, substituting the straw men Datis and Artaphernes (compare Diaeus and Critolaus in "Who Fought for the Achaean League") for the doughtier-sounding "long-haired Mede". And his disdain for the democratic values of the polis has a sub-Nietzschean ring of which we know Cavafy to have disapproved.[41] This is only exacerbated by his preachiness, marked by the word κηρύττω. Above all, his dogged emphasis on the *oeuvre* as the mark of a man is vitiated, both by the inexperience of life which makes his claims about trials and age implausible, but still more by his inability to find anything of critical interest to say about the works he so values: all he can do is exclaim in the

[41] This is a strand in his *Ανέκδοτα σημειώματα ποιητικής και ηθικής (1902-1911)*, ed. G. P. Savidis (Athens: Ermis 1983).

star-struck manner of a Tolkien buff. Is this fervent young man, in fact, nothing more than a fan of Aeschylus? Is this professedly exacting reader simply part of that nullity we call a readership?

Cavafy's poem of course refuses to comment, any more than it asks us to pile in on the young men for having a poetry soirée when they could be pumping iron at the palaestra. However we read its moral stance, there can be no doubt that one of things the poem sets out to expose is just how alive the words of the ancient epigram still are, able to cut through the merely literary to something more important still.

* * *

Cavafy, then, did not simply add to the number of authentically Greek epigrams (though he did that too: examples could of course be multiplied).[42] He re-imagined the Greek epigram in the light of all the history, not least the history of poetry, that had intervened.[43] This is a very different thing from the evanescent flavour that Mackail's formulation cited in my title seems to allow the ancient epigram, and by extension modern attempts to revive it: from this formulation (admittedly, one which distorts Mackail's broader outlook) one might deduce that the only modern destiny of the ancient epigram could be nothing but a half-life.[44] More polemically, and not long after Cavafy's death, Louis MacNeice's *Autumn Journal* (1939) seemed to write off the whole genre:

---

[42] So Malanos, *Καβάφης*, p. 188. For such poems see, at a minimum (and excluding some by no means contemptible non-canonical poems), Caires, "Originality and eroticism" and Ricks, "Cavafy's Alexandrianism". A vigorous and learned post-Cavafian foray into the more mordant vein of ancient epigram is Nasos Vayenas's prize-winning collection *Στέφανος* (Athens: Kedros 2004).

[43] On Cavafy's most unusual recourse to the corpus of Christian epigram (neither Mackail nor Jay includes a single poem by Gregory Nazianzen), see Ricks, "Cavafy and the body of Christ", pp. 21-2

[44] In fact, Mackail's perspective is not without subtlety, as I have argued in "Cavafy's Alexandrianism".

And for a thousand years they went on talking,
Making such apt remarks,
A race no longer of heroes but of professors
And crooked businessmen and secretaries and clerks
Who turned out dapper little elegiac verses
On the ironies of fate, the transience of all
Affections, carefully shunning an over-statement
But working the dying fall.[45]

MacNeice's accusation, like other western refusals to see "late Greek" culture as anything more than decline, would have piqued Cavafy; but it can, I trust, have little purchase on this modern Greek poet's ingenious and subtle appropriations from the ancient Greek epigram.

[45] Louis MacNeice, *Autumn Journal* (London: Faber 1998), p. 30. As I have argued in "Simpering Byzantines, Grecian goldsmiths et al.: some appearances of Byzantium in English poetry", in: Elizabeth Jeffreys and Robin Cormack (eds.), *Through the looking-glass: Byzantium through British eyes* (Aldershot: Ashgate 2000), pp. 223-35, MacNeice's view is representative.

The year 2006-7 at Cambridge

Students

Three students took Modern Greek papers in the Part IB examinations in 2007: Madeleine Edwards, Claire Nance and Katharina Walsh all achieved II.1s. One student took Modern Greek in the first-year examinations (Part IA).

Cecily Arthur spent her year abroad at the University of the Peloponnese in Kalamata. In addition to attending courses in Greek literature and linguistics at the University, she also studied the bouzouki and the viola at the local Odeion.

Four candidates passed the examinations for the Certificate in Modern Greek: Carleen Sobczyk and Emma Yap were awarded Distinctions; Alexander Holyoake passed with Credit. Dr Rupert Thompson was awarded a Distinction in the examinations for the Diploma in Modern Greek.

Marina Rodosthenous was approved for the PhD in October 2006. Her dissertation is entitled: "Youth and old age: a thematic approach to selected works of Cretan Renaissance literature". Dr Rodosthenous is continuing her research on Cretan and Cypriot Renaissance literature, with a grant from the A. G. Leventis Foundation.

PhD students Efstratios Myrogiannis and Foteini Lika were awarded second and third prizes respectively in the London Hellenic Society postgraduate essay competition for 2006.

Teaching staff

Ms Eleftheria Lasthiotaki took over the duties of Language Assistant, seconded by the Greek Ministry of Education, from October 2006. Dr Notis Toufexis contributed two lectures to the course on Greek literature, history and thought since 1880, and Mr Kostas Skordyles gave two courses on modern Greek history. Professor David Holton taught various courses on Greek literature, Introduction to the Cretan Renaissance, and translation from Greek.

The Department of Other Languages

As a consequence of administrative reorganisation within the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, the Department of Other Languages ceased to exist on 1 October 2007. Alternative arrangements have been made for the languages which formerly made up the Department: Dutch has become part of a Department of German and Dutch; Neo-Latin will be administered within the Department of Italian. Modern Greek is now a "section", within the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, with responsibility for its own teaching and research activities.

Visiting scholars

Professor Panos Karagiorgos, of the Ionian University, Corfu, paid a brief research visit to Cambridge in October 2006. Dr Ann Chikovani, Lecturer in Modern Greek at Tbilisi State University, Georgia, spent four weeks in Cambridge in July-August 2007, under the Cambridge Colleges' Hospitality Scheme. Dr Chikovani stayed at Selwyn College, while researching and planning new courses in Modern Greek literature.

Visiting speakers

Nine lectures were given by invited speakers in the course of the year. The programme was as follows:

19 October. Dr David Ricks (King's College London): *"A faint sweetness in the never-ending afternoon": Cavafy and the Greek epigram*

2 November. Dr Eleni Kefala (University of St Andrews): *Peripheral Modernisms in Greece and Argentina: the cases of Borges, Cavafy, Kalokyris and Kyriakidis*

9 November. Professor Richard Clogg (St Antony's College, Oxford): *Defining the Diaspora: the case of the Greeks*

25 January. Dr Georgios Varouxakis (Queen Mary, University of London): *After Philhellenism: perceptions of the modern Greeks among the Victorian intellectual elite*

8 February. Dr Liana Giannakopoulou (King's College London): *The Parthenon in poetry*

15 February. Dr Charles Stewart (University College London): *An epidemic of dreaming on Naxos in 1930: antecedents and consequences*

1 March. Professor Michael Jeffreys (King's College London): *Modern Greek in the 11th century*

8 March. Dr Tassos A. Kaplanis (University of Cyprus): *Recording the history of the Cretan War (1645-1669): an overview*

3 May. Professor Marc Lauxtermann (Exeter College, Oxford): *Inventing a literary past: the first two surveys of Modern Greek literature*

Graduate Seminar

The Graduate Seminar met on eleven occasions during the year. Papers were given by the following invited speakers: Dr Eleni Papargyriou (Oxford University), Christos Papadopoulos and Dr Barbara Zipser (both from the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine, University College London). The other papers were presented by members of the seminar, who include research students and research and teaching staff: Aslı Çomu, David Holton, Julia Krivoruchko, Foteini Lika (two papers), Stratos Myrogiannis (two papers), and Notis Toufexis.

The Grammar of Medieval Greek research project

In July 2006 we held a conference in Cambridge, in association with the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, with the title "Unlocking the potential of texts: interdisciplinary perspectives on Medieval Greek". Speakers included: Aglaia Kasdagli, Kritonas Chrysochoidis, Martin Hinterberger, Stavros Perentidis, Georgios Velenis, David Holton, Nils Langer, Nicholas de Lange, Charalambos Dendrinos, and Agamemnon Tselikas. Several of the papers can be viewed on the website: http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/

The next important event for the research team was the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, held in London from 21 to 26 August 2006. We convened a panel on language variation in Byzantine and post-Byzantine texts. Papers were given by David Holton, Notis Toufexis and Io Manolessou.

Tina Lendari has been appointed to a lectureship in Medieval Greek philology at the University of Athens and will leave the project on 1 October 2007. In her place, Marjolijne Janssen, a graduate of the University of Amsterdam, joins the project as a Research Associate from September 2007.

Activities of members of the Modern Greek Section

Professor David Holton gave a lecture on *Erotokritos* at Oxford University in February 2006, and in May he chaired a session at a conference on honour of Professor Peter Mackridge, also in Oxford. His co-authored book *Greek: an essential grammar of the modern language* (2004) has recently appeared in a Greek translation: *Βασική γραμματική της σύγχρονης ελληνικής γλώσσας*. Μετάφραση Μιχάλης Γιωργιαφέντης (Athens: Patakis 2007). He has also published: "*Ερωτόκριτος* και *Βοσκοπούλα*: μια συγκριτική ανάλυση", in: S. Kaklamanis (ed.), *Ζητήματα ποιητικής στον* Ερωτόκριτο (Heraklion: Vikelaia Dimotiki Vivliothiki 2006), pp. 273-90.

Dr Tina Lendari has published an article on *Erotokritos* and the Medieval Greek romances: "Ο *Ερωτόκριτος* και η ελληνική δημώδης μυθιστορία του Μεσαίωνα: ο λόγος της επιθυμίας και η απουσία του", in: S. Kaklamanis (ed.), *Ζητήματα ποιητικής στον* Ερωτόκριτο (Heraklion: Vikelaia Dimotiki Vivliothiki 2006), pp. 51-74. Her edition of *Livistros and Rodamne* has also been published: *Livistros and Rodamne. A critical edition of Vat. gr. 2391 with introduction, commentary and index verborum. Editio princeps* [Βυζαντινή και Νεοελληνική Βιβλιοθήκη, 10] (Athens: MIET 2007).

Dr Notis Toufexis, gave two papers at the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, held in London from 21 to 26 August 2006. He also gave papers at a workshop on "Open Source Critical Editions" held at the Centre for Computing in the Humanities, King's College London, in September 2006 and the Classical Association Conference at the University of Birmingham in April 2007. In February and April 2007 he organized two workshops for language officers in the Faculty of Modern and

Medieval Languages on digital resources for language teaching. In September 2006 he participated in a workshop on "Advanced Text Encoding with TEI P5" held at the University of Oxford. He has submitted two papers for publication, due to appear next year, and has written a set of reviews of publications on electronic editing for the "Gateway for the Greek Language" of the Centre for Greek Language in Thessaloniki (www.greek-language.gr). In March 2007 he played the role of Antinoos in "Penelopeia", a reading of the original Homeric Greek text organized by Professor Patrick Boyde in Cambridge.

About the contributors

Richard Clogg is an Emeritus Fellow of St Antony's College, Oxford. He previously taught at the Universities of Edinburgh and London. His books include: *The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821: a collection of documents* (Macmillan 1976); *A Short History of Greece* (CUP 1979, ^{2}1986); *Politics and the Academy: Arnold Toynbee and the Koraes Chair* (Cass 1986); *Parties and Elections in Greece: the search for legitimacy* (Hurst 1987); *A Concise History of Greece* (CUP 1992, ^{2}2002); *Anglo-Greek Attitudes: Studies in History* (Palgrave 2000) and *Greece 1940-1949: Occupation, Resistance, Civil War: a documentary history* (Palgrave 2002). His *Concise History of Greece* has been translated into a dozen languages, including Chinese and all the major languages of the Balkans. His edited volume, *Bearing Gifts to Greeks: Humanitarian aid to Greece in the 1940s* (Palgrave Macmillan) will be published in 2007. He is currently working on a memoir of academic life.

Liana Giannakopoulou is a Visiting Research Fellow in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek, King's College London. Her book *The power of Pygmalion. Ancient Greek sculpture in Modern Greek poetry* will shortly be published by Peter Lang.

Michael Jeffreys read Classics at Cambridge and immediately became a schoolmaster, though he soon began a part-time doctorate at Birkbeck College, London, on a subject on the border of Byzantine and Modern Greek. After fellowships in the United States and Greece he was appointed Lecturer in Modern Greek at Sydney University. He was one of the managers of the extraordinary expansion of Modern Greek in the 1970s and 1980s to rival French as Australia's premier modern language, and its sharp decline in the 1990s. He was appointed Professor of Modern Greek, and has written on popular levels of Greek culture,

between Ioannes Malalas in the 6th century and Yannis Ritsos in the 20th. Since taking early retirement in 2000, he has managed the Prosopography of the Byzantine World project (1025-1180) at King's College London.

Tassos A. Kaplanis has been Lecturer in Modern Greek literature at the University of Cyprus since 2004. He studied at the University of Thessaloniki (BA and Master's), and obtained his PhD at the University of Cambridge (Selwyn College). His research interests are in early Modern Greek vernacular language and literature (12th to early 19th centuries), the theory of literature, and comparative studies, on which he has published a number of articles. His most recent article, on the poetics of Vitsentzos Kornaros, appeared in S. Kaklamanis (ed.), *Ζητήματα ποιητικής στον* Ερωτόκριτο (Heraklion: Vikelaia Dimotiki Vivliothiki 2006), pp. 369-94.

Marc Lauxtermann is Bywater and Sotheby Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek Language and Literature at the University of Oxford, and a Fellow of Exeter College. Before coming to Oxford in 2007, he served as Professor of Modern Greek and Byzantine Studies at the University of Amsterdam. His recent publications include: *The Spring of Rhythm. An essay on the political verse and other Byzantine metres* (Vienna 1999) and *Byzantine poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and contexts* (Vienna 2003).

David Ricks teaches in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies and on the Comparative Literature Programme at King's College London. His recent publications include: "Homer in the Greek Civil War", in: Barbara Graziosi and Emily Greenwood (eds.), *Homer in the twentieth century* (Oxford 2007); an article on Homeric translation in Peter France and Kenneth Haynes (eds.), *The Oxford history of literary translation in English*, vol. 4 (Oxford 2006); and shorter pieces in *Arion* and *Harvard Review*.