Κάμπος

Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek

Cambridge No. 5 1997

ISSN: 1356-5109

Published by:
The Modern Greek Section
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DA
United Kingdom

Price per issue: £8.00
All correspondence should be sent to the above address.

Edited by David Holton and Shannan Peckham
Layout by Liz Crossfield

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)

Κάμπος. **Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek No. 5 1997**

Contents

Writing, identity and truth in Kazantzakis's novel *The Last Temptation* *

Roderick Beaton

The Last Temptation has provoked its share of controversy (not least, but not only, sparked by the Martin Scorsese film based on the book). More serious discussions have tended to revolve around issues of the book's theology – understandably, given its theme. But to approach this book exclusively from the angle of either religion or philosophy is to leave out what I believe to be its most genuinely radical component: namely its exploitation and simultaneous undermining, not only of its biblical sources, but at the same time also of the age-old art of story-telling.

This can be demonstrated by considering each, in turn, of the components of my title. All three are among the terms customarily invoked, ever since the books of the Old Testament and the writing down of the Homeric poems, to guarantee the authority and status of the most highly-valued narratives of a culture about itself. Writing (and this is true even of such a "residually oral" culture as the Modern Greek) traditionally is the most stable and trusted means of establishing, maintaining and transmitting to future generations the things they most need to know: *who* (identity) did *what* (truth).

These notions, or at least their stability, have come under such sustained attack, within the late-twentieth-century Western culture that we loosely term postmodern, that it seems almost quaint to invoke them in those terms at all, today. But the reason for doing so is that the very same foundations of (*inter alia*) narrative art that postmodernism in recent years has challenged, with heady and problematic success, are also those

* I am grateful to David Holton and other participants in discussion when an earlier version of this paper was given as a lecture at the University of Cambridge, and also to Peter Bien who read and commented on the text of that lecture.

which Kazantzakis, the "belated" survivor of an earlier, Romantic or immediately post-Romantic era, also challenged, rather earlier in our century (*The Last Temptation* was written in 1950-1, and first published in Greek in 1955).

Writing

Kazantzakis's strictures against the written word are well known, and most explicitly articulated in *Zorba,* which harps endlessly on the moral and spiritual infirmity of the *kalamarás* ("pen-pusher") who is Zorba's ineffectual superior in the mining business and willing disciple in the lessons of life. But even in that book, there is an implicit paradox which goes all the way back to Plato. Just as Plato in theory despised writing but none the less depended on his mastery of it in order to immortalise the teaching of his master Socrates, so Kazantzakis, through the mouthpiece of the book's narrator, denounces again and again the art which will at the beginning and end of the book actually be vindicated in the act of *writing* the "synaxari" (or saint's life) of Zorba.

This ancient ambivalence about writing has a more complex part to play in *The Last Temptation.* Relatively early in the book, we find Kazantzakis's characteristic diatribe against the tyranny of the written word, in the scene in the monastery where the old Abbot, Joachim, is on his deathbed and castigates the monks for seeing no further than the written word (γράμματα) of Scripture:

> Μα τι μπορούν να πουν τα γράμματα; αυτά 'ναι τα μαύρα κάγκελα της φυλακής, όπου στραγγαλίζεται και φωνάζει το πνέμα. Ανάμεσα από τα γράμματα και τις γραμμές και γύρα τριγύρα στο άγραφο χαρτί κυκλοφορεί ελεύτερο το πνέμα... (108; Eng. 110)[1]

---

[1] Greek text and page numbers refer to: Nikos Kazantzakis, *Ο τελευταίος πειρασμός* (ξαναστοιχειοθετήθηκε με επιμ. Πάτροκλου Σταύρου) (Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki 1984). The reader is referred to the excellent translation of the novel by Peter Bien ("Eng." after the Greek page number refers to: Nikos Kazantzakis, *The Last Temptation,* paperback ed., London: Faber 1975). For the purposes of this paper, however, I have preferred to give my own, fairly literal, translations of the passages cited.

> But what can writing say? The letters of the alphabet are the black prison-bars of the soul, that keep it suffocated and crying out. In between the letters and the lines, and everywhere round the margins of the unwritten paper: that's where the soul goes free...

This is Kazantzakis the demoticist, the scourge of narrow book-learning, in a familiar guise. But once Jesus becomes launched on his mission in the second half of the novel, the art of writing will appear in a more varied light.

Matthew the publican, though not prominent in the story, is nonetheless one of the more fully characterised of the apostles, after Judas. He is introduced into the narrative in a scene which closely follows the synoptic Gospels (for which, it should be said in passing, Kazantzakis has no systematic preference). To the canonical social revulsion caused by the inclusion of the former tax official among Jesus' disciples, Kazantzakis adds an additional colouring. In his description of Matthew, sitting outside his customs shed, we at once recognise the negative attributes of the *kalamarás* in the world of Kazantzakis's novels:

> Κοντός, παχουλός, χλεμπονιάρης· κίτρινα, μαλακά τα χέρια του, μελανωμένα τα δάχτυλά του, μαύρα τα νύχια του, μεγάλα μαλλιαρά τ' αυτιά του· ψιλή η φωνή του σα μουνούχου. (319; Eng. 322)

> Short, fat, and sallow; hands yellow, flaccid; fingers ink-stained, nails black; ears huge and hairy; his voice shrill like a eunuch's.

We have no difficulty recognising the type. And yet this despised *kalamarás* will reach surprising heights, just as the canonical Matthew did. Before leaving to follow in Jesus' footsteps, Matthew in Kazantzakis's version takes the tools of his trade with him. The despised inkpot and quill will soon be put to a new use. When the other disciples have gone to sleep, Matthew sits up beneath the lamp, takes out his "virgin notebook" (απάρθενο τεφτέρι) and quill-pen (here and throughout called by the dialect term καλέμι), and finds himself in a familiar dilemma:

> Πώς ν' αρχίσει; από πού ν' αρχίσει; ο Θεός τον έβαλε δίπλα στον άγιο ετούτον άνθρωπο να καταγράφει πιστά τα λόγια που λέει και τα θάματα που κάνει, να μη χαθούν, να τα μάθουν και οι μελλούμενες γενεές, να πάρουν κι αυτές το δρόμο της λύτρωσης. ... [Ό],τι πάει να χαθεί, αυτός να το πιάνει με το καλέμι του, να το απιθώνει απάνω στο χαρτί, να το κάνει αθάνατο... (331; Eng. 333-4)

> How to begin? Where to begin? God had placed him next to this saintly man to write down faithfully the words he says and the miracle he makes, so as they won't be lost, so as future generations will learn about them, and follow in their turn the road of salvation. ... Whatever's at risk of being lost, he'll be the one to catch it with his quill-pen, and set it down on paper, and make it immortal...

And at the moment of dipping his quill in the inkpot, Matthew hears behind him the rustling of wings, as though an angel were standing on his right side and whispering into his ear what he must write: which turns out to be the first sentence of the Gospel according to St Matthew as we know it (cited, moreover, in the original New Testament Greek).

The process of inspired writing described here is familiar from Homer and the Old Testament onwards. There are abundant precedents, too, for the sense of literary mission, the humble determination to catch fleeting reality and give it permanent form. And it is conspicuous, too, that the canonical opening sentence of Matthew's Gospel (which asserts the genealogy of Jesus Christ from the ancient kings of Israel) is not true in the world of Kazantzakis's story as we have read it so far.

This problematic relationship between writing and truth assumes ever greater importance as the book progresses. The Biblical story of Jesus' rescue of the disciples from the storm (Matt. 14.22-32) is narrated in the form of Peter's dream (though we are told that the dream was sent by an "angel from heaven" [p. 347]). Peter then tells the story of his dream to Matthew. Not for the first or the last time in this novel, the status of dreams and reality is put into question, as Peter explains to Matthew that the dream was so vivid, and his emotions so powerful, that "perhaps it wasn't a dream". Matthew agrees, and begins to wonder how he can write it up in his Gospel:

> Δύσκολο πολύ, γιατί δεν ήταν ολότελα σίγουρος πως ήταν όνειρο· δεν ήταν ολότελα σίγουρος πως ήταν αλήθεια· ήταν και τα δυο· το θάμα αυτό έγινε, μα όχι στη γης και στη θάλασσα ετούτη, αλλού· μα πού; (349; Eng. 351)
>
> Very difficult, this: because he wasn't altogether sure it had been a dream; he wasn't altogether sure it was true, either; it was both; this miracle had happened, but not on this earth and this sea, somewhere else. But where?

Where, indeed, could this miracle possibly be real, if not in writing?

Matthew has a harder time of it in a later passage (at the end of ch. 23), which gives a fuller account of the writing process. In order to write what the text here describes as the βίος και πολιτεία του Ιησού (life and times of Jesus [355; Eng. 357]), Matthew finds that the angel commands him to write things that he *knows* are not true. He protests; he refuses to write; sweat gushes from his forehead; but despite himself, he is writing at breakneck speed. What is narrated here is immediately recognisable as another version of Jesus' own struggle, and Jesus himself, half-wakened from sleep, recognises it as such (356; Eng. 358).

The crisis for Matthew comes in ch. 26, which also contains the pact between Jesus and Judas which is central to Kazantzakis's whole version of the story. It is a time of stress and uncharacteristic bad temper among the disciples. First Peter, who has never taken to Matthew, experiences a moment of paranoia: άτιμη γενεά οι γραφιάδες (a worthless brood, you scribes [397; Eng. 399]), and he determines to know what Matthew has been writing about *him*. For the second time in the book, the opening of Matthew's Gospel is quoted in the original, this time at slightly greater length. Despite the lapse of charity that initiated this exchange, Peter finds himself lulled by Matthew's narrative of things that he knows quite well his fellow-disciple could not have seen, is charmed to sleep by the evangelist's words, which he likens to pomegranates, and finally on waking embraces the writer and kisses him on the mouth: εκεί που σε άκουγα, he declares, μπήκα στην Παράδεισο

(while I listened to you, I entered Paradise [398; Eng. 399]). This is the aesthetic response to inspired art.

But now a sterner trial awaits the evangelist. Jesus summons him over, and asks to read the story so far. Jesus is immediately enraged, and throws the book on the ground.

> Τι 'ναι αυτά; φώναξε· ψέματα! ψέματα! ψέματα! Δεν έχει ανάγκη ο Μεσίας από θάματα, αυτός είναι το θάμα, άλλο δε χρειάζεται! Γεννήθηκα στη Ναζαρέτ, όχι στη Βηθλεέμ, ποτέ μου δεν πάτησα το πόδι στη Βηθλεέμ, δε θυμούμαι Μάγους, δεν πήγα ποτέ μου στην Αίγυπτο ... (399; Eng. 401)

> What's all this? he shouted. Lies! Lies! Lies! The Messiah doesn't need miracles, *he* is the miracle, he's no need of any other! I was born in Nazareth, not Bethlehem, I've never in my life set foot in Bethlehem, I don't remember any Wise Men, I've never been to Egypt ...

But Matthew, like many a writer of secular narratives before and since, insists that he himself is not the one responsible. These things were told him by an angel; and he tells Jesus what we already know:

> ... σαν το μωρό είμαι φασκιωμένος στη φτέρουγα [sic] του Αγγέλου και γράφω· δε γράφω, αντιγράφω ό,τι μου λέει. Αμ' τι; από δικού μου εγώ θα τα 'γραφα όλα ετούτα τα θαμάσματα; (399; Eng. 401)

> ... I'm like a babe swaddled by the Angel's wing and I write. I don't write, I *write out* what he tells me. So what? Would *I*, on my own, write all these miraculous doings?

And Jesus is struck by the same idea that had occurred to Matthew much earlier, when he had been considering how to write up Peter's dream about the storm:

> ... αν όλα αυτά είναι η αληθινή αλήθεια; Αν ετούτο είναι το πιο αψηλό πάτωμα της αλήθειας, όπου ο Θεός μονάχα κατοικεί; Αν ό,τι εμείς λέμε αλήθεια, ο Θεός το λέει ψέμα; (400; Eng. 401)

> whether these things aren't the true truth? Whether this might be the highest level of truth, where God alone dwells? Whether what we call truth, is called a lie by God?

Jesus then falls silent (Σώπασε) and reverently, now, hands the manuscript back to its author:

> Γράφε, ό,τι σου υπαγορεύει ο Άγγελος, είπε ο Ιησούς· εγώ πια ... μα δεν απόσωσε το λόγο του. (400; Eng. 401)
>
> Go on writing, write whatever the Angel dictates to you, said Jesus; as for me ... but his words were left unfinished.

It is as though Kazantzakis is about to set the highest seal on his own art, in the words Jesus is about to say to Matthew; but his Jesus stops short, perhaps baffled (it would not be out of character) at the phenomenon to which he has just been initiated. Bien, interestingly, tries to make sense of the unfinished sentence by translating "It is too late for me to –". But even that is an over-interpretation.

Matthew makes two further appearances in the novel. The first is on the eve of the Passion (in ch. 27), when he is unwise enough to complain to Jesus: σκοτεινά τα λόγια σου, πώς θες να τα βάλω στα χαρτιά μου; (your words are dark, how can you expect me to put them down on paper?).

Jesus rounds on him with a predictably Kazantzakian denunciation of his craft: καλά σας λεν εσάς τους γραφιάδες κοκόρια· θαρρείτε δε βγαίνει ο ήλιος αν δεν τον φωνάξετε (they're quite right to call you scribes cockerels; you think the sun doesn't come out unless you crow) but proceeds to express a more serious disquiet which is actually quite consistent with the unfinished sentence some twenty-five pages earlier:

> Άλλα λέω εγώ, άλλα γράφετε εσείς, άλλα καταλαβαίνουν αυτοί που σας αναγνώθουν! Λέω: σταυρός, θάνατος, βασιλεία των ουρανών, Θεός, τι καταλαβαίνετε; Καθένας σας βάζει στον κάθε άγιο ετούτο λόγο τα πάθη του και τα συμφέροντα και τις βολές του, κι ο λόγος μου χάνεται, η ψυχή μου χάνεται, δεν μπορώ πια! (423; Eng. 425)
>
> I say one thing, you people write something different. Something different again the people who read you take out of it! I say: "cross", "death", "kingdom of heaven", "God", and what do you understand? Each one of you puts upon these holy words his

> own passions and interests and hopes, and my words are lost, my soul is lost, I've had enough of this!

Jesus is ready to despair at the fickleness of the reception to which the written word is prone. But as we shall see more clearly later, in turning on Matthew in this way, he is unable to deny its extraordinary potency either.

Matthew appears, finally, at the very end of the long dream sequence which takes up all but the last of the last fifty pages of the novel. Here he too lends his voice to the chorus denouncing the renegade Jesus, in his case on the grounds that all his best efforts (there is no mention of an angel this time) will have been in vain if Jesus was never crucified, and his hopes for posthumous fame will therefore have been frustrated. In what is surely parodic sarcasm on Kazantzakis's part, Matthew insists that Jesus ought to have suffered if only for the sake of his, Matthew's, art:

> Έπρεπε, ας ήταν και για το χατίρι μου μονάχα, για να σωθούν ετούτα τα γραμμένα, να σταυρωθείς! (505; Eng. 506)

> You ought, if only for my sake, if only to save all that's written here – you ought to have died on the cross!

But by this point in the narrative, the cause of writing has been taken up by another figure, more powerful and, as presented, surely also more sinister, than Matthew.

I think it is a justifiable inference that Kazantzakis has no great liking for the apostle Paul. Paul, who historically never met Jesus while he was alive, gets to do so in the temptation-dream which extends Jesus' earthly life to shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 (495; Eng. 495). Clearly discernible in Kazantzakis's portrayal of Paul is the role commonly ascribed to him as the institutional founder of the Christian church. The character and behaviour of Kazantzakis's Paul is therefore complicated by Kazantzakis's known antipathy towards the Church which he founded. Paul is a highly ambiguous figure when he confronts Jesus in the second last chapter of the book. As representative of institutionalised Christianity, he is clearly to be understood as one of those who dangerously imprison the spirit, who had so terrified and

alienated the real Jesus on an earlier occasion (see p. 435; Eng. 437). Yet he appears here as a forerunner of Judas and the other apostles whose taunts will eventually bring the temptation-dream to an end; Paul appears as a tempter-within-temptation, and there is an ambiguity about his role, which seems to be at once to rub Jesus' nose in his betrayal of his followers, and to hold out the prospect, rather as Satan had earlier done, of world domination through the power of the institutionalised Church.

To add further to the ambivalence in the portrayal of Paul, there is another detail worth noticing. The Biblical Paul, according to himself in the *Acts*, had earlier been Saul, a virulent persecutor of the followers of Jesus. Earlier in the temptation-dream, this Saul duly appears. In the scene of gratuitous violence in which Mary Magdalene is murdered by the Levites and servants of Caiaphas (a scene which re-enacts the deaths of the sexual temptresses in *Zorbas* and *Christ Recrucified)* Saul is one of their number. Not only is he bloodthirsty, but we first see him through the eyes of the doomed Magdalene:

> Ποιος είσαι εσύ, με το φαλακρό κεφάλι, με τη χοντρή κοιλιά, με τα στραβά πόδια, ο καμπούρης; (462; Eng. 462)
>
> Who are you, with the bald head, fat belly, bent shanks, crooked back?

And it emerges clearly from the strange dialogue which ensues, that the thread of continuity between Saul the persecutor and Paul, the converted apostle, lies in his zeal, and specifically his weakness for world domination (explicit on p. 462, concluding lines; Eng. 463).

Paul, when he reappears in the courtyard of "Master Lazarus" (the name Jesus goes by, now that he has become a family man and head of his household), at first presents himself with the trite, narrow-minded optimism of a certain type of convert. There is surely irony behind the way he first introduces himself to Jesus:

> Ήμουν, δεν είμαι πια ο Σαύλος, ο αιμοβόρος· είδα το φως το αληθινό, είμαι ο Παύλος. Δοξασμένο τ' όνομα του Κυρίου, σώθηκα και κίνησα να σώσω τον κόσμο ... (485; Eng. 484)

> I *was*, I am no longer, bloodthirsty Saul. I've seen the true light, I'm Paul. Praised be the name of the Lord, I'm saved and on my way to save the world ...

But the scene quickly develops beyond irony. Paul, the determined preacher, begins preaching under Master Lazarus' roof the Good News of the life and resurrection of his master Jesus Christ. Jesus (who incidentally is never given the title "Christ" in the novel) is in a position to know better and vehemently contradicts him. Recognition follows, but Paul is not dashed in the way that Matthew will be, when his turn comes at the end of the temptation-dream. Paul is angry, and in the end contemptuous. The world, he declares, *needs* the story of the crucifixion and the resurrection:

> ... μέσα στου κόσμου ετούτου τη σαπίλα, την αδικιά και τη φτώχεια, ο Ιησούς ο Σταυρωμένος, ο Ιησούς ο Αναστημένος, ήταν η μονάκριβη παρηγοριά του τίμιου κι αδικημένου ανθρώπου. Ψευτιά ή αλήθεια – τι με νοιάζει; (488; Eng. 488)

> ... amid the stench of corruption of this world, the injustice and the poverty, Jesus Christ the Crucified One, Jesus Christ who rose from the dead, was the only, cherished comfort of honest, wronged mankind. True or false – what's that to me?

This in turn leads into a long diatribe on the power of the written word. Disdainful of literal truth, Paul declares:

> ... εγώ με το πείσμα, με τη λαχτάρα, με την πίστη, δημιουργώ την αλήθεια· δε μάχουμαι να τη βρω, τη φτιάνω. Τη φτιάνω πιο μεγάλη από το μπόι του ανθρώπου, κι έτσι μεγαλώνω τον άνθρωπο. (488; Eng. 488)

> ... I, with obstinacy, with longing, with faith, am the one who creates truth. I don't struggle to find it, I *make* it. I make it bigger than mansize, that way I make mankind stand a bit taller.

This is too close to the spirit and the rhetoric of Kazantzakis's own credo, *Ασκητική*, to be simply undermined by the same irony with which Paul has been introduced a few pages earlier. And the whole long, passionate speech ends by making it explicit that the power that Paul claims for himself (in effect, to create a world) is none other than the power of writing:

> ... εγώ θα φτιάσω εσένα και τη ζωή σου κια τη διδασκαλία σου κι τη σταύρωσή σου και την ανάσταση, όπως εγώ θέλω· δε σε γέννησε ο Ιωσήφ, ο μαραγκός από τη Ναζαρέτ, σε γέννησα εγώ, ο Παύλος, ο γραφιάς, από την Ταρσό της Κιλικίας. (489; Eng. 489)
>
> ... *I'm* going to make you and your life and your teaching and your crucifixion and your resurrection, the way *I* want. Joseph didn't beget you, the carpenter of Nazareth, *I* did: I, Paul the scribe from Tarsus in Cilicia.

*

Writing, then, to conclude the story so far, is seen in this novel as the very opposite of a transparent medium. At one point it appears in a fairly routine Kazantzakian guise, as a prison-house of the spirit. But whenever we see writing in action, in the activities of the apostles Matthew and Paul, writing turns out to be a highly complex process, fraught with struggle and danger. In its production it transcends the boundaries between waking experience and dream, and between truth and falsehood, so as to create a truth which is called by Matthew "the way of salvation" (το δρόμο της λύτρωσης [331; Eng. 333-4]) and by Paul the "salvation of the world" (να σωθεί ο κόσμος, 488; Eng. 488). In its reception, whatever λόγος or ψυχή caused it to be written in the first place, is lost through the subjective vagaries of reading and interpretation. Writing, according to this novel, has power in the world, both positive and negative. It never merely *records*, nor are the meanings it contains transparent to the understanding.

Finally, before we move on from "writing" to consider the other components of my title, we should also remind ourselves of the perhaps rather obvious fact that writing is not just one among

the novel's themes: it is also the medium in which *The Last Temptation* itself exists.

Identity

Determining the identity of the central figure is already explicitly articulated as a problem in the Gospels. In Matthew, the following exchange takes place between Jesus and the disciples:

> ... he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?
> And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.
> He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?
> And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. ... Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. (Matt. 16.13-16, 20; cf. Luke 9)

Fundamental to all four biblical accounts of the life of Jesus is the progressive revelation, in the face of rational doubt, that the man Jesus is identical with the Messiah, or Christ, whose coming was prophesied in the Jewish scriptures. The question of the identity of the central character assumes even greater importance in Kazantzakis's treatment of the story, but here it is not only those around Jesus who seek, in puzzlement, exasperation or desperation, to find out who he truly is: first among them is Jesus himself.

The four stages of the chief character's evolution, discussed by Peter Bien on the basis of Kazantzakis's own notebook for the *Last Temptation,* already place emphasis on the progressively changing identity of Jesus. These four stages are called by Kazantzakis: Son of the Carpenter, Son of Man, Son of David, Son of God.[2] It is probably uncontroversial to suggest that Kazantzakis's novel is not about the Son of God who was incarnated as a man (this is the "plot" of the Gospel stories), but rather about an exceptional man who through a long struggle first recognised and then fulfilled his mission to *became* the "Son

---

[2] Peter Bien, *Nikos Kazantzakis: Novelist* (Series: Studies in Modern Greek. Bristol Classical Press [= Duckworth] 1989), pp. 67-73.

of God". My point, in any case, is not about the book's theology. From the first page to the last, one of the most remarkable, effective and disturbing aspects of *The Last Temptation* is the instability of the chief character's identity. "Who are you?" (the question implicit in the synoptic Gospels as well) is a question that others obsessively ask of Jesus. As early as the second chapter, Judas is moved to ask him (and a ritualistic three times at that): "can it be you... you... ?" (μπας κι είσαι εσύ... εσύ...; [29-30; Eng. 28-9]); and Jesus can only answer with the most grammatically indeterminate counter-question possible: Εγώ; ποιος; (I? Who?)

Indeed it is not until the end of the fourth chapter (56; Eng. 56) that the young man, the son of Mary is named at all, and then it is (again in a ritualistic, threefold repetition) when his mother calls out to him at the scene of the crucifixion of the Zealot. In a later scene, after the start of Jesus' mission, but at a point when it is clear that he, least of all, fully understands the nature of that mission, Judas challenges him, in words which echo the synoptic Gospels:

> Δεν ξέρω πώς να σε λέω: γιο της Μαρίας, γιο του Μαραγκού, γιο του Δαβίδ; Δεν ξέρω, μαθές, ακόμα ποιος είσαι· μα μήτε κι εσύ ξέρεις... (206; Eng. 210)

> I don't know what to call you: son of Mary, son of the Carpenter, son of David? I don't know, you see, I still don't know who you are. But neither do you ...

It is Judas who proposes the visit to John the Baptist, which takes place almost at the midpoint of the book (at the end of chapter 16, out of 33). John also asks Jesus (and yet again, a ritual three times), who he is, but Jesus the first time throws the question back at him:

> Δε με γνωρίζεις; έκαμε ο Ιησούς ... Κι αυτουνού η φωνή έτρεμε· ήξερε, από την απάντηση του Βαφτιστή κρέμουνταν η μοίρα του. (239; Eng. 244)

> Don't you recognize me? said Jesus ... And his voice trembled; he knew, upon the Baptist's answer would depend the whole of his fate.

It is a scene of climactic ambiguity. Jesus depends on the Baptist *recognising* him. And by this point in the book, if not before, it has become clear that the whole question of Jesus' "identity" is not one of individuality, character, or even of biological substance. His poor mother, who has given him his name and since then more or less given him up in despair, does not, in this sense, know or recognise him at all. But John the Baptist, who has never seen him, is expected to recognise him. How?

> Δε διάβασες τις Γραφές; του αποκρίθηκε ο Ιησούς με γλύκα και παράπονο, σα να τον μάλωνε· δε διάβασες τους προφήτες; Τι λέει ο Ησαΐας; Πρόδρομε, δε θυμάσαι; (239; Eng. 244)
>
> Haven't you read the Scriptures? Jesus answered him with gentle reproach; haven't you read the prophets? What does Isaiah say? Baptist, don't you remember?

And we know that John has been reading the Scriptures; so well does he know them that recently he has dreamed about them and dreamed the very scene that is now taking place. Far from being a matter of individuality or personality, identity is something conferred by *writing*.

The scene of the Baptism is not only one of recognition, in which Jesus' identity begins to be subsumed into that of the Messiah prophesied by Scripture – a process which will be completed only with the second last sentence of the whole book. It is also a ritual of naming, and Kazantzakis extracts the maximum potential from this. While many miraculous occurrences in the Gospel narrative are toned down in the book, being presented as either dreams or hearsay, presumably in deference to the outward conventions of realism within which Kazantzakis usually operates, on this occasion the extent of divine intervention is, if anything, exaggerated. The river is suddenly stilled, schools of multi-coloured fish form a dance round Jesus, and the spirit of the river, in the form of an old man, rises up with gaping mouth and popping eyes (241; Eng. 245) – the scene strongly suggests a painting in the style of Titian, perhaps.

The Baptist, at the height of this miracle, stops short too, immobilised in the act of pouring water, as he does not know what name to give. In the book, as in the synoptic Gospels, Jesus

then sees a dove descending and hears a voice from heaven. But in Kazantzakis's version, no one can distinguish the words, or even whether they come from God or from the bird; not even Jesus:

> ... ψυχανεμίστηκε, ετούτο ήταν το αληθινό τ' όνομά του· μα δεν μπόρεσε ν' ακούσει (241; Eng. 246)
>
> ... he had a frisson that this was his true name; but what it was he couldn't hear.

According to tradition, the true name of God cannot be uttered, and in apparent deference to this tradition, the book specifically turns aside from the unambiguous declaration of the New Testament. The voice from heaven does *not* say, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3.17). Indeed, to ram home the point, Kazantzakis puts this interpretation of the inchoate utterance at the Baptism into the mouth of Satan at the climax of the Temptation in the Wilderness (266; Eng. 270), and has Jesus expressly deny that this is what he heard, when he reads the words in Matthew's Gospel-in-progress (399; Eng. 401) and upbraids Matthew that he wasn't even there. Even at this miraculous moment, his true identity continues to elude Jesus.

The process of becoming that lies at the heart of this novel is the almost perverse opposite of what theorists of the realist tradition call "character development". Jesus as a unique individual recedes, as the narrative progresses, in order for him to recognise his true identity in a role which must determine his actions, even his thoughts, and in which he will be recognised by others too. It is a process not of "growing into" a true personality (the underlying theme of the entire *Bildungsroman* tradition, a tradition to which this book could, in most other respects, be said to belong), but of putting off all personal, individual traits in order to become something (rather than somebody) which transcends it. The nature of this process is made clearer by comparison with the earlier *Christ Recrucified*, in which characters closer to an everyday reality, within living memory at the time of writing, were more obviously subsumed by predetermined roles which, like Jesus and Judas in this novel, they also resist. Manolios was not Christ, but in the course of the

novel he *became* Christ. In just the same way the Jesus of this novel is not Christ either, but he becomes Christ.

This is why Kazantzakis makes such extensive use of an aspect of the Gospel narratives which lies at the opposite extreme from realism in the modern sense.[3] This is the way in which so many details of the actual life of Jesus as narrated conform to, and thus are said to "fulfil", prophecies in the Jewish Scriptures. Some of these, such as the entire story of the Nativity in Bethlehem, and Jesus' descent from the line of David, the book, as we have already seen, ascribes to the ingenuity of the evangelist Matthew and so relegates from the "actual" life of *this* Jesus. But many others, of which we saw an example at the beginning of the encounter with John the Baptist, are not only part of Jesus' "real" life, but also actively willed by him.

It is not only Matthew the pen-pusher who is well-versed in Scripture. So, as we saw, is John the Baptist, who is thereby enabled to "recognise" a man he has never set eyes on before – not as an individual, but in the acting out of a role. And so too, finally, is Jesus himself. There are many references to, in particular, Isaiah and the prophecies of Daniel, and passages from both are paraphrased in demotic Greek in the text. The realisation that he must die, and the basis for the pact he makes with Judas, derives from the words of Isaiah, which become so intensely present to Jesus that he seemed to see the prophet bodily in front of him, and to read the letters inscribed on the air, just as John the Baptist had earlier done (393-4; Eng. 395-6). And later, the nearest to an explanation that Jesus can give to his disciples (or to us) for his coming crucifixion and death, is a long recitation which he calls upon Matthew to produce from memory, again taken from Isaiah (433-5; Eng. 435-6).

Jesus' truest, ultimate identity, then, appears to lie in the willing surrender of whatever individual identity he has, in order to enact a story *that has already been written.* The most succinct statement of this convergence of writing with the much-sought identity of Jesus in the book, though it comes as the

---

[3] Compare the discussion of "Figura" in Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (trans. W.R. Trask) (Princeton University Press 1953), esp. pp. 73-6.

conclusion to a passage that could be said to contradict it, forms the conclusion of a dialogue with the old Rabbi shortly before the crucifixion:

> Άγιες Γραφές, γέροντα, είπε, είναι τα φύλλα της καρδιάς μου· όλα τ' άλλα φύλλα εγώ τα ξέσκισα. (402; Eng. 404)
>
> Sacred Scriptures, Rabbi, he said, are the leaves of my heart. All the others leaves I've torn up.

Jesus' quest for identity, then, is resolved by a metaphoric equivalence between the pages (φύλλα) of the Old Testament prophecies and, in the traditional Greek expression, the leaves (φύλλα) of his heart.

But this resolution is only fully achieved at a single moment in the novel, and that is in its last two sentences. Even when the decision has been taken to be crucified, the deal with Judas has been struck and carried through, and Jesus, assuredly now calling himself the "Son of Man" has mounted the cross, this hard-won identity is still dizzyingly unstable. This is the nature and purpose of the fifty-page long temptation-dream. Neither the dream itself, nor its dissolution, is actively willed by the dying Jesus. Waking, as he thinks, to find himself in the company of a guardian angel, who is subsequently metamorphosed into the more Mephistophelian negro boy (αραπόπουλο) who keeps him company throughout forty years of supposedly normal life, Jesus reverts to the developing, individual, human personality he had left behind in order to step into the role of the prophesied Messiah. But even here, with the temptress Magdalene safely murdered, his two wives and his children to keep him company, and the security that comes with the role of Master Lazarus, Jesus does not know for certain who he is. Master Lazarus is after all an assumed identity, and he knows this.[4] Even as he lives out the life that the last temptation allots to him, he knows, and we know, that he is only acting out an alternative role. (Indeed, a robust reading of the novel might suggest that Jesus is not so much tempted as allowed to have his cake and eat it.)

---

[4] An example of this is explicit in the scene with Paul, e.g.: ξέχασε πως παράσταινε το μαστρο-Λάζαρο (485).

As the imaginary years pass, the disquieting, supernatural presence of the αραπόπουλο is a constant reminder that all cannot be as it seems in this supposedly "normal" world; and this Jesus is increasingly subjected to memories and real or imagined visitations from the past that rock the identity he has worked so hard to assume, and threaten the fragile happiness he has been able to build upon it. At the beginning of the final chapter (there are 33 chapters, as there were 33 years in Jesus' real life),[5] an ageing Jesus is disturbingly, and all too plausibly presented (if we take account of Kazantzakis's age at the time he wrote the book), as frightened by the passing of time and the evidence of his approaching physical decline and death. It is only having reached the end of his natural span (since the historical destruction of Jerusalem, which is now announced, took place three score and ten years after Jesus' birth) that the renegade Jesus reverts to the Cross; and even now, and entirely characteristically, he is disorientated:

> Έβαλε όλη του τη δύναμη να δει πού βρίσκεται, ποιος ήταν, γιατί πονούσε ... (506: Eng. 506)
>
> He used all his strength to see where he is, who he was, why he was in pain ...[6]

---

[5] Kazantzakis's special affection for the number 3, perhaps implying instability and the absence of closure, is well known (it seems to have been Kazantzakis himself, for instance, who first drew attention to the carefully contrived total of 33,333 lines in his *Odyssey*). In this book the 33 chapters continue that tradition of numerical symbolism, to which may be added an allusion to Dante's *Commedia*, which Kazantzakis of course knew well. Each of the canticles of Dante's poem is made up of 33 cantos, with the exception of the last, *Paradiso*, whose 34th canto adds the closure always refused up till that point. In the last canto of the *Paradiso*, Dante sees God, and the unstable multiples of 33 are rounded up to the total of 100. Naturally, it is precisely that kind of closure that is denied to Kazantzakis's Jesus and to the formal structure of *The Last Temptation*.

[6] I have retained the tenses of the original. Although the absence of a strict sequence-of-tense rule in Greek makes the effect of the curious alternation here less marked than it is in English, this use of language nonetheless seems to heighten the effect of disorientation.

And only now, at the end of just over five hundred printed pages, and only at the moment of death, is that question, "who am I?", definitively and fully answered, in the last word given to the biblical Jesus in the Gospel according to St John: τετέλεσται.

The Greek word, as is well known, means far more than the "It is finished" of the Authorized Version. Bien translates, as does the New English Bible, "It is accomplished". The prophecies have been fulfilled; but in the context of this book, Jesus' lifelong quest for his own identity is resolved fully only now, in the fulfilment of what had been written long ago. And this fulfilment is followed not by a resurrection – the evangelists and Paul can be relied on to provide that – but by a new beginning. The novel actually ends: κι ήταν σα να 'λεγε: Όλα αρχίζουν (and it was as though he said: Everything is beginning).

Truth

We have seen how the struggle of becoming that is the book's main subject is intimately bound up with the problematic art of writing. "Truth" turns out to be a highly relative and unstable concept in this book; and it is time now to turn this concept on Kazantzakis's book itself. Given what is said in the text about the nature, function, power, and limitations of writing, what claims to truth does *The Last Temptation* itself make? My answer would be: precisely the same claims as it upholds for its canonical predecessors.

The story of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles is retold by Kazantzakis in the middle of the twentieth century, in a form which owes much to the contemporary art of fiction. But Kazantzakis conspicuously does not call this book a novel, and it is worth noting, in passing, that all seven of the books from *Zorba* to *Report to Greco* that tend to be called novels are problematic in terms of genre.[7] The novel, as a genre, we know was not highly regarded by Kazantzakis, and along with the three components of my title, the conventions of realist, fictional narrative are thoroughly subverted in this book.

---

[7] I owe this insight to Georgia Farinou-Malamatari.

Any retelling of a story is, in effect, inevitably both a reading and an interpretation. *The Last Temptation* both reads and interprets the New Testament narratives, but also, I believe, the classic, realist novel of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Working within the same narrative framework as his sources, but adding within the frame also the *making* of these canonical narratives, Kazantzakis treats his scriptural sources in a way which is far subtler than merely rejecting them or claiming to supersede them would have been. What he does with the New Testament "life of Jesus" can, I think, be best described as "deconstruction", in the sense that this was defined by Jacques Derrida in *De la Grammatologie* (1967), a book which lies much closer in time to the writing of *The Last Temptation* than it does to us today:

> The movements of deconstruction do not destroy structures from the outside. They are not possible and effective, nor can they take accurate aim, except by inhabiting those structures. ... Operating necessarily from the inside, borrowing all the strategic and economic resources of subversion from the old structure, borrowing them structurally, that is to say without being able to isolate their elements and atoms, the enterprise of deconstruction always in a certain way falls prey to its own work. [8]

"Realism" is subject to much the same treatment in this book. Not only is the more-or-less realist treatment of the life and times of Jesus framed between two dreams,[9] but the Bergsonian concept of "subjective time" is taken to perhaps its furthest extreme in literature in the fifty-page sequence in which Jesus, while dying on the cross, during an unmeasurably small instant of time, experiences in dream almost forty years of earthly life, not merely passing before his eyes but actually lived by him.

---

[8] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (trans. G.C. Spivak) (Johns Hopkins University Press 1974), p. 24.

[9] Peter Bien, in a letter, draws attention to this point, which may be connected to the same structural device (which amounts to putting the entire "realist" part of a text within quotation marks), as early as *Toda Raba* (written 1929). Cf. Peter Bien, *Nikos Kazantzakis: Politics of the Spirit* (Princeton University Press 1989), p. 162.

Though it does not appear to have been discussed in these terms, this blatant subversion of realist narrative has much in common with the better-known subversions of Jorge Luis Borges, which have been so influential in shaping the fiction we have grown accustomed to think of as "postmodern". Though there is no indication, and little likelihood, that Kazantzakis knew Borges's *Ficciones* (published in Buenos Aires in 1944), this daring dilation of narrative time, in particular, invites comparison with Borges's short fiction "The Secret Miracle", in which something very similar happens.

For Kazantzakis, I would submit, the outrageously unverifiable, indeed explicitly counterfactual story of Jesus' temptation on the cross, is *true*, in the same sense as everything else in the book is "true", including the New Testament narratives which it revises and interprets: true, that is, not because it happened (it didn't), but because it is written.

Conclusion

I have tried to suggest that the issues of identity and truth, central to the Gospel narratives of the life of Jesus and also of this twentieth-century retelling, are presented in *The Last Temptation,* as indissolubly bound up with the ambivalent and problematic nature of story-telling and particularly of writing. Overtly and admittedly, Kazantzakis's book is based on and retells a story from sacred Scripture (Άγιες Γραφές). But as often as the modern retelling seems to break away from the hieratic, over-interpreted writings on which it is based, to go behind the inscrutable face of the sacred text and bring alive what it presents as the actual, earthly and sometimes earthy experience of Jesus and those around him, it reminds us, in a paradox that it is tempting to call postmodern, that both the achievement and the limitation of this reality are identical to its realisation in writing.

King's College London

The image of Britain in the literary magazine *Pandora* (1850-1872)*

Sophia Denissi

Like many aspects of the literature of Greek Romanticism (1830-1880), literary magazines of the period have not yet attracted the attention of scholars to a satisfactory degree. A bibliography of nineteenth-century newspapers and magazines is still lacking,[1] as is an adequate historical survey of the Greek literary press.[2] The only work that deals exclusively with some of the magazines produced during the period of Greek Romanticism, and especially with the most important one *Pandora*, is Apostolos Sachinis's 1964 book *Contribution to the history of Pandora and older magazines*.[3] Other volumes that partly cover the period are Dimitrios Margaris's *The old magazines, their history and their era* and Martha Karpozilou's seminal 1991 work: *The Greek family-oriented literary magazines (1847-1900)*.[4] We look forward to the publication of Karpozilou's long announced bibliography of nineteenth-century newspapers and magazines, as well as to that of a bibliography for the years 1800-1847, recently announced by the National

---

* The research presented in this article was collected as part of the ongoing project "Archive of Greek fiction 1830-1880", which is being conducted under the auspices of the Institute of Mediterranean Studies, Crete.

1 The catalogue of Dimitris Ginis, *Κατάλογος ελληνικών εφημερίδων και περιοδικών 1811-63* (Athens 1967), covers only a part of the material, as its title indicates.

2 The only work available is Mayer's three-volume *History of the Greek Press*, which does not meet the needs of researchers: Kostas Mayer, *Ιστορία του ελληνικού τύπου* (Athens 1957-60).

3 A. Sachinis, *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Πανδώρας και των παλιών περιοδικών* (Athens: Papadoyiannis 1964).

4 D. Margaris, *Τα παλιά περιοδικά, η ιστορία τους κι η εποχή τους* (Athens: Sideris 1955); M. Karpozilou, *Τα ελληνικά οικογενειακά φιλολογικά περιοδικά (1847-1900)* (Ioannina 1991).

Research Institute; they will be indispensable research tools for scholars working on the nineteenth century.

Pandora, the periodical whose relationship with Britain we shall be concerned with here, has been generally accepted as the most distinguished and successful of the magazines of the period of Greek Romanticism.[5] It has been considered a unique case for its unprecedented longevity (twenty-two years of continuous publication, whereas the second periodical with a notable life-span, *Efterpi*, was published for only seven years), for its high standards, the brilliance of its contributors (mostly university professors) and for the fact that its sole owner after five years of shared ownership, Nikolaos Dragoumis, is the only professional editor of the period who managed to make a living from a literary magazine. I believe that its success is closely related to the initial editorial team, Alexandros Rizos Rangavis, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos and Nikolaos Dragoumis,[6] who gave the periodical its high standards and distinctive identity. But to a greater degree it is related to the charismatic personality of its sole editor for seventeen years, Dragoumis, who abandoned a political career to devote his life to a humanitarian purpose: the enlightenment of the masses by means of a periodical. As my recent research on Dragoumis's fiction has shown, his decision to create a family-oriented literary magazine was the political act of a man who had become disillusioned with the way political life was conducted in Greece and chose another means to realise his political aspirations.[7]

What sort of periodical was *Pandora*? *Pandora* has been predominantly called a family-oriented literary magazine. This

---

[5] D. Margaris, op. cit., p. 14; A. Sachinis, op. cit., pp. 7, 35.

[6] I must make a distinction between the editorial team, consisting of the three scholars A.R. Rangavis, K. Paparrigopoulos and N. Dragoumis, and the owners, who are the above mentioned names plus the printer Chr. Doukas and the illustrator G. Skoufos; the last two were responsible for the technical part of the enterprise.

[7] These ideas were first expressed in the still unpublished paper I gave on Nikolaos Dragoumis's fiction at the Conference on Literature of Greek Romanticism, which took place at the Goulandris-Horn Institute on 24-25 October 1995.

characterisation might be misleading unless we realise that it is used to describe a kind of periodical that first appeared in Greece in 1847, containing miscellaneous material which included a fair amount of literature in its pages, mostly in the form of serialised fiction.[8]

Let us first examine the proclamation made by the owners about the aims and the content of the periodical. This proclamation is dated 12 December 1849, three days before the contract for the foundation of the periodical was signed,[9] and three and a half months before its first issue was published. According to it the aim of this fortnightly periodical would be to diffuse knowledge to all social classes and to accustom its readers to the pleasure of perusal. It was addressed to "all Greeks", and its real goal was national progress, which in the editors' opinion could be achieved only through the education of the masses. The owners seem to have realised that the only means to achieve such a difficult task in a young state, most of whose inhabitants were illiterate or semi-literate,[10] would be mainly through the inclusion of material that would combine entertainment with useful knowledge. They also seem well aware of fiction's didactic potential; they sought to launch a reading career for as many people as possible with the help of fiction. Although most of the reading public would probably never develop their reading taste once they acquired it, some might extend it to "higher" reading.

The editors, in their effort to expand the existing limited reading public with the help of the newly founded periodical,

---

[8] On the different categories of contributions to Greek family-oriented literary magazines see Karpozilou , op. cit., pp. 93-116.

[9] Full details about the foundation of *Pandora* can be found in Sachinis's book, pp. 36-47. The proclamation had not been found until recently; I tracked it down in the coloured covers of the first issues of the magazine, which are preserved only in the copy held in the E.L.I.A. library in Athens.

[10] The percentage of illiteracy in Greece, according to the existing statistics, was 87.5% of men in 1840 falling to 71.38% in 1870; for the female population we do not have statistics until 1870, when the percentage of illiterate women was 93.7%. I take these figures from Konstantinos Tsoukalas, *Εξάρτηση και αναπαραγωγή, ο κοινωνικός ρόλος των εκπαιδευτικών μηχανισμών στην Ελλάδα (1830-1922)* (Athens: Themelio 1987), p. 393.

endeavoured to cover a wide spectrum of tastes. The different fields that *Pandora* promised to cover according to the proclamation were: (1) short stories by Greek or European writers, (2) travel-writing, (3) essays on the most important social matters, (4) essays on scientific matters, (5) articles on new technology, (6) book-reviews concerning Greek publications, (7) book-reviews or announcements of new publications concerning European books with an emphasis on those dealing with Greek subjects, (8) poetry, and (9) novels by Greek writers or translations from the best European writers. To these categories two more were added in the first year of the periodical's circulation: biographies and miscellanies. From the above we can clearly see that from the moment the periodical's profile was drawn up, even before the publication of its first issue, *Pandora* was presented as a "miscellany" magazine. In the fifteenth year of the periodical's publication its editor described it "as a general periodical similar to those that the French and the English call Reviews, offering a variety of contents for its readers to chose from";[11] two years earlier Dragoumis had avowed that he was emulating "the wisest European periodicals" in order to achieve a high profile for *Pandora*.[12] It is not therefore surprising that it gave emphasis to contributions on social, scientific, and technological subjects, as well as to book-reviews. However, *Pandora's* emphasis on these categories seems inappropriate to the level of the average Greek family of the times, let alone the totality of Greek families the editors address in their proclamation. I would rather see such a periodical as appropriate for the middle and upper classes of the time, and it is they that the editors must be actually addressing. Furthermore, lower-class people could not have afforded to buy it even if they wanted to, as Karpozilou has shown, since their wages didn't even cover living expenses; at least that was the situation in Greece until the year 1880.[13]

As we have seen, *Pandora* included fiction in its pages but it did not depend solely on it. Why then is it mostly remembered for its literary aspect? One basic reason lies in the fact that it

---

[11] *Πανδώρα* 15 (1864-65) 597.
[12] *Πανδώρα* 13 (1862-63) issue 291, p. 63.
[13] Karpozilou, op. cit., pp. 252-64.

was mainly through this periodical – because of its longevity and status – that serial publication of novels was consolidated, although *Pandora* was not the first periodical to introduce serialised fiction in Greece.[14] Another important reason must be that a well known debate on the appropriateness of the publication of novels in literary magazines took place in its pages from 1856 onwards.[15] This debate evolved into a public discussion on the usefulness of novels in general (which for the more conservative part of the population were considered immoral), which divided people into two hostile camps of novel-lovers and novel-haters. A third reason is to be found in the fact that a number of the most famous Greek novels and short stories of the times were first published in the periodical. The mere repetition of those titles in histories of modern Greek literature would suffice for the name of *Pandora* to be connected with fiction. A last important reason must be the fact that of all its contributions it was literature that most appealed to the taste of the reading public. All these factors may be considered responsible for the prominence the literary aspect of the periodical has attained.[16]

However, I believe that *Pandora's* role must have been much more complex than has been recognised up to now. It seems that it not only played an important role in the development of a taste

---

[14] For *Pandora's* forerunners see Karpozilou, op. cit., pp. 53-90. According to Karpozilou the first literary magazine to promote the publication of novels in its pages was *Efterpi* (1847-1855).

[15] For more information on this debate see Apostolos Sachinis, "Μια συζήτηση του 1856 για το μυθιστόρημα, η κριτική του Νικολάου Δραγούμη", in: *Θεωρία και άγνωστη ιστορία του μυθιστορήματος στην Ελλάδα 1760-1870* (Athens: Kardamitsa 1992), pp. 165-82. An earlier form of this article appeared in the periodical *Ελληνικά* 18 (1964) 97-119. On the impact of this debate on contemporary Greek novels see Sophia Denissi, *Το ελληνικό ιστορικό μυθιστόρημα και ο Sir Walter Scott (1830-1880)* (Athens: Kastaniotis 1994), pp. 17-67.

[16] Among them are the novels *Ο συμβολαιογράφος* and *Ο Ανθέντης του Μορέως* by A.R. Rangavis, in the first two years of *Pandora's* publication, *Θάνος Βλέκας* by P. Kalligas in its sixth year, as well as a number of short stories by Rangavis, Konstantinos Ramfos, Angelos Vlachos, Nikolaos Dragoumis, and Achilleas Levendis, to mention only the most famous writers.

for novel-reading; it must also have helped its readers develop a political as well as a cultural taste, probably coloured by the preferences of its successive editors. The lack of articles dealing with the periodical's contents (one gets the feeling that since everybody knows *Pandora* why bother to look seriously into it?), together with the few existing works that either have a descriptive rather than an evaluative character or place the periodical in the context of the periodical press of the times, do not help me verify my claim. On the contrary, Sachinis describes the periodical as "neutral" to the political events of its time, "indifferent to any political cause", "void of a political voice", "a magazine in some way outside its time and outside history", "without a political or literary direction that can be felt by its readers".[17] However, the variety of contents, the obvious emphasis on political and cultural essays, as well as on articles that deal with developments in technology, the political echo in its proclamation, together with the fact that its editors were men involved in various ways with politics,[18] strengthen my belief that *Pandora* must have played an important political and cultural role that has not yet been recognised.

The fact that Dragoumis was a follower of Mavrokordatos and of his so-called "English party", together with the fact that *Pandora* abounds in articles that deal with the contemporary British scene, made me think that this might not be a coincidence. Thus it occurred to me that it would be interesting to relate my effort to trace this hypothetical political and cultural role of *Pandora* to the large amount of articles that refer to Britain. In my opinion the articles that came close to the editors' political sympathies could be those that colour the magazine politically, culturally, and even in matters of literary taste, thereby giving it a special identity.

In order to verify my claim I will examine, in some detail, a small but representative sample of this great amount of articles

---

[17] Sachinis, op.cit., pp. 50-1.

[18] Rangavis, Paparrigopoulos and Dragoumis had all served in various political positions from an early age; during the years of *Pandora's* publication Rangavis had to quit because he was elected to the Parliament and Dragoumis had to leave temporarily to become the last minister of foreign affairs to the first King of Greece, Otho.

on British topics. What sort of articles are these? Is their presence intentional or accidental? Do political developments between Great Britain and Greece affect the presence of articles on British topics in the magazine? Are those developments commented on in the periodical? These are some of the questions we will try to answer.

The large amount of contributions commenting on different aspects of the British reality can be divided into four main categories: (a) articles translated from British periodicals or books; (b) articles other than British ones that refer to British issues; (c) short stories, novels and poems by British writers translated into Greek, and finally (d) short stories and travel-writing by Greek writers that refer to British matters. Let us briefly examine each one and its relation to the profile of the periodical.

The first category, translations or free translations from books or newspaper and periodical articles in English, occupies a great many pages of *Pandora's* twenty-two volumes and covers a variety of subjects. It is interesting to see the content of articles translated, their sources, the translators, and the criterion for their choice. To do so, this large category might usefully be divided into seven basic sub-categories which would include different types of texts: (1) historical, (2) political, (3) scientific, (4) literary, and (5) social, plus (6) miscellanies, and (7) statistics.

Historical texts dealing with British history comprise a relatively small sub-category, but the articles or chapters of books translated are long and the translator is usually a well known personality. Those translations include: "The trial of the seven Bishops",[19] a chapter from Macaulay's recently published *History of England* put into Greek by the leading historian Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos and published in the fifth and sixth issues of the periodical.[20] Paparrigopoulos not only

---

[19] Κ.Ρ., "Η δίκη των επτά Επισκόπων, Εκ της νεωτάτης *Αγγλικής Ιστορίας* του Μακωλαίυος", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 5, pp. 107-17, issue 6, pp. 127-62.

[20] In this first year of the periodical's publication Paparrigopoulos had already written a short biographical article on Macaulay, in which he praised the recently published first two volumes of his *History of England*,

translated this chapter, but also added useful explanatory notes for the Greek reader. Earlier that year the translator had written a biographical article on Macaulay in which he had expressed his wish that the whole book should be translated into Greek. It seems that he chose a representative chapter from it, an episode leading up to the 1688 Revolution.[21] In the same sub-category one can find a very long article on "Charles I King of England",[22] dealing with another critical period of British history, as well as a brief article on "The Youth of Frederick the Great of Prussia",[23] based on Macaulay and translated by the poet Christos A. Parmenidis. The last of the historical articles I will mention is an essay giving information about the last descendant of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Palaiologos.[24]

The next sub-category we will be discussing consists of important political texts, most of which are long essays referring to different aspects of British political life. Among them there are two very interesting treatises: one on "Lord Clive", the so-called founder of the British state in India,[25] again translated by Paparrigopoulos, and the other on "Robert Emmet", the Irish rebel of the 1798 Rebellion.[26] Although both could be listed

---

a work of English historiography often mentioned in the twenty-two volumes of *Pandora*.

[21] K.P., "Θωμάς Βαβιγκτών Μακωλαίυς", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 4, p. 83.

[22] "Κάρολος Α΄, βασιλεύς της Αγγλίας", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 45, pp. 1077-85; issue 46, pp. 1099-107; issue 47, pp. 1123-30; issue 48, pp. 1151-8. There is no mention of translator or source but it is probably from Macaulay again.

[23] Ch.A.P. trans., "Νεότης Φριδερίκου του Μεγάλου κατά Macaulay", *Πανδώρα* 9 (1858-59) issue 200, pp. 189-91.

[24] "Ο τελευταίος των Παλαιολόγων", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 232, pp. 375-9. There is no mention of source; the translator is G. Danos Pekos.

[25] K.P. trans., "Ροβέρτος Λόρδος Κλίβης, ο θεμελιωτής του εν τη Ινδική Βρετανικού Κράτους", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 16, pp. 372-81; issue 17 pp. 401-6; issue 18, pp. 421-8; issue 19, pp. 456-9; issue 20, pp. 464-73. The name of the historian who wrote the article is not mentioned.

[26] Sophia F., "Ροβέρτος Έμμετ", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 235, p. 451ff.; issue 236, pp. 478-80; issue 237, pp. 489-93; issue 238, pp. 513-17; issue 239, pp. 550-4; issue 240, pp. 582-6; *Πανδώρα* 11 (1860-61) issue 244, pp. 93-6; issue 246, pp. 143-4; issue 247, pp. 173-5; issue 248, pp. 199-200;

under the historical sub-category, I have chosen to discuss them here because I believe that they were translated as political works (actually they belong to an intermediate category which could be called historico-political). They both refer to Britain's imperialist policy – both Ireland and India were under British rule – but the ten years that separate those two translations indicate a change in the Greek translator's attitude towards Britain. The translation on Lord Clive, published in 1850-51, is a pro-British article which praises the conquest of India by the British army although Lord Clive's behaviour is subjected to some criticism. Even when he is tried in court the essayist finds excuses for all his deeds. The second one is a free translation published in 1860, very critical of British imperialist policy; it is definitely pro-Irish, and the translator intervenes a couple of times to identify the way the British have treated Ireland with their behaviour towards India and the Ionian Islands and to condemn their tyranny. In the same sub-category there is also an interesting brief article on "Taxes in Great Britain",[27] taken from *The Edinburgh Review* and translated by Dragoumis, which gives an analytical chart of the taxes paid to the state from 1815 to 1850 in order to indicate the state's efforts to reduce taxation and relieve the lower classes. Dragoumis explains that he chose to translate this article so that it would serve as an example to the Greek state, which should follow Britain's successful policy on such matters. I will close this important sub-category with an unsigned translation from Macaulay on a similar subject: William Pitt's political career and his efforts to improve the life of the lower classes.[28]

The third sub-category involves mostly free translations of English newspaper articles dealing with the latest developments in technology as they relate to Britain. The

---

issue 252, pp. 285-8; issue 253, p. 316ff.; issue 255, p. 366ff.; issue 256, p. 389ff.; issue 257, pp. 408-10. It seems that it was translated by a lady who signed by using her forename and only the initial of her surname.

[27] N.D. trans., "Φόροι εν τη Μεγάλη Βρετανία", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 35, pp. 849-50.

[28] "Γουλιέλμος Πιττ ο πρεσβύτερος", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 39, pp. 935-41; issue 40, pp. 957-63; issue 41, pp. 985-91; issue 42, pp. 1008-15; issue 43, pp. 1026-31.

periodical devoted a great number of articles to subjects such as: the submarine telegraph that connected England to France,[29] the different applications of steam-engines in factories, trains and ships,[30] steamships,[31] the transatlantic telegraph which would connect Britain to America,[32] or the Dover-Calais tunnel,[33] to give just a small sample. Those free translations often include the translators admiration for those developments and his wish that they will soon be part of Greek everyday life.

The sub-category of literary texts is large and includes mainly book-reviews taken from British periodicals and newspapers on both Greek and British books referring to Greek topics. I will mention some of the most interesting ones that appeared in the twenty-two volumes of *Pandora*. The first is an extensive article translated by Rangavis from *The Edinburgh Review* analysing W. Mure's *A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece*.[34] Then there are two book-reviews analysing Spyridon Trikoupis's *The History of Greece*, published in London where Trikoupis was at that time Ambassador of Greece. One of them is translated from *The Times*

---

[29] "Τηλέγραφος υποθαλάσσιος", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 13, p. 290. The article refers to the telegraphic connection of Britain to France, which took place two months earlier. It is signed by Dragoumis, whose fascination with the new technological developments is expressed in it.

[30] "Ατμοκίνητοι μηχαναί", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 39, pp. 943-4. In this article the translator (probably Dragoumis) expresses his regret that his country has not yet followed those developments; see also "Ατμοκίνητος μηχανή", *Πανδώρα* 4 (1853-54) issue 81, p. 228.

[31] "Νέα νίκη επί της αποστάσεως", *Πανδώρα* 4 (1853-54) issue 81, p. 228.

[32] "Τηλέγραφος υποβρύχιος", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 39, p. 944; see also D.N. Botasis, "Υποβρύχιος τηλέγραφος", *Πανδώρα* 7 (1856-57) issue 166, pp. 523-4, giving full details on the enterprise, which was expected to be completed by the summer of 1857, and "Περί του υπερατλαντικού τηλεγράφου", *Πανδώρα* 9 (1858-59) issue 204, pp. 287-8, with information on the successful operation of the telegraph.

[33] I. Dekigallas, "Περί της κατά τον πορθμόν του Καλέ υποβρυχίου διώρυγος", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 232, pp. 383-4 ; the article discusses the prospects for the construction of a Channel tunnel or even of a railway bridge to connect Britain with the Continent.

[34] "Βιβλιογραφία", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 27, pp. 644-52; issue 28, pp. 668-76.

and the other from the *Athenaeum*. The *Times* review praises the book's objectivity and its eloquence. The anonymous translator, in all probability Dragoumis, expresses the hope that this book will help people who are not acquainted with the Greek reality, like the editors of *The Times*, to form a correct opinion about Greek matters; this will be invaluable since the latest political developments on the Eastern question proved that the wise editors of such excellent newspapers lacked basic information about the Christian nations of the East and therefore are quite unfavourable towards them. The second review finds Trikoupis's history an interesting book written in a smooth language and in a classical style but very subjective. Other articles include *The Eclectic Review's* critique of *Pandora* itself with very favourable words asking for more Greek novels and short stories in its pages,[35] and the *Athenaeum's* critique of a collection of works by the Greek poet, translator, and prose writer Christos A. Parmenidis, who lived in Britain. Parmenidis included in this volume his translation of Byron's *Sardanapalus*, a number of poems and a novel *Evgenia*. The reviewer is clearly acquainted with Parmenidis's works, whom he praises for his contribution to the development of literature in his country.[36] Before we leave this important sub-category we should mention an article written by Washington Irving describing his visit to Lord Byron's family estate, translated by Parmenidis,[37] and another one, translated from the Edinburgh newspaper *The Scotsman*, dealing with the problem of the correct pronunciation of ancient Greek. This article, written by J.S. Blackie, professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh,[38] is against the

---

[35] "Κρίσις περί Πανδώρας", *Πανδώρα* 6 (1855-56) issue 143, pp. 611-14; issue 144, pp. 624-5. Dragoumis's reply to the *Eclectic Review's* request for more Greek fiction is that Greek writers have to earn their living, so there is not enough time to devote to the writing of fiction.

[36] "Βιβλιογραφία", *Πανδώρα* 16 (1865-66) issue 371, pp. 285-7.

[37] Ch.A.P., "Απόσπασμα εκ της περιηγήσεως του Washington Irving εις Newstead Abbey πατρώαν έπαυλιν του Λόρδου Βύρωνος", *Πανδώρα* 5 (1854-55) issue 109, pp. 301-5; issue 110, pp. 318-22.

[38] "Βασιλικός Σύλλογος εν Εδιμβούργω", *Πανδώρα* 16 (1865-66) issue 363, pp. 59-65. The article was published in *The Scotsman* of 22 March 1865 and was translated in *Pandora* on 1 May of the same year; it is amazing how well informed the Greek scholars of the time were about anything

Erasmian pronunciation that the professors of English universities support and in favour of the Modern Greek pronunciation preferred by Scottish as well as French scholars, as being closer to the development of the language.

I will go through the last three sub-categories very briefly just to give an idea of the areas of English reality they cover. What we called social texts are translated articles of two kinds: some deal with important events of topical interest, such as the London International Exhibition and the construction of the Crystal Palace in Hyde Park,[39] or Franklin's last exploration of the North Pole, his disappearance and the subsequent visits of rescue teams for the recovery of his remains.[40] Others deal with the great social problems of the period, especially those of the huge city of London. These articles refer to the Lunatic Asylum in London,[41] the London Poorhouse,[42] public executions,[43] and so on. Miscellanies that could also be called curiosities include whatever of British origin could sound strange to the Greek reader of the periodical. *Pandora's* readers will learn about:

---

that concerned Greece. I believe that the translator of the article could easily be Rangavis, who was married to a Scotswoman and had access to the Scottish press.

[39] "Η εν Λονδίνω Παγκόσμιος έκθεσις", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 30, pp. 725-7; there is no mention of whether the article is a translation but it must be one. "Βιογραφία του Κρυσταλλίνου Παλατίου", *Πανδώρα* 3 (1852-53) issue 55, pp. 162-6. This is a free translation of an article by Charles Dickens probably made by Dragoumis, judging by the translator's comments in it which are typical of his style.

[40] "Περιήγησις Αρκτικός Έκπλους", *Πανδώρα* 3 (1852-53) issue 53, pp. 110-12; D.N. M[avrogordatos] trans., "Νέα Εκστρατεία προς αναζήτησιν του Πλοιάρχου Φραγκλινού", *Πανδώρα* 9 (1858-59) issue 202, pp. 238-41.

[41] N.D. trans., "Φρενοκομείον Λονδίνου", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 25, pp. 608-10.

[42] "Νυκτερινή σκηνή εν Λονδίνω", *Πανδώρα* 17 (1866-67) issue 402, pp. 453-5. This text is something between a travel memoir and a short story describing a night scene outside the Poorhouse near Whitechapel.

[43] A.S. Livathinopoulos, "Άτοπος περιέργεια", *Πανδώρα* 16 (1865-66) issue 361, p. 24; the text seems like a free translation of a description of a public execution. The Greek translator severely criticises the British practice of hiring windows with a good view of the scaffolds.

mice bred for use in industry,[44] ratting as a sport in London,[45] the betting habit of the British,[46] unusual duels,[47] a painter taken to court because of an unsuccessful portrait,[48] a wife biting her husband,[49] etc. Finally, statistics include information about British newspapers,[50] coal mines,[51] railways and trains (a favourite subject of the time),[52] iron and coal,[53] British commerce and ships,[54] the population and size of London,[55] the rate of suicides in London,[56] etc.

After this brief look at the contents of this first, very extensive, category of translated contributions dealing with British matters, one can reach certain conclusions. It is clear that the Greek scholars who contributed to the periodical are not only well acquainted with recent British publications but closely follow the periodical press of Britain and are well informed about all aspects of British life. Why should Greek scholars be so well informed about British reality? The answer must be that in their opinion Britain should be placed at the centre of public interest as the most powerful nation of the time, deciding on the

---

44 "Βιομηχανία μυών", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 22, p. 531.

45 " Κυνομυομαχία", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 47, pp. 1131-4.

46 "Στοίχημα Άγγλου", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 36, p. 874.

47 "Καταπότιον δια τους μονομάχους", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 36, p. 874.

48 "Δίκη περί εικόνος", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 227, p. 264.

49 "Σύζυγος δάκνουσα", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 232, p. 359.

50 "Δαπάναι των Αγγλικών εφημερίδων", *Πανδώρα* 2 (1851-52) issue 29, p. 705. Based on a recent book by Knight Hunt. See also "Δημοσιογραφία εν Αγγλία", *Πανδώρα* 19 (1868-69) issue 436, p. 80.

51 X. Landerer, "Περί ανορύξεως και χρήσεως των λιθανθράκων εις Ευρώπην", *Πανδώρα* 8 (1857-58) issue 190, p. 524. The article also gives information about the coal that can be found in Greece. "Περί γαιανθράκων", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 238, pp. 534-5.

52 "Σιδηρόδρομοι", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 238, p. 534.

53 I. Dekigallas, "Σίδηρος και γαιάνθρακες", *Πανδώρα* 14 (1863-64) issue 330, p. 488.

54 "Πολιτειογραφικά Αγγλίας", *Πανδώρα* 22 (1871-72) issue 522 pp. 431-2.

55 "Πληθυσμός Λονδίνου", *Πανδώρα* 7 (1856-57) issue 154, p. 239. Taken from the *Morning Chronicle*. See also I. Dekigallas, "Λονδίνον", *Πανδώρα* 14 (1863-64) issue 331, p. 511.

56 F.A. M[avrogordatos], "Αυτοχειρίαι εν Λονδίνω", *Πανδώρα* 19 (1868-69) issue 438, p. 120.

fate of smaller nations, but also as the most developed one. Their choice of articles to translate into Greek mirrors the image of Britain they want to project for their readers: as a model for emulation in matters of political liberties (the translated historical texts, for example, showed the way to constitutional democracy without a Revolution) and of technological advancement (railways, submarine telegraphs, steam-engines in factories, transatlantic steamships). On the other hand, a number of articles ("Robert Emmet" for example) and some comments of the Greek translators in free translations published after the first five years of the periodical's circulation, indicate that although Britain is admired and respected, particularly for its democratic liberties and its development, at the same time it is severely criticised for its inhuman foreign policy, for its imperialistic attitude, its despotism and the disdain it shows to the poor and helpless nations of the world. This attitude, which is not very easy to perceive in this first category we have examined, becomes more evident in the second one, which we will dealing with next: articles written mostly by Greeks and referring to British matters.

Before we come to this second category, it is worth reminding ourselves of the most important political events which took place during the years of *Pandora's* publication (1850-72) and influenced British-Greek relations.

The generation of Greeks who had fought in the War of Independence, and later served the newly founded kingdom in various political positions, knew that they had to adjust to the constantly shifting relations of the Great Powers. The year 1850, which saw the foundation of *Pandora*, found Greece in a strained relationship with Britain. The victory of Kolettis, the leader of the so-called French party, in the 1847 elections and his establishment of a parliamentary dictatorship provoked the fierce opposition of the English minister in Greece, Lyons, who advised Palmerston, the foreign secretary, to take a firm line in Greece. On the occasion of an unfortunate event that took place in Athens involving a British subject, Palmerston took the opportunity to raise certain unsettled British claims against the Greek government and to demand compensation for the victim of the specific event, the Portuguese consul Don Pacifico, a Maltese Jew and British subject, whose property was plundered by the

Athenian crowd in 1847. This affair ended in 1850 with the blockade of the port of Piraeus by the British fleet. Through this gesture Palmerston forced the Greek government to pay £8,000 but he infuriated Europe and humiliated his country by having to accept French mediation. Three years later a more serious political event disturbed British-Greek relations. On 4 October 1853 the Russian-Turkish war broke out due to religious matters involving the protection of the Christian religion in the Ottoman empire. England and France decided to intervene and support the Turks after their defeat at Sinope, declaring war on Russia on 28 March 1854. King Otho had encouraged the formation of Greek bands which had infiltrated Epiros, Thessaly and Macedonia, and was looking for an opportunity to declare war on Turkey. The British and the French would not tolerate Greece declaring war on Turkey in support of the irregular bands and of Russia, so at first they threatened to enforce their financial rights arising from the loans, and then, when they realised that they couldn't stop King Otho, they occupied the port of Piraeus, forcing Otho to declare neutrality. This occupation lasted almost three years until February 1857 and dramatically changed the climate towards Britain. The last important political event which affected British-Greek relations was Prince Alfred's candidacy for the Greek throne after King Otho's departure from Greece in 1862. Prince Alfred, the second son of Queen Victoria, was a very strong candidate for the Greek throne mainly because the Greeks welcomed the possibility of acquiring the Ionian Islands. His rejection of the throne because of Queen Victoria's objections was nevertheless followed by Palmerston's offer of the Ionian Islands providing the choice of a sovereign was satisfactory to England. After the election of Prince William of Denmark as King George I of the Hellenes, the Ionian Islands were ceded to Greece by the treaty of March 1864. These were the most important political events that took place between Greece and Britain in those years and greatly influenced the political climate between the two countries.

This change is evident in the next category we will examine, consisting of articles dealing with British matters written mainly by Greek writers. Here the important sub-categories are two: as one might imagine, political articles are in the majority

and literary articles come second. To these we may add a small number of contributions on political economy and on social matters. Political articles can be divided into those that deal with the domestic politics of Britain and those that deal with its foreign policy towards Greece. Among those that deal with internal policy I will mention the political biography of Robert Peel, published in 1850 on the occasion of his death.[57] The text is translated from the French by Paparrigopoulos with a short notice explaining that it is a homage to the greatest politician of the time. The article describes how Peel re-constituted a "Conservative" party out of the wreckage of the "Tory" party destroyed by the Reform Bill; and how he surrendered to O'Connell's Catholic League in 1829 and to the Anti-Corn Law League in 1846, risking being overthrown for what he thought best for his country, and in this way saving Britain from a possible 1848 Revolution. Written in the same spirit is a long essay titled "Political life in England", by Alphonse Esquire, dealing with the way elections are conducted in Britain after the 1832 Reform Bill.[58] The essayist explains the advantages of this Bill as well as its disadvantages praising the English people for their political maturity. The reverse image about elections in Britain is given by a French satirical article written by the French academic De Jouy, who describes the whole enterprise as a parody.[59] An important introductory note written by the translator, who must be Dragoumis himself, explains that the article is published at the time of the 1859 Greek elections to show his readers that bribery and corruption exist even in Britain, the birthplace of democratic institutions. The significance of this article lies in the fact that it was chosen by Dragoumis himself, the greatest admirer of English democracy. The introductory note mostly refers to his personal

---

[57] "Ροβέρτος Πηλ", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 8, pp. 178-84.

[58] "Ο πολιτικός βίος εν Αγγλία", *Πανδώρα* 18 (1867-68) issue 427, pp. 377-81; issue 432, pp. 474-8; *Πανδώρα* 19 (1868-69) issue 438, pp. 110-14; the article remains unfinished, which is untypical of the periodical. The translation is signed by the letter S., which is how Dragoumis's son Stefanos signed many of his contributions.

[59] "Βουλευτικαί εκλογαί", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 228, pp. 284-7; issue 229, pp. 293-5.

disillusionment, a disillusionment that must be closely related to the French-English occupation of Piraeus. Internal British policy is also the subject of an article dealing with the abolition of the advertisement tax imposed on newspapers and periodicals,[60] and of a number of essays on political economy. The three essays on political economy deal with important developments in that field that have affected the life of the lower classes. Two of them are written by Alexandros A. Soutsos, the University professor of this discipline; one is about pauperism and its antidote – what Soutsos calls "the principle of association". In this long essay John Stuart Mill's theories are examined, as well as the establishment and function of friendly and loan societies in Britain and their beneficial effects.[61] The other essay by Soutsos is concerned with the British origin of co-operative societies, and how they have transformed the life of the lower classes.[62] The third essay is a translation from the French dealing with the benefits of free trade if used wisely; Britain serves as the successful example of the measure, in contrast to France, which failed to implement it at the right time.[63] All those articles dealing with matters of internal policy and with the function of the British state look upon Britain with admiration. They promote the idea that in many respects Britain should serve as an example for imitation to developing countries like Greece.

Nevertheless, the next group of political articles we will examine refers to Britain's foreign policy and sends a different message to the reader. A couple of them deal with British politicians' changing attitude towards Greece from philhellenic (mainly in the years of the Revolution) to antihellenic or rather

---

60 "Κατάργησις του επί των αγγελιών φόρου εν Αγγλία", *Πανδώρα* 4 (1853-54) issue 77, pp. 110-11.

61 A.A. Soutzos, "Περί της πτωχείας και της αρχής του συνεταιρισμού", *Πανδώρα* 15 (1864-65) issue 350, p. 348ff.; issue 353, p. 424ff.; issue 355, p. 475ff.

62 A.A. Soutzos, "Εργατικοί συνεταιρισμοί", *Πανδώρα* 17 (1866-67) issue 383, pp. 90-8.

63 "Περί του προστατευτικού συστήματος και της περί την εμπορίαν ελευθερίας", *Πανδώρα* 20 (1869-70) issue 478, pp. 425-8; issue 480, p. 465ff.

pro-Turkish, from the time of Greek independence. For example, Lord Palmerston's philhellenic policy of the years 1827 to 1829 changes to pro-Turkish when he feels that this best serves the interests of Britain.[64] So does that of *The Times*, the most influential newspaper in Britain in the period before the election of a new king for Greece and after the election of King George I; the article written to criticise this attitude expresses the writer's disillusionment and bitterness.[65] The same complaint is expressed about the Duke of Wellington, but also about the foreign policy of Britain towards Greece in general.[66] The last article I will mention, dealing with Britain's antihellenic policy, is a very long and important essay: Paparrigopoulos's answer to the British Ambassador's speech in Constantinople.[67] On the occasion of Queen Victoria's birthday on 24 May 1859, Lord Henry Bulwer gave a speech praising Turkey and reassuring it that Britain would help the preservation of the great Turkish Empire. According to him the Turks are the only ones capable of ruling an empire, in contrast to their neighbours, the Greeks, who are only good at governing small states. Paparrigopoulos's refutation of this absurd claim is a very important historical-political essay referring to the whole history of Greece and ridiculing Bulwer's arbitrary conclusions, which were the result of the British pro-Turkish policy of the time. Before I leave this category I should certainly mention a number of articles paying tribute to the

---

[64] D. V[ikelas], "Επιστόλιον του Γ. Κάννιγκος", *Πανδώρα* 9 (1958-59) issue 196, pp. 82-3; "Ο Παλμερστών περί Ελλάδος προς τον αδελφόν τού W. Temple", *Πανδώρα* 22 (1871-72) issue 527, pp. 538-46.

[65] "Και πάλιν περί *Καιρών (Times)*", *Πανδώρα* 15 (1864-64) issue 338, pp. 45-6.

[66] "Δουξ Ουελλιγκτών", *Πανδώρα* 4 (153-54) issue 94, pp. 593-7. Edgar Quinet, "Διάφορα – Κρίσεις περί Ελλάδος", *Πανδώρα* 13 (1852-53) issue 306, p. 463.

[67] "Λόγος του εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει πρέσβεως της Αγγλίας Σιρ Ερρίκου Βούλουερ, υπό την ιστορικήν έποψιν εξεταζόμενος", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 227, pp. 241-51; issue 228, pp. 265-74. On the importance of this essay see K.Th. Dimaras, *Κ. Παπαρρηγόπουλος* (Athens : M.I.E.T. 1986), pp. 204-5.

British philhellenes, people like Lord Guilford,[68] Hastings[69] and of course Lord Byron.[70] Finally there is a number of articles dealing with current political events, like Prince Alfred's refusal to reign over Greece or the cession of the Ionian Islands[71] and the treaty signed between the United Kingdom and Greece in 1864.[72] In the light of those articles the suspicion that Britain must have played an important role in the political and cultural line of the periodical becomes a certainty. Britain is both admired and despised by the contributors: admired for its development in matters of home policy, technology and culture and despised for its foreign policy towards the young Greek kingdom. The fact that the contributors have the maturity to distinguish between the different faces that this powerful country presents and to comment favourably on some and criticise others is notable.

I will end my examination of this second category with a brief look at texts written by Greeks and dealing with British literary life, which will then lead us to translated short stories, novels and poems from the English. As one might expect, the main articles in this category are biographies and book-reviews. The biographies worth mentioning are those of Macaulay,[73] Milton,[74] William Martin Leake[75] and Dickens.[76] There is also

---

[68] "Σατωβριάνδος και Λόρδος Γυιλφόρδος", *Πανδώρα* 4 (1853-54) issue 83, pp. 279-80. See also "Λόρδος Γυίλφορδ", *Πανδώρα* 6 (1855-56) issue 138, pp. 479-80.

[69] "Ο πλοίαρχος Άστιγξ", *Πανδώρα* 5 (1854-55) issue 101, pp. 104-5.

[70] One could devote a whole unit to Byron's presence in *Pandora*. There are hundreds of references to his name and works; one can find articles dealing with his life, translations of his poetry, anecdotes of his life etc.

[71] "Εφημερίδες 1 Ιανουαρίου 1863", *Πανδώρα* 13 (1862-63) issue 306, pp. 487-8; issue 308 p. 510.

[72] "Εφημερίδες Απριλίου 1, 1864", *Πανδώρα* 15 (1864-65) issue 337, pp. 20-3; "Εφημερίδες Απριλίου 12, 1864", issue 338, pp. 46-7.

[73] Κ.Ρ., "Θωμάς Βαβιγκτών Μακωλαίυς", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 4, pp. 82-3.

[74] "Ολίγα τινά περί Μίλτωνος", *Πανδώρα* 5 (1854-55) issue 119, pp. 552-4.

[75] "Ο συνταγματάρχης Λήκιος", *Πανδώρα* 6 (1860-61) issue 259, pp. 445-7.

[76] "Κάρολος Δίκενς", *Πανδώρα* 5 (1854-55) issue 117, pp. 489-90; D. N. Botasis, *Πανδώρα* 21 (1870-71) issue 489, pp. 203-6.

an article on Sir Walter Scott's meeting with Fenimore Cooper,[77] and a number of book-reviews on recent publications, such as Stefanos Xenos's book about the international exhibition in London, an historical book by William Roscoe, and Byron's tragedy *Sardanapalus* translated by Parmenidis. The number of texts dealing with British literature, in comparison to the other categories we have examined, is rather limited. This impression doesn't change when one examines the third category of material related to Britain: that of translated literary works.

The amount of translated fiction from English in the twenty-two volumes of *Pandora* is considerable, even though most of it is not first-rate. The criterion for a work to be translated is definitely not its high quality, but rather its brevity. The works chosen are intended for pleasant reading; they are not generally extracted from prominent writers, although Dragoumis is well acquainted with the major fiction of the time. Consequently, the majority of English fiction published in *Pandora* does not even mention the name of the writer but simply bears the notice "from the English". Out of 159 translated works of fiction that are included in the volumes of *Pandora* only 34 are translated from the English language; the rest are mostly from the French with a few exceptions: six from the Italian, two from the German, one each from Russian, Spanish and Danish.[78] Most translated fiction is of undisclosed authorship and simply labelled "from the French" or "a Russian story". Among the 34 English works translated, seven are by Charles Dickens and one by Bulwer-Lytton.[79] The Dickens translations are very important: they

---

[77] N.D., "Ο Φ. Κούπερος και ο Ουαλτερσκώτος", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 6, pp. 138-9.

[78] All information is taken from my checklist of translated fiction in *Pandora*, which will be published soon.

[79] The following are taken from Dickens: "Αίγυπτος: Κάιρον" and "Ο οίκος της Βαθενδάλης", *Πανδώρα* 3 (1852-53) issue 62, pp. 327-30; issue 63, pp. 337-45; "Οδοιπόρος", *Πανδώρα* 4 (1853-54) issue 83, pp. 268-70; "Οι Άγγλοι εν Ινδία", *Πανδώρα* 9 (1858-59) issue 199, pp. 167-71; "Δύο αδελφαί", *Πανδώρα* 17 (1866-67) issue 401, pp. 418-24; issue 402, pp. 445-50 "Ωράτιος Σπάρκηνς" and "Μις Χόλιγκφορθ", *Πανδώρα* 20 (1859-60) issue 457, pp. 3-10 and issue 460, pp. 65-71; issue 462, pp. 105-9; issue 464, pp. 152-7; issue 467, pp. 220-4; issue 471, pp. 289-96; issue 476, pp. 385-92; issue 477, pp. 416-22; issue 479, pp. 457-9.

seem to be introducing him to the Greek reading public. The rest of the works are translated without any indication of author probably because the author was unknown even to the translators, who had taken them from foreign literary magazines where they were published anonymously. In addition to those translations, two well known novels were published in the literary supplement of the periodical: Bulwer-Lytton's *Rienzi*, translated by Dragoumis himself in 1850-51, and Sir Walter Scott's *The Bride of Lammermoor*, translated by Dragoumis's young daughter Zoe under the pseudonym "Vion" in 1865-66. British poetry is also present in the periodical, although *Pandora* does not devote so many pages to poetical works. The poets translated are Charles Swain, Oliver Goldsmith, W. L. Bowles and, of course, Lord Byron. The most important contributor of translated British poetry is Christos A. Parmenidis, who lived in Manchester. If one compares the presence of Britain in *Pandora* in the first two categories we have already examined with this third category of literature, it is clear that the emphasis is on the first two. Translated poetry and fiction in the periodical attempt to cover the entertainment part of its double aim of "useful knowledge and entertainment". Consequently, although the editor and the contributors are well acquainted with serious literature of their time they make no particular effort to include it in *Pandora's* pages. Nevertheless, as we have seen, some of the most famous names of British letters are represented.

We will end our examination of the image of Britain as it is mirrored in the pages of *Pandora* with our last category: short stories and travel-writing by Greek writers. The number of short stories with British protagonists dealing with various aspects of British reality in the first four volumes of the periodical is impressive. Out of the twenty-three Greek fictional works published between 1850 and 1854, nine are in some way related to Britain. All nine works were written by two of *Pandora's* founders: five by the father of the Greek short story Rangavis,[80]

---

[80] Their titles are: "Καλμίνα", "Οδοιπορικαί αναμνήσεις", "Η ευδαίμων οικογένεια", "Η Αμαζών" and "Ο καμινάπτης".

and four by Dragoumis.[81] I believe that the choice of British protagonists, which has often been negatively commented on by Greek critics, is no coincidence. On the contrary, their presence is strongly related to the spirit of admiration towards Britain that characterises the periodical, especially in the first years of its publication before the change in attitude towards Britain after the 1854 occupation of Piraeus. Rangavis and Dragoumis shared an admiration for Britain as the most developed country of their time; they both knew English and followed the British press closely; they also visited Britain regularly, especially Rangavis, who was married to a Scotswoman and spent his summers in Scotland. In the first years of *Pandora's* publication it seems that Rangavis and Dragoumis themselves strove to supply the Greek fiction promised to their readers, which they tried to adjust to the aims of the periodical. The prerequisites for this fiction were to combine useful knowledge and entertainment while, at the same time, being embellished by illustrations. How could they achieve such an objective? The procedure was simple: they would either get inspiration from the etchings send to them from abroad and combine this inspiration with a useful peace of information that they had read recently in one of the foreign newspapers, or they would simply describe an impressive event they had come across in their travels. Rangavis writes his short story "Calmina" to describe the explosion of a steamship-engine inspired by an etching of an erupting steamer bearing the name *Elberfeld*, a name that he borrows for his protagonist.[82]

It is interesting to examine the close relationship of those short stories with the press of the time. In every story the writers combine more than one important event from current news, a fact which suggests one reason for the stories' appeal to their readers, an appeal which seems hard to explain by today's standards. In his short story "Travel memoirs"[83] Rangavis explains his goal clearly; he will give his readers a lesson, teaching them about the latest technological developments in

---

[81] They are: "Υπακοή και μεταμέλεια", "Τι έστιν ελευθερία", "Απροσδόκητος λύσις", and "Διάπλους ουραγγουτάγκου από Βορνέου εις Λονδίνον".

[82] A.R. Rangavis, "Καλαμίνα", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 5, pp. 97-106.

[83] "Οδοιπορικαί αναμνήσεις", *Πανδώρα* 1 (1850-51) issue 18, pp. 428-36; issue 19, pp. 446-56.

Britain (such as the railway and the use of the telegraph), and mixing those elements with a love story. All this in a form of a narrative told by a traveller to his female friends who want to know all about his recent trip to Britain. Dragoumis's four short stories that deal with British reality also serve a didactic and, at the same time, entertainment purpose. In one of them Dragoumis describes the British habit of having the eldest son inherit the family land and how that affects high society marriages. In another, a political-philosophical story, he expresses his thoughts about democracy in the civilised world, including Britain. All four express the writer's desire to include Britain in the narrative. Dragoumis openly confesses his respect for Britain in his "Memoirs of a traveller" and especially in a text about his visit to London, Manchester and Liverpool in 1858. He explains that he admires Britain because there is no comparison in the way democratic institutions operate there and in the way they operate in France or Greece. The difference, he concludes, lies in the mentality of the people. In the same text he gives a representative picture of the development of the country describing its industry, factories, printing-houses, docks, as well as the most important sights of London like the British Museum, its parks and squares, the Crystal Palace, the Kensington Museum, the National Gallery and so on. [84] What is made clear here once more is the editors' desire to inform their readers about the latest developments in Britain through entertaining texts, to instruct through pleasure, at the same time sending a political message that Britain should serve as the example for emulation in matters of democracy.

The four categories discussed in this article give only a representative idea of the material referring to Britain contained in the twenty-two volumes of *Pandora*. Nevertheless, the material demostrates the extent to which the periodical had a distinct identity. *Pandora* was very much part of its time and included all sorts of information from a variety of foreign periodicals and books, with hundreds of references to the latest developments in politics, science and literature related to Britain. The texts I have examined, excluding fiction, totalled

---

[84] "Αποδημητού αναμνήσεις", *Πανδώρα* 10 (1859-60) issue 218, pp. 38-43; issue 219, pp. 64-9.

around 2,500 pages; the prevailing ideas were two: on the one hand, Britain deserves the attention of the Greek reading public as the leading nation of the time, the most advanced in the way democracy operates as well as in technological and cultural developments. On the other hand, Britain, in its quest for power and through its promotion of the idea of international stability, may exercise its foreign policy to suppress weaker nations like the Greeks, and do so under various pretexts. These two contradicting tendencies are aptly expressed by Dragoumis himself in the following two extracts, with which I conclude. In a book-review praising the new edition of an English-Greek dictionary Dragoumis explains why it is important for the Greeks to learn English. Among other things he writes: "Britain is the ruler of the sea and the treasury of commerce; it sets the best example for political liberties which Greece is trying hard to follow; it is ahead of the entire human race in every invention and every sort of progress; its literature hides a treasure no smaller than any other literature."[85] In a later book-review, however, he employs an allegory to give the other face of the relationship: "I am not against the combat of uneven forces, but I detest deceitful enemies. I honour the tiger attacking its victim without hiding; I detest the wolf looking for an excuse to devour the lamb."[86]

School of Fine Arts, Athens

[85] "Βιβλιογραφία", *Πανδώρα* 5 (1854-55) issue 115, p. 431.
[86] "Βιβλιογραφία", *Πανδώρα* 12 (1861-62) issue 280, p. 379.

The Australian dimension of the Macedonian Question *

Michael Jeffreys

In the inner-western suburbs of Sydney where I live, there are many pieces of Greek real estate. One large building is occupied by the Greek Orthodox Community of New South Wales, the unsuccessful rival to the Greek Orthodox Archbishopric of Australia in a fifty-year battle for the central position in Sydney Greek life. The Archbishopric itself has four substantial churches in the area. There is an old cinema taken over by the Mytilenians and a sports complex which after dark belongs to the Arcadians. Sydney Olympic Soccer Club is down by

---

* This paper is a personal reaction to the Macedonian problem based on twenty years of teaching Greek in Sydney and some knowledge of the problem's Balkan dimension. Thoughts from a similar starting-point but drawing Australian conclusions for an Australian audience may be found in my article "Macedonia is Australian", *Modern Greek Studies (Australia and New Zealand)* 3 (1995) 83-96. I have found it interesting that many parameters of the issue look different from the Australian and Balkan viewpoints, and that the differences do not seem to be widely appreciated. I have had little need to take sides in the contested aspects of either situation: I have tried to give an uncontroversial narrative (as against the terminology used, which is made explicit since it cannot avoid controversy). Such a piece, in my view, should not be heavily noted. A few references are given to three books dealing with the Macedonian problem in Australia from three different viewpoints, so that those who require more information may find it:
Hill: Peter M. Hill, *The Macedonians in Australia* (Carlisle, Western Australia: Hesperia Press 1989).
Tamis: Anastasios M. Tamis, *The immigration and settlement of Macedonian Greeks in Australia* (Bundoora, Victoria: La Trobe University Press 1994).
Danforth: Loring M. Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic nationalism in a transnational world* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1995).

Cook's River. Close to us is a large hall behind a pub bought by the Pontians to mark unity between their rival clubs, sometimes little used when unity has broken down. The leftward-leaning Cypriots own an impressive building built by the now downgraded Newtown Jets Rugby League Club. The other Cypriot club is down in town, but they cannot develop the building as it has become an icon of the struggle for Aboriginal recognition, because of a meeting held there before any Cypriot connections. In another direction is the Alexander the Great Macedonian club and near the main railway line the Panmacedonian club, a small office building marking the unity of the Sydney Greek-Macedonian clubs and showcasing the Greek side of the Macedonian struggle.

These buildings are only a part of the Greek real estate in Sydney. Together with the rest, they house a more intense public life than that of Australians in general or other minority Australian communities. Putting the churches to one side, the leaders of the clubs spend their time improving and enlarging their premises, providing a pleasant environment for eating and drinking, celebrations of local and national festivals, both Greek (or Cypriot) and Australian, and cultural and charitable events. There are some 60,000 first-generation Greek migrants in Sydney who like to discuss the world with others who share the same local background from Greece. Some Australian-educated professionals of the next generation are taking over club leadership, others are turning their backs on such organisations and joining the wider Australian community.[1]

The clubs are very politicised: they are good at attracting visits from national and local politicians from the general community, for Greek-Australians are supposed to vote more as a block on some issues than other minorities. Many clubs' internal political life too is fiercely competitive, with contested elections and accusations of vote-rigging, all reported in Sydney's three Greek newspapers. However the fiercest

---

[1] The best general book on Australian-Greek society is A. Kapardis and A. Tamis (edd.), *Afstraliotes Hellenes: Greeks in Australia* (Melbourne: River Seine Press 1988). On the clubs, see Gillian Bottomley, *After the Odyssey: A study of Greek Australians* (University of Queensland Press 1979), pp. 52-76.

competition arises between clubs from the same region – resulting from splits, on political, geographical and/or personal grounds. Attempts to heal the splits by overarching federations sometimes simply add one more competing club.

Greek-Australian public life can be a complex minefield for new consular representatives or academic visitors, as the possibilities for giving offence are wide. Only the Greek national issues, the εθνικά θέματα, can unite all the groups. In fact in recent years an impressive degree of Greek unity has developed in Sydney, under the auspices of a body known as the Greek Council, the Ελληνικό Συμβούλιο, run by the leaders of the clubs and brotherhoods under the guidance of a group of second-generation professionals. There are few Turkish migrants in Sydney, and they keep a low political profile. The local opposition targeted by the Greek Council is therefore the so-called Σκοπιανοί. To meet them, we have to go rather further than our previous geographical survey, to the suburb of Rockdale, where they are so numerous that the municipality is officially twinned with Bitola in FYROM. There, one may find other Macedonian organisations with Slavic names. I have never visited them, because at the moment when my professional interest was strongly aroused, around 1990, the philhellenic credentials of all Australian academics were being put on the line by the Greek community, as possibly subversive influences over their children. A visit to a Slav-Macedonian club would have needed explanation and lost me credibility.

Mention of credibility reminds me to make explicit the terminology to be used in this paper. The observant will already have noticed that I call the new, predominantly Slavic state FYROM, and that I use "Macedonian" without qualification for local Greeks, but not for Slavs. On the other hand, I distanced myself with the phrase "so-called" from use of the intransigent word Σκοπιανοί. The language I will use is based on Greek academic discourse, including the term "Slav-Macedonian", which is now the official Australian name for those who identify with FYROM. The language of FYROM I will call the language of FYROM: despite Greek objections, it seems clear that in international academic discourse on languages and dialects, especially in a Slavonic framework, FYROM has a language.

The purpose of this paper is to explain that the Macedonian crisis has taken a different shape, chronologically and socially at least, in Australia from that in the Balkans. Australian experience is likely to be replicated in Canada and parts of the United States, but my knowledge of those cases is at second hand. The Australian form of the crisis may also need different treatment from the Balkan manifestation, and may be harder to solve.

In spite of the number of Slav-Macedonians in Rockdale, the total in Sydney is much smaller than the number of Greeks. In the state of New South Wales, the greatest concentration of Slav-Macedonians is in the steelmaking port of Wollongong, as far south of Sydney as Cambridge is from London. Wollongong is unique in Australia as the only city where there are more Slav-Macedonians than Greeks, reversing the regular balance of numbers in this conflict. Another major city where the two clash is Perth, on the other side of the continent, where the issue began in Australia – at a time when the dynamics were different, as we shall see. But Perth, despite its early beginning, did not have mass settlement from the Balkans in the late fifties and sixties as occurred in the Eastern States, and so the crisis did not develop the same intensity there. The major city of confrontation between the two sides is Melbourne.

Melbourne has the largest Australian concentrations both of Greeks and Slav-Macedonians. With some 180,000 persons of Greek descent in a city of three million, Greek influence is strong and obvious, in several major shopping centres, in professional life, particularly medicine, law and accountancy, in education, the media and soccer. Those of Slav-Macedonian background are far fewer, difficult to estimate but certainly under 40,000.[2] Other Australians know them mainly through soccer. They are geographically divided in Melbourne, reflecting the geographical division of their origins. The first to arrive were those originally from the Greek side of the border, many of whom had been involved with the losing army in the Greek Civil War.

---

[2] These numbers, like all statistics on Australian minorities, should be treated with great caution. They are an individual estimate based on reading much of the literature. On the range of estimates of numbers of Slav-Macedonians in Australia see Danforth, pp. 88-9, 205-7.

Many had lost sympathy with the Greek government, which itself – they claim – was not trying to retain their loyalty but to harass and punish them. This group arrived, often after some time in communist Eastern Europe, early, on average, among post-war Balkan migrants to Australia, usually in the early 1950s. They largely settled in the northern suburbs of Melbourne. Migrants from north of the Greek border, from the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, generally came later, in the late 1960s, and they settled more in Melbourne's western suburbs.[3]

To show the difference between Australian and Balkan dimensions of the problem, I will begin with two eventful days and their reception in different newspapers.[4] The first is 27 November 1988 in Sydney. President Sartzetakis of Greece was invited to a reception by the Premier of New South Wales in a central hotel. I had guests for lunch and went to an evening reception, so I missed the event. Sartzetakis had spent the previous week in Melbourne, where we had seen him on multi-cultural television making passionate declarations, with tears in his eyes, on the Greekness of Macedonia. But in Sydney he was ambushed by Slav-Macedonians. Many of that community in Sydney, reinforced by several busloads from Wollongong and Melbourne, pelted the official party, including the President and the Premier, with fruit and some stones, as they walked the few yards from the kerb into the hotel. One person was hospitalised.

The Greek-Australian press expressed outrage in banner headlines, wondering how such events could happen without strong reaction from official Greece and official Australia. The Australian press was confused, reflecting political and police embarrassment, but also public annoyance that a Balkan quarrel was again flaring up in Australia. It is interesting to note that the English-language newspapers assumed in their readers a little knowledge of the background of the quarrel, referring

---

[3] Hill, pp. 10-34; Tamis, pp. 116-31.

[4] I will not document newspaper reports to the two events in detail. Those interested will find interesting material (in issues up to a week following the dates given) in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Age* (Melbourne) and the *Australian*, and in the Sydney Greek newspapers *Εθνικός Κήρυκας* and *Ο Κόσμος*. Representative Greek reactions may be read in *Αντί* and *Ταχυδρόμος*.

without comment to different claims about Alexander the Great. I have not examined the Athens daily press for that week, but I have read the periodical press. The week saw a great revelation in the Koskotas affair, which dominated the headlines. It is interesting that more column inches are spent on the President's tears in Melbourne, with some sarcasm, than on the fruit thrown in Sydney. There was as late as 1988 in Greece no journalistic discourse of protest against Slav-Macedonian actions into which this event could easily slip.

The second date is better-known, 14 February 1992, the day of the huge demonstration in Thessaloniki which brought home to Greek politicians how far they lagged behind public opinion on Macedonia. All Greek periodicals, especially on the left, express surprise and concern over the strength of feeling shown. At the other end of the world, the reaction of the Sydney Greek press is predictable. At last, it says, the obvious has struck home. Leaders of Greek-Macedonian clubs, who had often asked Athens for help over the crisis, and had received the reply, "What crisis?", felt vindicated by the new turn of events. After allowing the other side to make the running for decades in propaganda over the history and name of Macedonia, the papers continued, the Greek government now had to make up lost time. Even a report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* suggests that Athens had been blind to its own national interest. You will not need to be told that the Macedonian issue has dominated Greek politics for most of the nineties, redefining relations with Europe and causing a serious split in conservative politics.

Press reports on these two days suggest a curious reversal of what one might expect. Greece, a protagonist in a significant international crisis, plainly came to understand its importance only at the beginning of 1992. The Greek press had little idea of its severity at the end of 1988. In that year, however, twelve thousand miles away, several coaches full of Slav-Macedonian Australians were driving the six hundred miles from Melbourne to Sydney to join in a few seconds of confrontation with President Sartzetakis. They and their Greek-Australian targets knew well what struggle was being fought. Even some of the general Australian public were expected by their press to have a reasonable insight into events. How had this passion arisen on the geographical periphery of the problem, while its Balkan

centre remained calm? I have a historical reconstruction to offer on the Australian side of the comparison.

The history of the Macedonian problem in Australia is competently narrated from the Slavic viewpoint in Peter Hill's popularising *The Macedonians in Australia.* Tasos Tamis's *The immigration and settlement of Macedonian Greeks in Australia* has more academic pretensions and is longer, containing much useful material in a somewhat undigested form. In fact the events differ little from the two viewpoints, despite variation in technical terms, motivations and judgements. A final item of bibliography is Loring Danforth's *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic nationalism in a transnational world.* Danforth deals with the international problem from its European end: but for destructive pressures at a personal level he uses two visits he made to Melbourne. Danforth combines careful anthropological theory, much of it illuminating, with unexpectedly partisan writing, showing what can only be described as pro-Slavic prejudice. This leads him, for example, to include emotional detail almost exclusively from the Slavic viewpoint. He is one of several academics I know who support the Slavic side as the underdog, powerless against the might of the Greek propaganda machine. The picture of Greece as a powerful international bully is one I still find it hard to recognise – but in an era of Eastern European poverty, fragmentation and impotence, it is an image that cannot be ignored.

Before the Second World War, most migrants coming to Australia from the Southern Balkans were from islands – more than half from the three small islands of Ithaki, Kythera and Kastellorizo. There were few migrants from Greek Macedonia and the FYROM area. Subsequent research has revealed a few moments of hostility between supporters of Greece and Bulgaria, in terms of the antagonism shown in the first decades of this century. Closer analysis still has found some cases in the thirties of a change in support on the Slavic side, especially in Perth, from Bulgaria to a future independent Macedonia. Changes of names are a useful index of national identification. For example, a person might arrive in Australia with the Greek-imposed name Petropoulos but use the name Petroff (apparently a more

Bulgarian spelling than Petrov), and then change his name officially to the more Slav-Macedonian Petrovski.[5]

But the most significant period of the development of the quarrel was from the mid-forties to the mid-fifties. This was of course the moment at which Tito established the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, turning what was primarily an academic discourse of Macedonian separateness into a broad basis for national identification. I am sure this was the most significant cause of increased polarisation in Australia. But other factors must be borne in mind:

- During the war, Bulgarian troops were the occupying power in much of Northern Greece. Their insensitivity tended to disappoint previous supporters and make them seek another identification.
- Several villages in Greek Macedonia with migrants in Australia were badly treated or even destroyed by one side or another in the Greek Civil War. This terrible news from home had serious effects on loyalties, varying according to circumstances.
- Among the earliest post-war migrants to Australia from the Southern Balkans were many politicised by Civil War experiences. Most had been on the side of the leftists, and the majority of these had the FYROM language as their first. Their stories formed much of the material on the issue put in the public domain on the Slavic side before the explosion of the early nineties. Their biographies vary: some fought from the start for an independent Macedonia, following the then policy of the Greek Communist Party. Others, especially those whose first language was Greek, joined the leftists as the result of their political orientation, with no thought of a change in Greece's borders. Whatever the original motives, supporters of the left-wing struggle from the area of Macedonia – or at least many prominent cases in Australia – ended up with an obsession against the Greek state. They often claim that their attitude results from mistreatment by the Greek army, and tell atrocity stories, which it is not in my power to check. Most of them fled during or after the war across Greece's northern border, and from

[5] Danforth, pp. 160-3.

there (if they had relatives in Australia) applied for migration there in the early fifties.[6]

• There were a few supporters of the Greek government army whose lives in Northern Greece were made uncomfortable by the events of the war, leading to migration to Australia. I have no idea how many: I happen to know two personally. For these, of course, the very idea of an independent Macedonia was a betrayal of what they and the Greek nation had fought for.

When these groups arrived in Australia they joined previous Macedonian clubs, where, as stated before, Greek vs. Bulgarian antagonisms were being replaced by Greek vs. Slav-Macedonian tension. The new arrivals brought these lines of division to the centre of Greek-Australian life. But it would be a mistake to assume that the problem immediately took on the Athens vs. Skopje orientation we might predict from subsequent events. One virtue of Danforth's book is that he analyses the pressures at work now on the sense of identification of Australian migrants from Florina, and comes up with a picture of mind-bending complexity.[7] If one extends the geographical focus beyond Florina and also tries to examine developments of these pressures over time, the complexity increases still further.

Probably the main axes of division were the following:

• Political left and right, the main fault-line of the Greek Civil War.

• The old Greek vs. Bulgarian antagonism and a new Bulgarian vs. Slav-Macedonian split as well as the Greek vs. Slav-Macedonian division which would predominate.

• Greek language versus Slavic language, largely fought out over the language of liturgy in disputed churches and of the minutes of disputed organisations. This division did not mirror Greek vs. Slav-Macedonian conflict over ethnic identification, for many Slavic-speakers identified with Greece and a few Greek-speakers rediscovered an allegiance to a Slavic background.

• Geographical origin: townspeople were more likely to favour Greece, those from mountain villages were more likely to support an independent Macedonian state.

---

[6] Tamis, pp. 177-90.

[7] Danforth, pp. 212-47.

• Original provenance: descendants of earlier inhabitants of the area, even if Greek-speaking, might respond to appeals in the name of Macedonian solidarity. Descendants of "foreigners", Pontian refugees or officials from the south, had no interest in Macedonian identity.

• Religious background: those whose local churches had followed the patriarch of Constantinople were more likely to have Greek sympathies, while a Slavic orientation was often connected with the Exarchate, the independent Bulgarian church founded in 1870.

• Finally one may mention complexities connected with the state of Yugoslavia: some diplomats tried to divert to Belgrade loyalties generated by Skopje, while Stalin's split with Tito in 1948 had caused confusion in many Communist circles.

All these complexities also existed, of course, in the post-war Balkans, but suppressed beneath the conformist pressures of post-Civil War Greece and Communist Yugoslavia. On both sides of the border all the resources of the modern state were being used to create homogenous citizen bodies each with a single language and set of national traditions. Furthermore, the border was a version of the Iron Curtain, which seemed set immovably for ever. The streams of material from Skopje designed to inculcate a Macedonian nationality were a considerable threat to Greece. But in the Cold War period there was a natural tendency to regard them as communist games played beyond the Iron Curtain and therefore not significant. There was some truth in this view: much post-war Yugoslav propaganda was designed to prevent its southern republic from slipping towards Bulgaria. There was not much official contact across the Greek-Yugoslav frontier, and what there was was generally polite, with no real engagement.

In Australia, however, there was no question of a border. The material of Slav-Macedonian nationalism disseminated from Skopje inspired those living in the same streets, often even in the same families as Greek migrants, whom it deeply shocked. The politicised post-war migrants also played a large role both in setting up and in fracturing the structures of Australian-Greek public life, which would later welcome the mass migration of the later fifties and sixties.

What is more, the process of acculturation into an Australian identity did not operate in the same way as in Greece or Yugoslavia. From the beginning the content was entirely dissimilar, with British historical and geographical focuses, and the nationalist pressure less, loosely based as it was on distant British patterns. But as time went on Australia began to undergo a conversion from a British colony with old-fashioned traditions to a multi-ethnic and multicultural society, which was finally proclaimed in the early seventies. Then, if you were not of English descent, it became important to have another, non-Australian homeland and identity. Money became available from Canberra for the cultivation of your other tradition – its language, folklore and whatever else you thought important. Greek-Australians, for example, were encouraged to maintain pride in their Greekness and foster it: the university department where I work has benefited greatly from this policy. But in terms of this paper, multiculturalism increased the pressures on migrants from the Macedonian area. First, it was necessary to enrol oneself under one of several mutually exclusive banners, particularly when invited to multicultural day at the children's school. Second, the banner labelled "Greece" or "Macedonia" was placed in a kind of competition with other banners: "Italy", "China", "Lebanon", "Ireland", and earnest teachers expected a full national tradition. I suspect that many urgent requests for information must have been sent from Melbourne to Skopje for this reason. Danforth wonders at one point why children of migrants from Florina could not simply become Australians: one answer is that non-English Australian migrants increasingly need another nationality to satisfy all the demands of *Australian* society.

I began this paper with a picture of Greek public life in Sydney, concentrating on real estate and inter-club rivalry, particularly when several clubs claim to represent the same part of the Greek world. I invite you to imagine the impact of the Macedonian crisis of the last fifty years on clubs and brotherhoods from Macedonia.[8] At first it was just one more reason for fragmentation, like those which have threatened to

[8] A narrative of the bewildering developments in Macedonian clubs in Melbourne is given by Tamis, pp. 131-72.

divide most local clubs from time to time. Strains appeared within them, they split, attempts were made at recombination and so forth. Gradually, however causes for division connected with the Macedonian issue predominated over all others and became the major structural basis for fragmentation, affecting all Northern Greeks and Pontians too.

Among the results are: violence in churches and on club premises; divisions in families, especially at baptisms, weddings and other rites of passage; disputes over buildings which might lead to lawsuits, sometimes appealed to higher courts, regardless of expense or sense; endless arguments over language (in liturgy or in meetings), identity and the ownership of symbols and tradition, conducted by mutually unintelligible rules. Again, the Athens-Skopje axis was not the only division, for the best known lawsuit was between some Slav-Macedonians originally from Greece and the Bulgarian church, to which they had made over their church building to remove it from Greek control.[9] Other Australians watched these activities in disbelief: but the only high-profile influence outside Greek and Slavic circles was on soccer: for years crowd violence made it hard to hold games in Melbourne between Preston Macedonia (the Slavic team) and Heidelberg Alexander (the Greek Macedonians) or South Melbourne Hellas, the Greek side. Two non-Melbourne Greek teams in the national league also became involved. There was often as much tension and disturbance in these fixtures as in those between local Serbian and Croatian clubs.

In the eighties, there were signs that the conflict was dying down, perhaps out of sheer exhaustion. A few heroic individuals still managed to keep alive village brotherhoods spanning the Greek-Slavic divisions. Generally, however, extremists on both sides kept to their own organisations and rarely met. This relative stability was the status quo when tension rose in Europe in the late eighties and became a full-blown international crisis in the early nineties with the collapse of Yugoslavia. This has turned the wary hostility of the rival clubs into active propaganda crusades on behalf of their respective national causes.

---

[9] Tamis, pp. 276-83.

I hope I have convinced you that the crisis has had a different form in Australia from that on the northern Greek borders. The last thing I wish to discuss is the differences between the two cases with regard to possible solutions. In Europe, I have a sense that common interest and the pressures of neighbours and allies is imposing a general solution at a political level without solving all the questions of detail. A compromise name will be found for FYROM, ever firmer declarations will be made against changing borders, provocative symbols will be outlawed, as has already happened with the old FYROM flag, but there will be left an area of disagreement, mainly historical issues, where the two sides will beg to differ. The peoples of Greece and FYROM will glare at each other a little across the border, while getting on with the business of raising their respective standards of living. If this occurs, will it solve the Macedonian problem in Australia?

I think not. The Australian quarrel is more about identity than political power, and a political compromise will leave the identity issue unresolved. Many Greeks in Australia have been told for fifty years by Slavic neighbours that Alexander the Great was not a Greek but a Macedonian, and have claimed in return with equal force that he was Greek. Others from Greek Macedonia have seen with dismay maps on all sorts of garments and publications from Slavic sources that place their old homes in a Greater Macedonia, not in Greece. Above all, there is the issue of the name: clubs of Macedonians identifying with Greece have been repeatedly told that they have no right to use the name Macedonia without adopting a non-Greek identity. These issues are of an importance which cannot be sidestepped. Each of them is seen in terms permitting only black and white solutions, Greek or Macedonian. Many leaders on both sides, even those with little education, have learned a lot of history, and can argue with subtlety about Macedonia's ancient borders or nineteenth-century demographics. But the questions to be answered are always simple – are they Greeks or Macedonians? Is it possible to be both? Once they have chosen an identity, do they have the right to link it with the ancient Macedonian world-conquerors? Over such issues, the upcoming political compromise will be of little help.

The root of the problem is an important need of the Slav-Macedonians. Those who were equally alienated from Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria had no satisfactory identity. Tito, when he popularised the label "Macedonia", was playing cynical politics, but he was also filling an important vacuum which needed filling, particularly for migrants in this category outside Yugoslavia. In Australia, Tito has been splendidly successful. The Slav-Macedonian identity is one of the best-maintained of all the elements of Australian multiculturalism. As a culture which has had to make its way against constant hostility, it is inextricably linked, in its Australian form at least, with a series of arguments for its own existence. It has been said that to argue a Macedonian issue with a half-educated Slav-Macedonian resembles arguing a religious point with a Jehovah's Witness. It is hard even to exploit what could be a strong argument for Greek-Australians – that their opponents use two different historical scenarios to explain their own existence. A majority would agree with the FYROM President Gligorov, that their identity is Slavic, arriving in the Balkans in the sixth century AD. However there is a minority, vocal at least in Australia, who claim that the population of the area of Macedonia has been stable since antiquity – that it was first partly hellenised by the Greeks, then turned Slavic by the Slavs, subsequently affected by other conquerors and migrants, like the Albanians, and is only now standing up for what it really is – Macedonian. The results of this line of argument are very positive for FYROM: Alexander and FYROM's large Albanian minority are both included in the identity. Yet when the weaknesses in this argument are exposed, some take refuge in the alternative Slavic view, and deny any contradiction. The need for an identity is strong enough to justify in practice an almost explicit arrangement and rearrangement of history.

The Greek Council in Sydney is fighting back by giving its own people similarly detailed arguments on the issue. In the Greek school system of Sydney, classes on Alexander the Great are now primarily designed to demonstrate how Greek he was. I would concentrate, if I were involved, on Alexander's role in spreading mainstream Greek culture around the world, rather than a hypothetically different Macedonian culture, with the result that is hard to use him as an anti-Greek symbol. Instead,

Greek voices seem to be responding directly to Slavic questioning of Alexander's descent and language, accepting their opponents' choice of ideological battleground.

No rules of debate between the two sides have been established to give any chance of progress. The history of the two languages, the key to identification, is so different. A Greek reading a transcription of a Linear B tablet nearly 4,000 years old can say "This is us! These people are Greeks like us!" Critics may be found to ask whether this is a meaningful statement, but there is no-one to claim Linear B for another modern identity. By rules which seem natural to most Greeks (and certainly to me), some modern Greek ethnic identification is possible with these and any subsequent Greek speakers. By contrast, the President of FYROM on a visit to Bulgaria finds it controversial to claim even his own speaking voice for his country's language, against the counter-claim of Bulgarian. This Greek advantage in historical depth is so overwhelming that it is of little use in the propaganda war with FYROM. It drives the argument on to other levels and permits unexpected jumps of logic. The most annoying of these I have met in Australia is the assumption that any doubt cast on the Greek case can be used to validate the Slavic alternative. Somehow, if the Greekness of the northern part of Philip and Alexander's Macedonia can be questioned in the fourth century BC, this establishes a connection between the Macedonian name and Slavic migrants who entered the area a thousand years later.

FYROM is recognised as a sovereign state around the world, and, like all other states, needs a past. It is surely dangerous, as well as unfair, to set the rules of popular ownership of the past in such a way that it can acquire no traditions earlier than the twentieth century. The only long-term solution, in my view, must be a relaxation of the absoluteness of national traditions – the recognition of shades of grey beside the black and white of which I have complained more than once in this paper. I should like to dream of a day when a national museum in Skopje will have an exhibit on the story of the battle of Kossovo, in which FYROM will share as an adjunct to Serbia, and a room devoted to Tsar Samuel, whom they will share as a second to Bulgaria. I am not sure what will be in the Albanian gallery. The next room will contain one or two of the smaller finds from Vergina, with

grateful thanks to the Greek government for their generous loan. This will be in recognition of FYROM's close geographical connection to Ancient Macedonia, which makes her link to Alexander closer than that of any state but Greece. After all, Slavic speech has been heard in the Macedonian area as long as English has been heard in England. The identity of FYROM will be as a predominately Slavic state with special links to neighbouring nations, especially to its south, and a subordinate but significant share in several traditions.

The Macedonian crisis may be dealt with in Europe by a political compromise: but only a real solution to the problem of the FYROM identity will significantly alleviate the crisis in Australia. The use of the past to construct an identity is usually employed for the ends of divisive nationalism: it is time to appropriate it to heal and unite rather than to divide. Unfortunately, I cannot at present write any convincing scenario to lead to this desired end from the present polarised positions.

University of Sydney

Gender, sexuality and narration in Kostas Tachtsis: a reading of *Τα ρέστα*

Christopher Robinson

I have argued elsewhere[1] that both the label "neo-realist" often applied to Tachtsis and the generally accepted view that his sexual orientation does not have a determining effect on the form of his writing encourage an undervaluing of the complexity of his work. There is in fact a close relationship between sexuality and textuality in *Το τρίτο στεφάνι*, such that the realist layer of the novel is matched by, and indeed (particularly as regards deceptively-gendered narrative voices) part of, a more elaborate meta-textual dialogue between writer and reader about the ways in which literature concurrently forms and reflects our view of gender, notably through the "myth of motherhood". Tachtsis thus creates what I have termed a transvestite text, one which dons the mask and costume of a realist narrative to show us that in literature gender roles are not the reflection of what is conventionally considered reality but the product of a discourse. At the same time, in so doing Tachtsis paradoxically shows that it is precisely in that sense that literature *does* reflect reality, since gender roles in society are only constructions to which the literary discourse makes a significant contribution. I would contend that *Τα ρέστα* and *Το φοβερό βήμα* develop from this dialogue, also playing with the relation between sex, gender and writing, to create a critical intertext akin to the sort of *espace autobiographique* posited for Gide by Philippe Lejeune.[2] In this paper I want to look at the contribution of *Τα ρέστα* to this process.

If it can be argued that *Το τρίτο στεφάνι* is a self-conscious text, the same is emphatically true of *Τα ρέστα* (1972).

---

[1] "Social, sexual and textual transgression: Kostas Tahtsis and Michel Tremblay, a comparison", in: D. Tziovas (ed.), *Greek Modernism and Beyond* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield 1997), pp. 205-14.

[2] P. Lejeune, *Le pacte autobiographique* (Paris: Seuil 1975), pp. 165-96.

Mitropoulos, in the preface to *Συγνώμη, εσείς δεν είσθε ο κύριος Ταχτσής;*,[3] has already observed that the motif of the self-conscious text in *Τα ρέστα* makes it a postmodern text:

> *Τα ρέστα*, with their revelation of their own fictionalising texture, the deliberate *gaps* in their creative procedures, and generally their literary self-consciousness, come close to what is usually known, generically, as *metafiction* [...] with their persistent revelation of their fictional – artificial – nature belong to the category of post-modernism.

The question is: in what form are such elements present in the stories, and how do they relate to social and sexual issues?

The fact is that even before embarking on *Τα ρέστα* we have to face a problem of reading which does not apply to the earlier novel. Although about a half of the individual texts which make up the collection were previously published in separate literary periodicals during the '60s and very early '70s, we should be wary about assuming that we can read them in isolation from one another. As Kay Cicellis has observed,[4] the texts construct a "whole", whose structure may be different from that of the conventional novel, but which does constitute, nonetheless, a structure. The point is taken, in fact, from a statement by Tachtsis himself, in the last section of *Το φοβερό βήμα*,[5] where he refers to the desire to write what he calls "ένα μυθιστόρημα-αλυσίδα" – a series of apparently independent texts with himself as the hero, but a self "πίσω από διαφορετικά προσωπεία", stretching from his early childhood to the moment when he "becomes" a writer. Each text is therefore to be seen as both independently valid *and* as constituting a link in the "novel". Mitropoulos accepts the identification of this technique as applying to *Τα ρέστα*, but interpretatively he doesn't do much with it. Indeed, he takes dangerously literally the idea of the "self as hero", claiming (17) that it is the stability of the perspective of a single character, who merely changes in age,

---

[3] D. Mitropoulos, *Συγνώμη, εσείς δεν είσθε ο κύριος Ταχτσής;* (Athens: Patakis 1993), p. 18.

[4] Quoted by D. Mitropoulos, op. cit., p. 17.

[5] K. Tachtsis *Το φοβερό βήμα* (Athens: Exandas 1989), pp. 374-5.

which, over-riding the question of first, second or third person narration, guarantees unity within the "chain-novel" (Tachtsis's term μυθιστόρημα–αλυσίδα). This seems to me to beg the question of what is meant by a single character (Mitropoulos's phrase is "το ίδιο πρόσωπο", the same person). Because, just as the family details shift from story to story, so do significant features such as the central character's sexuality, or his awareness of his sexuality. Tachtsis himself says that the great problem of writing is "moral" (ηθικό)[6] and that techniques simply develop to express the particular nature of the moral/ethical issues which the artist is exploring. If we assume that that moral/ethical dimension cannot be divorced from problems of individual identity, and that individual identity cannot be divorced from issues of gender construction and sexual identity, then there must be a link between these and the techniques of representation used in *Τα ρέστα*. What I want to look at now, therefore, is the relationship between the "masks" represented by the central characters in the individual texts and the shifting forms of narration/generic experimentalism in the work, in terms of both the social construction of gender and sexual identity and the theme of writing itself.

Working on the assumption that we are reading a chain-novel which is in some sense playing with the conventional concept of the *Bildungsroman*, I shall begin by looking at the first and last texts, to see what sort of framework they set. The social construction of gender is introduced in the first text, whose eponymity confirms the importance of its placing at the opening of the work. The mother says to her son:

> Ή θα γίνεις άντρας και θα μάθεις να μην κλαις [...] ή θα σε σκοτώσω από τώρα μια και καλή, να σε κλάψω και να σε ξεχάσω, άναντρους σαν τον προκομμένο τον πατέρα σου δεν χρειάζεται άλλους η κοινωνία.

The text underlines the conflicting signals about gender which Greek society offers: power lies with the mother, a power arbitrarily exercised, since whether the child gets belted or not depends less on what it does than on the mother's mood, which is

---

[6] The word is used in *Το φοβερό βήμα*, p. 374.

itself socially determined (money, male/female relations etc. lie mysteriously behind it). Paradox number one: the mother's mood is thus determined by patriarchal (i.e. male) forces. But (paradox number two) the mother's power is exercised in the construction of a "male" adult, a figure, that is, to whom women will at least nominally be subject. The absent father is consigned to the linguistically paradoxical category of ἀναντρος – a word whose very structure (morphologically asserting what it semantically refuses) emphasises the gap between biological and social genders, creating the concept of the non-masculine biological male. And the whole of this is presented as governed by the needs of society: the boy must avoid falling into a category, the non-masculine biological male, for which, according to the mother, society has no use. This motif of socially-constructed gender is then linked to another motif which will recur in the texts, that of *guilt* – made overt in the boy's cry of "ήμαρτον μανούλα μου [...], ήμαρτον"[7] – and consequent punishment, both in the past (the child's sense of transgression and the mother's infliction of physical retribution) and in the present (the man's feeling of guilt for not having understood the causes of the mother's behaviour, and the punishment of the mother, in the sense that the boy failed to be socially constructed as a man).

If we look at the formal interest of the story, two things stand out: firstly, for the greater part of the text (all the past narrative) the narration addresses the child in the second person singular, i.e. the child is presented as object/other; but, secondly, at the end the narration moves into a present tense and a first-person voice, while identifying the past child with the present speaker. The reader thus experiences both the sense of alienation from an earlier self, and the degree to which this otherness/exteriority of childhood is cancelled out by one particular aspect, the "continuity in failure" between child and adult which the first-person narrator emphasises – a continuity constituted precisely by the "failure to be[come] a man".[8]

---

[7] Note the reference to the language of the Christian religion, the ultimate patriarchal model.

[8] The logical subtext of this is that "man" (in the conventional sense) and author are incompatible categories.

The opening text thus sets up a number of paradoxes about gender and identity, emphasising both the importance of social construction and the co-existence of perceptions of continuity and discontinuity within the adult. The closing text, "Η πρώτη εικόνα", is entirely a reflection on the same gender issues and their broader repercussions, reaching into the area of inter-male sexual attraction and its roots in childhood. (Note in passing that the novel starts with what is left over, τα ρέστα, and finishes at the beginning, with the "first picture" – a contradiction of structural logic which helps to emphasise that the progression of "plot" around which a traditional *Bildungsroman* is built is merely a *convention* embodying a particular concept of cause-and-effect psychological and social determinism.) Couched in the first person, the final text reflects on the paradox of woman-as-power/man-as-victim in a patriarchal society, and it too associates the narrator with a sense of guilt. But whereas the first text exemplifies the issues from a particular case, the last text generalises on every level. This includes imagery, since it links the sexual revolt of the narrator to social non-conformity by expressing it in the image of a personal Οκτωβριανή Επανάσταση and representing the clash of conventional gender characteristics within the narrator as a "Peloponnesian War". In the process of establishing the validity of these generalisations, the narration returns to childhood memory as central illustration, thus returning the book full circle to its beginning, but with the difference that the distancing second person singular of *Τα ρέστα* has been replaced by a first person singular which identifies child with adult. The framework of the book can thus be interpreted as creating the impression of a work whose focus is, or includes, issues of gender, sexuality and identity; the passage from a divided perspective (past narration, second person) – the child-object and the man-subject – to a single perspective (first-person narration from a present perspective) which contains a harmonious "first-person narration of the child" within it – helps to create the sense of a fulfilled perceptual quest, i.e. the attainment of some understanding about sexuality and gender.

So far we have identified the presence of a child-man axis in a form which relates thematically to gender construction. If we look at the story "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια", which

occupies roughly the centre of the cycle of texts (in the 1977 edition there are 84 pages of text before it and 75 after), we find one further essential voice, that of the writing self. In this story, Tachtsis, adopting the persona of the "writing I", deliberately undermines the reader's confidence in the "truth" of the texts which s/he has read so far, challenging the tendency to interpret stories as reproductions of external fact and pointing to discrepancies between a supposed autobiographical reality and the family details given in the preceding text, "Το άλλοθι" – one of the texts whose biographical relevance will be specifically invoked in *Το φοβερό βήμα* (120). However, as Mitropoulos points out, "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια" itself creates a new set of discrepancies when compared with the final text, "Η πρώτη εικόνα". From this Mitropoulos argues that the whole notion of external reality as transferable into fiction is thrown into doubt, and that in addition the reduction of the writer himself to a fictional figure contributes to a Barthesian "death of the author", leaving Tachtsis himself as "unknowable". While sharing Mitropoulos's view of the importance of the intrusion of a Tachtsis-the-writer in the middle of the text-cycle, and of the fact that the voice itself is not allowed simply to become the reality against which the other voices have to be measured, but is instead another *mask*, I want to argue against this idea of "unknowability". I would suggest that what is important is the way in which the reader is prevented from adopting conventional notions of what constitutes knowability. What we have to consider closely is the linking of the theme of writing to the gender/sex/power thematics already identified, and the ways in which the "writer-as-mask" element serves to disturb the reader's assumptions about characterisation and traditional ways of labelling identity. The fact that Tachtsis-the-writer is not a privileged voice (a vehicle for the whole, external truth) does not mean that he is not a partial vehicle for *a* truth – as are all the other masks.

The idea of an intrinsic connection of the gender/sex elements with the theme and practice of writing is articulated by Tachtsis in *Το φοβερό βήμα*, where he makes a claim about that book which could just as easily stand in the text of *Τα ρέστα*:

> It will already have been understood, I hope, that what I have written thus far revolves – for the time being in a necessarily indirect and implicit way – around one axis and has a single aim, the gradual uncovering of the unknown but indivisibly linked secrets of the two authorities which monopolised my interest, devoured most of my time, and set the seal on my life: sex and writing. If I talk about my childhood years and the environment in which I grew up, it is because everything begins from there and not from some freak of nature or some personal peculiarity of mine.[9]

In other words, the narrational complexity of *Τα ρέστα* is necessitated not merely by the fact that the work discusses sex and writing, but that the two elements are interrelated within Tachtsis's personality, i.e. writing is an aspect of his sexual identity and vice versa. For the reader to unravel the "indivisibly linked secrets of the two activities" s/he has to appreciate the ways in which Tachtsis is trying to avoid the pitfalls of conventional gender stereotyping in literature as well as in life, and is obliging the reader to adopt a way of reading which emphasises *self-creation* and downgrades social construction. (The issue becomes more complex still if we add the intertextual readings with *Το τρίτο στεφάνι*, and still more with *Το φοβερό βήμα*, to which Tachtsis eventually invites us.)

*

So far I have tried to identify an overall framework for *Τα ρέστα* which suggests a reading compatible with the issues in which I am interested. At first glance the connections between the other constituent texts are less obvious. If the opening text is clearly about the social construction of gender, the second is certainly less obviously so, although the motif of female power is there (the teacher), as are the motifs of failure (the boy has to resit the end-of-year exam in maths), of guilt (he is the reason that his grandmother cannot go to the seaside for the summer) and of gender difference (his fascination with the unknown interior of the girls' toilets). The most important aspects of the text are,

---

[9] See p. 107: all translations from Tachtsis's works in this paper are my own.

however: (i) the final lines, in which the grandmother decrees that it is inevitable that the boy will be weak at maths because his mother and grandmother are: "είναι [...] ζήτημα ιδιοσυγκρασίας", a judgment which appears to rob him of the right to determine his own identity and which, whilst healthily transgressing the stereotype "boys are good at maths", unhealthily capitulates to binarism (the child is to be read as "really" female); and (ii) the broader question of power, the boy being both the powerless object of other agencies, and the voiceless object (except in dialogue, the narration being omniscient), throughout the story. In fact all the boyhood texts of *Τα ρέστα* revolve around this sense of predetermined values, in both life and literature, to which hero/text conform and from which gradually they will liberate themselves. At the same time the issue of power/the boy as object is also to the fore in these texts. Thus the following one, "Ένα σύγχρονο προϊόν", portrays the complex interplay of power roles between grandmother, uncle Mimis and the boy, with the boy this time making an attempt to assert his right to self-determination. Note that the object of power is itself the question of *appearance*, the boy's right to determine how he wears his own hair. The paradox of the extent and limits of woman's power comes to a head in the final lines, where the grandmother plays the classic card of emotional blackmail: "ό,τι κι αν κάνω, δε μπορώ *ποτέ* να σας ευχαριστήσω" (38).

So far I have had little to say about sexual identity, because the boy-hero is an almost neuter figure at this point in the cycle. However, henceforward the theme of sexuality is gradually introduced, first in "Μια επίσκεψη" as adolescent female sexuality, in a context where the boy-role in the text is purely voyeuristic – he is an excluded observer-figure – then as adolescent male sexuality in the masturbatory rhythm with which the boy rubs the damaged toy boat up and down on the satin divan-cover as he falls asleep at the end of "Ένα πλοίο στη στεριά". So far the texts have largely an air of conforming to the conventions of "tales of childhood": they stage family events, schooldays, children's perceptions of the adult world. But the hints of sexuality in the last-mentioned two texts begin to disrupt these conventions. This disruption comes to a head in "Η μουτζούρα", whose title – the stain – refers ostensibly to the

"smudge" – μου(ν)τζούρα is the Greek word used in the text (67) – glimpsed on the boy in the bath by his grandmother and which turns out to be his first pubic hair. (This already creates an ambiguity, since the choice of the word μουτζούρα associates puberty with disgrace.) However, the title can also potentially refers to the semen which the older boy Ilias splashes on the younger boy's thighs when using him for intercrural sex in the basement of the newspaper office, and equally to the semen which the boy himself is about to spill as he takes his newly-awakened erection in his hand at the end of the story. Accordingly it also refers to the "moral stain" which would conventionally attach to sexual initiation itself and thereby to the motif of guilt – Ilias's insistence that the younger boy must not mention what has passed between them, and the boy's later anxiety to make sure that his putative masturbation will be safe from interruption. But the story itself is a subversion of childhood literary conventions, turning the theme of innocence into the theme of *ignorance* – the ignorance of the child's own physical development/puberty in which his grandmother and uncle leave him. The falsity of the literary conventions of childhood is literally stripped bare in the opening line of the text, in which the boy drops his trousers and sits on the lavatory. The "new masculinity" which emerges at the end of the story – "Ξαφνικά είδε πως το πουλί του είχε μεγαλώσει" – is not the form of growing or "becoming a man" envisaged in the earlier texts, nor is it determined by his mother or grandmother; its presence is hastened by the "antisocial" act of Ilias and its literary representation is characterised by "pornographic" insertion into a story about a pubescent child.

Significantly, the next text, "Το άλλοθι", completes what can be read as a "history" of sexual development. (Note that, in a sense, it doesn't matter whether the boys in these various texts are the same figure, because sexual development and its social context emerges as itself the unfolding "character" around which the narration centres, the boys being merely vehicles for this process.) It is of interest that this text is the first to figure significantly in an outside text (its biographical reference will be invoked in *Το φοβερό βήμα* (120), a passage which confirms the boy's age as thirteen), and will also become the basis for the mise-en-abyme of textual self-reflection in the following text. In

other words, it is the bridge-text between sex and writing. "To άλλοθι" extends sexuality to the process of *mutual* fulfilment: hitherto, sex has been an instinct or a solitary act, or the boy has been used as a sexual object. Again the narrative begins with a "forbidden" sexual act. The 18-year-old Kleitos reads books which he hides in his shirt when he returns to the house; the result is sexual excitement, unbuttoned trousers, and an indirect indication of both masturbation (with the aid of a ripe water-melon) and probably of more intercrural sex, this time incestuous (the boy being Kleitos's cousin). Tachtsis is thus quoting the motifs of adolescent sexuality already established in the cycle, while emphasising concealment, guilt and the boy-as-object. But this is used to preface the boy's attempt to initiate *himself* heterosexually, and the failure of that attempt – a failure underlined by the concurrent failure to cross *class* borderlines as well as gender boundaries (the girl is a tobacco-worker's daughter, the boy's father is a lawyer). Furthermore the failure derives from the hypocritical moral impositions of the adult world. Thus far the text presents otherness in a divided form: conventions overthrown (inter-male sex), conventions sustained (class boundaries).

However, the text does not consist merely of this past narration; it is the first text since the opening story to acknowledge two time levels – past and present experience – and at the same time the first to give any sort of sexual identity to the narrating voice. The closing section of the text is important in this respect. In central Athens the narrator meets the man responsible for his heterosexual fiasco 25 years previously, but the fact that the narrator is accompanied by the stereotype of a classically handsome young man, "έναν απ' τους ελάχιστους αυθεντικούς Ερμήδες που κυκλοφορούν στην αθηναϊκή πιάτσα" (91), doesn't deter his old enemy from identifying him (the narrator) as a womanizer. In other words the narrator is "read" as having a stereotypical sexual identity on the basis of a failed childhood experience. The model for this misreading is in fact present in the title – the alibi – both that behind which the closeted gay male shelters his sexuality in later life and that behind which society shelters from the acknowledgement of the existence of unsanctioned sexualities. This text therefore completes a process by which we are introduced, within a

framework of female power and male guilt, to the idea of a shifting emergent sexuality over which the adolescent needs to take control. The text emphasises the blinkered concepts of socially-constructed sexual behaviour which can impede the boy's transfer from object to subject; it juxtaposes *transgressive male/male* sex with failures to bond with the "other" sexually and socially, and puts all these into the context of the stereotyping which prevents society from correctly "reading" sexuality in non-conformers. Significantly, it is only at this point that we arrive at the introduction of the theme of the writer and the problematic of narrative realism, as embodied in the (physically and metaphorically) central text of the chain, "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια".

The first function of this pivotal text is to *refuse* a conventional biographical identification between writer and written. Personal experience, the writer-narrator insists, is useful only "as kindling": the written text has an autonomous existence. Accordingly he justifies, for example, the prior death of the boy's mother, in "Το άλλοθι", as a means of "sensitising" the hero to the point where the thwarting of the boy's attempt at heterosexual initiation will traumatise him into a later attraction to his own sex. (I shall comment on the function of this argument shortly.) The text of "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια", then, appears to offer a commentary on the previous texts, to give the reader a "genuine" biography of the father, and to guarantee the significance of the father's discovery of the diary in which the writer's relationship with the 27-year-old English soldier Paul is recorded. It appears to be a "documentary" text, and as such out-of-place in a fictional cycle. But even without the discrepancies between the new version of the "facts" and the details given in the final text of the chain ("Η πρώτη εικόνα"), the reader would be unwise to take the text as having a different truth-status from those which precede it, precisely for the reasons articulated in the opening paragraph: "from the moment you begin to write, the written text acquires an autonomous existence, a 'truth' of its own." Furthermore, what if we read the text intertextually against *Το φοβερό βήμα*? In that work the boy's mother is *not* dead, therefore he has not undergone the same "sensitization", but he will also grow up attracted to his own sex (indeed the text indicates that he already is). As an

intertextual reading emphasises, the reader should mistrust not only the "biography of the father" and the explanation of it which "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια" presents as an absolute "truth"; s/he should also mistrust the causal explanation of sexuality which it promotes. We can no more trust the text's claim to explain *why* things happen in terms of external reality than we can assume that it portrays *what* happens in external reality.

So far I have read "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια" negatively, in the sense of reading it as a disruptive text, which deters the reader from falling into certain interpretative traps while luring him/her into other versions of the same traps. Does it also have a positive role to play? Well, yes, because it directs the reader to the issue of the coexistence of mythifying/demystification in Tachtsis's work. In his essay "Τα περισσότερα βιβλία είναι σκουπίδια"[10] he presents himself as a demythologiser – as revealing the αλήτης inside every Hermes (in contrast to the painter Tsarouchis, whom he sees as turning every αλήτης into a Hermes, on the Cavafy pattern); but at the same time Tachtsis stresses the need for myths in the world. What "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια" does is to emphasise the double action of Tachtsis's own texts in this respect. They demystify by breaking down and refusing the myths of gender/sexuality and literary representation to which society adheres, but they attempt to replace these with a different sort of fiction – a fiction which expands perceptions of the truth, instead of imposing "false" images. The author is self-constructing in the text in a way which he sees as true to the self-construction which, because of his sexual orientation, he has undergone in life.[11] So the reader of *Τα ρέστα* should now be alert to the idea

---

[10] K. Tachtsis, *Από την χαμηλή σκοπιά* (Athens: Exandas 1992), pp. 152-3

[11] The importance of breaking down the barriers between reality and fiction is evident in much contemporary gay writing, notably in the use of self-reflexive techniques. Such techniques tend to have different functions in different contexts, but they are always at odds with the fixity of values/perceptions usual in conventional literature. This is compatible with Tachtsis's very Proustian attitude to the idea of the label, e.g. *Τα ρέστα*, pp. 105-6: "He kept saying over and over the thing which I didn't yet know I was, the thing which perhaps I was not *yet*, which, my God, it took

of a text which is "constructing" an author/a set of values or ideas, while *refusing* conventional values and conventional literary methods of constructing/conveying such values.

What then does all this mean for our reading of the second half of the text-cycle/chain-novel? "Το κόκκινο παλτό" at first sight throws out-of-synch the progression of the *Bildungsroman*-like developmental schema, in that it reverts to a boy-hero. In fact this is misleading, as the story depends upon three elements which throw the perspective back onto the adult: an act of retrospective memory, the influence of reading and the function of writing. It concludes: "And what's the point of my sitting here now, twenty-five years later, writing about these things" (123). Characteristically, this does not mark a complete switch to a writer-focus either, since that is ellipsed in the following text, only to recur in the one after – "Τα παπούτσια κι εγώ" – which refers back to "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια". (Indeed, the title of the later text itself needs investigation because it only makes sense as an invitation to read the story intertextually in the light of the earlier text.) These three texts lead to the present-of-writing voice in the final text. At the same time, the question of sexual persona and gender-construction is presented from a number of angles which depend upon the texts with which these writing-conscious texts alternate ("Το κόκκινο παλτό", "Μια διπλωματική ιστορία" and "Λίγες πέννες για το Στρατό Σωτηρίας").

The first of these texts hints that the boy's late return from an afternoon concert is because he has met someone and gone to the Acropolis for a quickie with him (119 and 121); this interpretation, which is obvious to a gay reader in any case, is facilitated for the straight reader by the reference to the Acropolis as a sexual rendez-vous point for Paul and the narrator in the previous story (104). But this sexual emancipation is presented in a context of power-struggles (the attempted social construction of the boy by the women), of *misinterpreted* sexuality (his grandmother suggests that he has been seduced by his female piano teacher) and of guilt (the boy's guilt at the

---

nearly twenty years of angst and self-destruction for me to begin to realise that I am *not*." The father imposes a label which is false because it assumes a binary gender opposition.

effects of his falsehood in suggesting that he had seen his aunt Sophy, who is in mourning, wearing a red coat). This last motif at the same time, by raising the question of *appearance* again (social codes of image) and the issue of socially-constrained falsehood (lying to cover your sexuality), also inserts itself into the debate about the nature and function of fiction.

The same is true, in a more indirect form, of "Λίγες πέννες για το Στρατό Σωτηρίας", which stands apart in the second half of the cycle as a third-person narration. This text picks up and develops the motif of guilt, a guilt whose homosexual nature is hinted at in the reference to a "sinful past" (ενός αμαρτωλού παρελθόντος – 144) and the insistence on the emphatic desire to be a "natural man" (the Greek term used is "φυσιολογικός"), using the reader's instinctive social stereotyping to weight the word αμαρτωλού and to interpret the concept of naturalness in the context of such surrounding vocabulary as αθώοι, αμαρτίες, ένοχος and μολύνει. The text also repeats the motifs of otherness – "Τα παπούτσια κι εγώ" is set in London, "Λίγες πέννες για το Στρατό Σωτηρίας" in Australia – and of appearance – the boy who is anonymously offering his erection for oral sex through a glory hole in the wall of the station toilet wears a "respectable" image outside this, i.e. that of a member of the Salvation Army. The story thus focuses on significant motifs from this section of the chain, including the motif of appearance which is part of the truth/fiction theme, but there is no specific reference to the writing context.

It is the question of appearance, of social codes of image and socially-constrained falsehood, which forms the bridge between both the preceding and subsequent texts and "Μια διπλωματική ιστορία". This is the only text in which the young man at the centre of the narration is ostensibly straight (133), or certainly sees himself as such. Fiction plays various roles in this text: the narrator escapes the attentions of the professor by pretending to have a homosexual relationship with another student, while the professor's reputation both during and after his life is determined by the social fiction that he is a womaniser. With the fiction motif we can link the more general theme of appearance, either in straightforward physical terms such as the students' plot to send up the professor by all appearing in bow-ties like his, and the subversion of the plot by the

professor's appearing in an ordinary tie, or in terms of social appearances – the narrator is ashamed of the professor's provinciality when in the company of a distinguished French writer, he is then ashamed/embarrassed by the way in which the professor is publicly insulted by a couple of young sailors. In all these cases the social value given to externals is at odds with the "truth" of the person concerned, but in the first example the mask is voluntary, whereas in the latter two it is a question of the social reading of appearance which is at issue. Fiction thus becomes negative or positive depending on whether we are dealing with choosing a mask (remaining subject) or having one imposed (being reduced to object). Fiction in the form of reference to books/reading, raised en passant in "Το κόκκινο παλτό", takes on a greater significance in "Μια διπλωματική ιστορία", with the reference to the narrator's reading of Proust's *La Prisonnière* and the professor's simplistic interpretation of its "literary transvestism"(136).[12] This inevitably ties reading – and hence writing – back to motifs of sexuality. The professor's rigid interpretation of Proust as gender transference and his assumption of completely discrete categories of gender behaviour (a girl could not be interested in football) merely mirrors the arbitrary classification procedures of straight society. The reader is thereby reminded that gender *is* a problematic category and that assumptions about sexual identity can distort our perceptions of any text, including the one we are currently reading.

This leaves us with the final text, "Η πρώτη εικόνα". With its opening statement about the power of women over the first-person narrator in his childhood and its closing anecdote about female prevention of his physical bonding with his father and its psychological influence in his later life, the text seems to place itself firmly in the genre of the essay, an essay whose dual function is to analyse gender roles within Greek society generally, and his own experience of it in particular, and to use that analysis to "explain" his own experience of gender and sexuality. But, as already stated, the family details of the text

---

[12] I have been unable to trace the story about the milkman's daughter and the football match (136-7) in Proust. Tachtsis is surely making fun of the literalism of the sort of literary scholarship which adopts exactly this sort of attitude to gender issues in *A la recherche*.

are not identical with those offered by "Ο πατέρας μου και τα παπούτσια", a fact which should alert the reader to remember that s/he has no reason to treat *any* of the text-chain as authoritative in the sense of laying claim to a mirror-relation to external fact. "Η πρώτη εικόνα" can only be read as *a* commentary on the system of gender, power and stereotyped identity around and against which the preceding texts have been structured. Read in this way what it does is to provide a counter-model for interpreting Greek society, based on a simple inversion of values, a model which is carefully linked to a counter-mythology: the patriarchal myths of the Bible and Classical Olympian theology are rejected for the kind of magical mysticism of primeval matriarchal religion which features in the work of Margarita Lymberaki (e.g. in *Σπαραγμός*).[13] Ostensibly these counter-myths legitimise the final text's picture of a boy whose sense of gender has been disorientated by his overwhelming exposure to female values, causing him to identify at certain levels with women while at others feeling a deep guilt for rejecting them, and whose separation from natural inter-male physicality has left him with a need for men which becomes a determinant in his sexual direction. But the cautious reader has by now learnt not to find any single "explanation" for the shifting patterns of gender and sexuality which the novel-chain has set up. The writer as structured by the text is his present *and* his past; he has found a value for the concept of άντρας which defies the social construction of both gender and sexuality precisely because he *is* a writer, who can be both subject *and* object of the text.

I earlier quoted Tachtsis as saying, in *Το φοβερό βήμα*, that the function of the autobiographical act was to trace the links between sex and writing within his childhood context (107). "Becoming a man" – the motif introduced in the opening text of the chain under the aspect of social construction, conforming to a pattern of what society, in the person of the grandmother, says a man should be – is *four* things in *Τα ρέστα*, all of them essential to such an autobiographical process. First, it is a physical process: the acquisition of the external trappings and the

[13] It is interesting in this context to remember that "Η μουτζούρα" is possibly dedicated to Lymberaki.

physical capacities of puberty which open up the world of sexuality – this gives a man the technical power of sexual creation/recreation; second, it is the acquisition of the ability to create metaphorically, i.e. to write, which is closely tied to the experience of reading and to awareness of the representation of sex and gender in the existing literary tradition; third, it is the acquisition of the power of self-determination, the freeing of the self from taboos and external pressures which he attaches to his personal definition of the word άντρας in "Δεν θεωρώ τον εαυτό μου ερωτικό συγγραφέα",[14] a liberation which will turn him from object to subject in a social context; and, consequently, fourth, it is the freeing of the self from the social constraints embedded in literary representation – including, for example, those of generic expectation to which his "novel" declines to conform. The boy-figures chart the emergence of these anti-social powers – justifying the reference in "Τα περισσότερα βιβλία είναι σκουπίδια" to the "antisocial presence of the writer behind every hero".[15] Thus, by the end of "Το άλλοθι" the text-chain has confirmed the multiple-hero's determination to acquire the freedom to do what he likes with his penis, and the texts themselves, in their departure from the conventions of "literature of childhood" have demonstrated his freedom to do what he likes with his pen. The second part of the chain problematises the experience of this freedom for both the adult and the writer. What this method of literary composition does is to prevent the reader from reading in a conventional way on a number of essential issues. Notably, (i) the book *constructs* identity (or at least "identity as multiplicity"), it does not record it: there is no sense of stable sexual identity, a fact underlined by the failure of society's attempts to fix such identity, which are represented both thematically and in the "psychological explanations" which the text (particularly when read intertextually with *Το φοβερό βήμα*) parodies by showing their arbitrariness; (ii) the book *refuses* a conventional generic identity, not only in using a text-chain to mimic the development of a *Bildungsroman* without accepting the positivist determinism of such a narrative, but also by subverting

[14] K. Tachtsis, *Από την χαμηλή σκοπιά*, p. 163.
[15] *Από την χαμηλή σκοπιά*, p. 151.

the boundaries between fiction and documentary. What it establishes is the psychological biography of non-conformity, but in such a way as to keep it grounded in a particular Greek social reality. While *Το τρίτο στεφάνι* reminds its reader of the pitfalls of the "discourse of gender", *Τα ρέστα* (while acknowledging the same pitfalls) does the same for the "discourse of identity".

Christ Church, Oxford

The Ionian University of Smyrna, 1919-1922: "Light from the East"

Victoria Solomonidis

To those unfamiliar with the period of Greek history from 1919 to 1922, the title of this paper may give the impression that the Ionian University existed and demonstrated the practical application of peaceful coexistence in the field of higher education, as indeed it was intended to do. On the contrary, the story is not of a fine project brought to fruition, but of a great idea brought to heroic failure by the forces of *realpolitik*.

Indeed, the fate of the proposed Ionian University was bound up with the fate of the Greek venture in Asia Minor which, in turn, was inextricably bound to developments in the international post-First World War scene. In retrospect, given the circumstances and conditions which shaped Greece's role at that stage, it is evident that this venture was doomed to be short-lived. Of the episode Churchill wrote:

> The story carries us back to classic times. It is a true Greek tragedy, with Chance as the ever ready hand-maid of Fate. The interplay between the Greek love of party politics and the influence exercised over them by Venizelos, constitute the action of the piece. The scene and the lighting are the Great War and the theme "How Greece gained the Empire of her dreams in spite of herself and threw it away when she awoke".[1]

In October 1918, with the collapse of the Central Powers imminent, Turkey hastened to sign an armistice with the Allies. As soon as the lenient terms of this armistice became known, persecution of the Christians in Asia Minor intensified and law and order was on the verge of collapse. The Ottoman Greeks retaliated, demanding the restitution of property confiscated

---

[1] W. Churchill, *The World in Crisis: The Aftermath* (London 1929), p. 309.

during the Great War and the return of those exiled, deported or recruited to the labour battalions. The presence of Allied warships in Constantinople and Smyrna emboldened them and encouraged them to believe that their moment of redemption was at hand. As this perception of the situation was far from the truth, Eleftherios Venizelos advised the Greek primates to restrain their communities from any undue nationalist manifestations, fearing that any such activities could impede his negotiating efforts at the Paris Peace Conference.[2] However, the local Greeks, embittered by endless years of persecution, could not understand the reasoning behind the Venizelist policy of appeasement and leniency towards the Turks, a policy essentially dictated by the need to convince the Allies that Greece was capable of ruling over ex-enemies, forgiving and forgetting.

Meanwhile, a number of factors militated against Asia Minor ever becoming part of Greece. For one thing, the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Great War, in conjunction with the Turcification policy pursued by the Young Turks, had stirred a rise in Turkish nationalism, with ample prompting from those Allied circles which opposed Greek expansion in Asia Minor. By the end of March 1919, the hostile attitude of the Allied representatives in Smyrna towards Greek aspirations emboldened the Turks to set up committees for the defence of Turkish rights. The Muslim population was armed and, in the words of a Greek representative, "what remains of Hellenism in Asia Minor is today sitting on an active volcano, largely due to the attitude displayed by our Allies, and especially Italy".[3] It was against this background of violence prevailing in Anatolia that the

---

[2] Αρχείο Ε. Βενιζέλου, Benaki Museum, Athens [VA]. File 314, Report no. 637/18.1.19, Politis to Diomidis.

[3] Ιστορικό Αρχείο Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών, Athens [MOFA], Υπάτη Αρμοστεία Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, [CHC], Ειδικός Φάκελος Β/1/1919, Report no. 494/11.3.19. Captain Mavroudis to MOFA. On Turkish evidence of Italian co-operation, see i.a. Nail Moralı, *Mütarkede Izmir Olayları* [The events of Smyrna during the Armistice Period] (Ankara 1973), pp. 51-2. Count Sforza, Italian High Commissioner to Constantinople at the time, refers to these events extensively in his book *Costruttori e Distruttori* (Rome 1945).

landing of Greek troops at Smyrna was decided by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference which, in the meantime, had started its deliberations in Paris.

This is not the place to recount the manoeuvrings of the Paris Peace Conference and, more particularly, those of the Supreme Council, about which an ample bibliography exists.[4] Sufficient to note that in May 1919, Lloyd George advised the Supreme Council that, if the Allied mandates over Turkey were not rapidly regulated, half of Asia Minor would finish up occupied by Italy, which, having withdrawn from the Supreme Council over a row with President Wilson, was landing troops in several locations along the Asia Minor coast. Lloyd George concluded: "We must let the Greeks occupy Smyrna. A massacre is taking place over there and there is nobody to protect the Greek population."[5] At that point, a somewhat vague Greek mandate over an undefined portion of Western Asia Minor received the unanimous sanction of the Supreme Council, composed of the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of Britain, France and Italy.

Far from representing any indication of Allied support for Greek irredentist aspirations, and in order to clarify any misunderstandings in that direction, this unanimous decision was soon followed by Supreme Council declarations to the effect that the Greek occupation was temporary and would not determine the final settlement of the issue. Clearly, by deciding the Greek landing in Smyrna, the Allies had found a convenient though temporary solution to the question of the mandates over Asia Minor, since, in the words of the American Consul General to Smyrna, "there was such strong jealousy among them that they could not go ashore either together or separately".[6] For Greece, on the other hand, the Allied decision represented the starting

---

[4] For a comprehensive treatment of the Greek presence at the Paris Peace Conference see N. Petsalis Diomidis, *Greece at the Paris Peace Conference* (Thessaloniki 1978).

[5] P. Mantoux, *Les Délibérations du Conseil des Quatre* (Paris 1955), I, LXII, pp. 485-6.

[6] G. Horton, *The Blight of Asia* (Indianapolis 1926), p. 23.

point for the realization of the Μεγάλη Ιδέα.[7] However, the temporary and vague nature of the Greek mandate, together with Italian hostility towards Greek expansion and the long standing differences between Greeks and Turks were bound to lead to events that would seriously question the Greek government's wisdom in accepting the Allied offer.

The Greek contingent landed in Smyrna on 15 May 1919. The Greek High Commissioner Aristidis Stergiadis followed a week later, accompanied by a team of high-ranking members of the Greek civil service who had worked under him during his term as Governor General of Epirus. Their task was threefold: to exercise discreet control over the Turkish authorities until Greece assumed the administration of the area after the conclusion of the Peace Treaty; to represent Greek interests and liaise with the representatives of the Great Powers in Smyrna, as well as with the Allied High Commissioners in Constantinople; and to lay the foundations for the establishment of an effective state machinery in Asia Minor.

Although Stergiadis assumed the post of High Commissioner reluctantly, he was to follow Venizelos's directives with enthusiasm. With Asia Minor under martial law throughout the period of Greek administration, his strict and uncompromising character, together with his past performance as Governor General of Epirus, guaranteed that he would live up to the Greek Prime Minister's expectations for an impartial rule over a society of so many inherent contradictions.[8]

---

[7] A substantial bibliography exists on the subject of the development of the Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Most of the relevant works are listed in D. Zakythinos, "Η ιδεολογία του Μεγαλοϊδεατισμού", *Πολιτική Ιστορία της Νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, (Athens 1965), pp. 47-65. See also K.N. Vavouskos, *Η Μεγάλη Ιδέα ως ιδέα και πραγματικότης* (Thessaloniki 1970) and S.G. Xydis, "Modern Greek Nationalism", in: *Nationalism in Eastern Europe* (Washington 1974), pp. 207-58.

[8] Venizelos himself rarely missed an opportunity to express his confidence in the High Commissioner: "The situation prevailing in Asia Minor is extremely serious and, if I still hope to overcome the dangers, I rely mainly in your presence there as it assures me that everything humanly possible is being done." MOFA, Φάκελος ΑΑΚ 1919-1920, telegram no. 6627/5.7.19, Venizelos to Stergiadis.

As things turned out, the Greek Administration of Smyrna survived, to be precise, three years, three months, three weeks and three days. Certainly, it did not last long enough to see the establishment of an administration which, as Venizelos planned, could change the face of Asia Minor and bring the public and financial activity of the area into the twentieth century. Nonetheless, the Greek government's adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence among the peoples of Asia Minor favoured the assumption of measures which, even in that short time, showed how successful they would have proved, had the international situation allowed them to flourish.

For despite the horrific destructive culmination of 1922, the Smyrna High Commission administration was notably positive and constructive. Its programmes were wide ranging, starting with the repatriation and rehabilitation of some 250,000 refugees who had been obliged to flee Asia Minor during the First World War, the organization of a health service free to all peoples in the zone, the planning and implementation of important public works, the supervision of the Muslim institutions which permitted their proceeds to double within three years, and the establishment of the most progressive University in the Balkans.[9]

The most important feature of these programmes was the objective of minimising friction between the different nationalities who were obliged to coexist. The liberal Greek regime set out deliberately to avoid partiality towards the local Greeks. An early expression of this policy came in Prime Minister Venizelos's message to the Hellenes of Asia Minor on the occasion of the landing of the Greek troops in May 1919:

> Let the expression of joy filling your hearts be accompanied by an expression of brotherly feelings towards the cohabiting populations. Let them realize that we are not celebrating the casting-off of a yoke in order to replace it with our own so that we can hurt others, but that the Hellenic freedom brings liberty, equality and justice to everyone irrespective of race and creed.

---

[9] The work of the Smyrna High Commission in these fields is examined in V. Solomonidis, *The Greek Administration of the Vilayet of Aidin, 1919-1922* (PhD thesis, University of London, 1985).

> Winning the trust of the other populations in the area, not only do we remain true to our national traits but we also serve our ultimate national interests.[10]

The first practical demonstration of this policy had come with the selection of Aristidis Stergiadis as High Commissioner by Venizelos himself, despite the displeasure this choice incurred among Liberal party members who had hoped to secure this major post. Stergiadis, who had participated in the Cretan liberation movement, and had lost two brothers in that struggle, was a fervent supporter of the views held by Dragoumis and Souliotis Nicolaidis on peaceful coexistence between Greeks and Turks. Equally, he was a firm supporter of the move to create a new eastern civilisation in response to the efforts of the West to penetrate the Near East.[11] As he often declared, the only reason for his agreeing to take up the post was his wish to participate in the creation of such a civilisation, whose advent would constitute the ultimate justification for Greek expansion in Asia Minor.[12]

At the same time, the Greek political leadership under Venizelos was adamant that the contradictions inherent in the Asia Minor campaign demanded the pursuit of peaceful coexistence as the only realistic means of safeguarding the Greek presence in the area. The Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexandros Diomidis wrote to the Greek Commander in Chief Leonidas Paraskevopoulos:

> Greece is going to be under continuous scrutiny and the size of the role awarded to her by the Allies in Asia Minor is going to be decided by the impartiality of the Greek administration and its active protection of the rights of the minorities. If Greece behaves towards the minorities as a representative of a superior

---

[10] MOFA, A 5/VI, 1919, Φάκελος Σμύρνης 4000 - 6000, telegram no. 4443/13.5.19, Venizelos to Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

[11] These principles were expressed by Stergiadis in one of his rare interviews, published by Costas Ouranis in the Athenian newspaper *Ελεύθερος Τύπος* (7 April 1929).

[12] V. Solomonidis, "Βενιζέλος – Στεργιάδης: Μύθος και πραγματικότητα", in: Th. Veremis (ed.), *Μελετήματα γύρω από τον Βενιζέλο και την εποχή του*, Vol. 2 (Athens 1986).

> civilisation, only then can she hope for a positive reaction from the Allies towards her territorial claims.[13]

Despite the strong reservations of those who were sceptical as to the feasibility of this policy against a background of continuous warfare, specific measures taken from the first days of the Greek occupation – such as the institution of Turkish as an official language of administration equal to, and in parallel with Greek – underlined the determination of Athens to implement policies conducive to the desired peaceful coexistence among the peoples of the area.[14] At the same time, the preservation of the existing Turkish administrative machinery which would operate in conjunction with the Greek authorities, was considered by Venizelos as the first step towards the creation of an international administration which would reflect the population mix in the zone under Greek rule. From the first days of the official Greek presence in Smyrna, it was underlined that the youth of Asia Minor, Greek, Turkish, Jewish and Armenian, would be called upon to assume an important role in the administrative machinery of the new regime. At Stergiadis's invitation, the primates of the Jewish and Armenian communities were informed of his intention to employ qualified Jews and Armenians, who, in conjunction with the Turkish civil servants already serving, would form the new Asia Minor administration.[15]

This inclination of the Greek leadership was soon to be applied to educational matters with the aim of cultivating and educating the inhabitants of the new lands and, thereby, preparing the next generation of senior administrative and state officials. It was also hoped to counter the hellenocentric nature of Greek higher education, which largely ignored the eastern

---

[13] N. Petsalis Diomidis, op. cit., p. 210.

[14] MOFA, A 5/VI I, 1919, Φάκελος Σμύρνης 4000 - 6000, telegram no. 48881/22.5.19, Venizelos to Stergiadis. According to instructions contained in this telegram, all the announcements of the civil and military authorities would be issued in Greek and Turkish and a special department of the High Commission would undertake the required translations.

[15] MOFA, Φάκελος Έντυπα 1919-1920, telegram no. 2884/17.6.19, Stergiadis to Venizelos.

world now living within the borders of the Greek kingdom and which should participate on an equal basis in public life and the general development of the country. Furthermore, it was obviously vital to ensure the education of a large number of people who would thus obtain detailed knowledge of the whole spectrum of issues specific to the new domains. The foreign minorities had to be given the opportunity to embrace the spirit of Greek civilisation which would in turn contribute greatly to the improvement of mutual understanding. This effort to promote mutual understanding was not planned as a vague utopian exercise but as a substantial and necessary prerequisite for the pacification of Anatolia.

One of the means central to the realization of these goals was the establishment of a new university. In the aftermath of the victorious Balkan wars, the establishment of a second Greek university to meet the needs created by the addition of new lands to the Hellenic Kingdom was already being planned before the Greek landing at Smyrna. Now, however, with the impending extension of Greek territory to the other side of the Aegean, the immediate implementation of the plan became a pressing necessity. The importance which Venizelos attached to this project became evident in September 1919 when, despite his work load during the Paris Peace Conference, he called Professor Constantine Karatheodoris to Paris to consult him on the matter.[16] A Professor of Mathematics and a member of the Prussian Science Academy and the Vatican Academy, Karatheodoris was probably the most appropriate person to brief and advise the Prime Minister because he had for many years been an advocate of the creation of a second university in Greece. As Toynbee wrote:

> He was interested in everything – archaeology, hygiene, economics, languages – and constantly reminded me of what I had

---

[16] On the personality and the work of Constantine S. Karatheodoris, see the entry in S. Vovolinis, *Μέγα Ελληνικόν Βιογραφικόν Λεξικόν*, Τόμ. Ε΄ (Athens 1962). See also an article by his assistant in Smyrna Professor N. Kritikos, in the periodical *Παιδεία και Ζωή* (1950). For his contribution to the establishment of the Ionian University, see Ch. Solomonidis, *Η Παιδεία στη Σμύρνη* (Athens 1961).

> read about Ludwig Ross and the other German savants who came out to Greece in the thirties of [the] last century in the train of King Otto. In fact, Professor Karatheodhorís was a Westerner abroad – constructive, broad-minded, humane, and out of water.[17]

As a result of Venizelos's discussions with Karatheodoris, a detailed feasibility study was compiled and submitted to the Greek Prime Minister. The study covered all possible aspects and was based on the maxim that "the Greek state should re-examine the very basis of the education of its children".[18] As immediate goals, the study suggested "the spiritual preparation of those young people who will be called upon to co-operate in the economic development of the country, such as farmers, engineers and traders", as well as the propagation "among the Greeks of the scientific knowledge of Slavonic and Eastern European languages... [as well as] the history, customs, religion and legal system of these peoples". In addition, the foreign minorities living within the Greek borders would be provided with the opportunity to study Greek language, history and culture. According to the feasibility study, the university departments to be established immediately were those of engineering, agriculture, commercial studies and oriental ethnology, the latter incorporating a section of eastern languages open to the students of all other departments. The long-term goal of this initiative was the creation of a major centre of scholarship which would serve as the core of a broad spectrum of scientific study and research. To these initial departments,

---

[17] A. Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey* (London 1922), p. 166. Professor D. Chondros also notes: "It was an honour for us to have him as a colleague... Karatheodoris was the exact opposite of the pure mathematician. He was human and nothing human was foreign to him. Few men had his understanding of the arts. He knew Greek, modern and classical, as well as Latin, French, German and English. His knowledge of the bibliography was unequalled". See D. Chondros "Από τη ζωή του Καραθεοδωρή", *Αιών του Ατόμου* (Feb.-March 1950).

[18] MOFA, Φάκελος Α: Πολιτικά Σχέδια περί Διοικητικής Οργανώσεως Μικράς Ασίας, 1921, Report: "Projet d'une nouvelle Université en Grèce presenté au Gouvernement Hellénique par C. Karatheodori", Paris 20.10.19.

others would be added in order to meet future needs of the state, with the institution, for example, of a medical school or a school of Islamic Law.

Karatheodoris's project visualised a completely new kind of university which would not imitate either the German or the British institutions of higher education, but would express and serve local needs and would constitute the antipode of the National Capodistrian University of Athens, which, by its nature, was geared towards classical antiquity. "The syllabus of each course," the feasibility study underlined, "should not be compiled as a replica of the one applied by this or that foreign university but should take into account the particular goals of each department." Theoretical knowledge would be transmitted to all students, to be followed by specialised practical courses according to each student's inclinations rather than "a little of everything to all and sundry", Karatheodoris concluded.

The years of study for every course would vary according to the qualification sought, while short vocational courses spanning a few weeks were also envisaged to cover practical aspects of engineering and farming. Specific entrance examinations for each course would guarantee the level of the students. For checking progress during the course the system proposed a combination of the British model with a large number of examinations with that of German universities, which featured very few, if any. The syllabus would provide compulsory subjects for each course with the possibility to choose one or two electives. The feasibility study also advocated that the new university should on no account duplicate courses taught in Athens, but, on the contrary, complement them with new ones.

A detailed list of subjects for each course was incorporated in Karatheodoris's study. Provisions made for the Department of Oriental Ethnology included the teaching of Turkish, Farsi, Arabic, Jewish and Aramaic languages, history, history of art and archaeology, as well as comparative linguistics and Islamic Law. The aim of the Department was to provide the student with a real understanding of the Middle and Near East, not only from the historical but also from the contemporary perspective. To quote from the feasibility study: "In addition to his university duties and as a real master of his subject, the holder of this chair should be in a position to exercise positive influence

over a wide audience, and over the foreign minorities in particular, through tutorials and public lectures."

As a plan of action, Karatheodoris proposed the implementation of the scheme in stages so that the organizers would have ample time to identify high-calibre teaching staff . Thus, during the first year of its operation, the University would offer only core subjects with laboratories for physics, chemistry, engineering, electrical engineering and agriculture, together with model farms and nurseries. Among the high-priority tasks of the organizers would be the creation of a large library.

The seat of the proposed university was not specified in Karatheodoris's report but Smyrna, Thessaloniki or Chios were suggested as the most appropriate host cities. When, however, the feasibility study had been approved by Venizelos and Athens had given the go-ahead for the implementation of the proposal, the idea for the institution of a real *universitas litterarum* in Smyrna was adopted without further discussion.

In July 1920, a Royal Decree on the Establishment of the Smyrna University was published in the Government Gazette.[19] The decree was based on Karatheodoris's report and provided for the institution of four Departments: Physical and Technical Sciences, Agriculture, Eastern Languages and Ethnology, and Public Administration. At the end of the academic year 1919-1920 Karatheodoris left Berlin to work exclusively on the organization of the new University. In August 1920, he escorted Venizelos on his only visit to the port of Smyrna, where the Professor met Stergiadis for the first time. The High Commissioner was to become his most ardent supporter as well as an eager sponsor for the finances required.[20] Two months later, Karatheodoris and his team had taken up residence in Smyrna. In a letter to his friend Professor Vouyioukas in Austria, Karatheodoris wrote:

> At last I see realized the plan I conceived before the war for the establishment of a second university in Greece. It is to be based in Smyrna. It would be of great help if you could come and offer your expertise in this task, whose aim is to shine the light of

---

[19] *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως*, Series A, ii, Law 2251/14.7.20.
[20] S. Vovolinis, op. cit., p. 492.

> civilisation in Asiatic Greece, as well as in Thrace and Macedonia. I do not know if you are aware that Smyrna and its hinterland constitute today and for the next five years a separate state which, for the time being, is ruled almost dictatorially by the High Commissioner Aristidis Stergiadis, who shows great eagerness to assist our plans with all his power. So, if you decide to come, you will be in a position to realize in a short space of time an organization that would take many years to achieve in Greece.[21]

On 28 October 1920, High Commissioner Stergiadis officially appointed Karatheodoris to the positions of organizer of the Ionian University of Smyrna and Professor of Mathematics, with a view to his assuming the rectorship of the University when circumstances permitted.[22] An Office for the Organisation of Smyrna University was established as part of the Directorate of Education in the High Commission. The post of the secretary was entrusted to Karatheodoris's student and future professor at the National Technical University of Athens N. Kritikos, who, at the time, was carrying out his military service at Aivali.[23] The Office's brief included legal matters related to the establishment of the University, the compilation of regulations and the completion and refurbishment of buildings made available by the High Commission.[24]

---

[21] The text of this letter is published in Vovolinis, op. cit., p. 492.

[22] Local newspaper *Αμάλθεια* (29 October 1920). Decree no. 119/12711/12720. Karatheodoris's monthly salary was fixed at 4,000 drs. During the same period, the monthly salary of the High Commission Secretary General was 2,000 drs.

[23] From October 1920, Karatheodoris was also assisted by I. Kalitsounakis, G. Ioakeimoglou and F. Theodoridis, who were all later to become Professors at the University of Athens. I. Philippidis, who had served in the position of the Secretary General of the Rizareios School of Theology for over thirty-five years and held a doctorate at Law, was selected to serve as Secretary General of the new University.

[24] For the issue created between the Jewish community and the High Commission regarding the ownership of these buildings, see Ch. Solomonidis, op. cit. The Ottoman administration was constructing these buildings with a view to housing a public library and a technical school. With the advent of the Greek administration and following the High Commissioner's decision to hand them over to the Ionian University, the

Against the background of the continuing war in Asia Minor, the difficulties encountered in the realization of the project were innumerable. Buildings had to be restructured or constructed, laboratories set up, books and equipment purchased and brought in from Europe and, finally, professors selected from among the best available in Greece and abroad. Undaunted, the organizers forged ahead and the fruits of their labours were soon evident.

The initial staffing plan provided for a small number of professorial chairs and readerships, supported by lecturers and assistant lecturers, with a free hand to decide on content and methodology. According to the Royal Decree on its foundation, the language used at the University would be Greek and "of equal status, wherever possible, Turkish. If required, the use of other languages is not excluded."[25] All those who had the qualifications provided for by the regulations would be accepted as students regardless of sex or creed. The qualifications awarded would be certificates, degrees or doctorates, according to the length of the course.

In the summer of 1921, Karatheodoris made a four-month trip to Germany, Austria and Switzerland in order to meet with scientists wishing to be engaged by the University. He also visited firms which specialised in equipping scientific laboratories and arranged procurement at reduced prices. One of the foremost tasks of this trip was the furnishing of the University Library, which he considered as the backbone of the institution. "I am convinced," he wrote to Stergiadis from Leipzig, "that within the next few years we will have in Smyrna a library which, though smaller than the one in Athens, will be much more useful for our purposes."[26] Two days later he added: "The sum required for the library collection is relatively large ... if we can secure 20 to 25 thousand pounds, we will be able

---

project for their restructuring was entrusted to the Athenian architect Aristotelis Zachos (1879-1939). Up until September 1922, the work for the restructuring of the site and the addition of new buildings had cost 110,000 Turkish liras, while the total of the monthly salaries of the personnel working for the University amounted to 15,647 drachmas.

[25] *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως*, Series A, ii, Law 2251/14.7.20.

[26] The text of this letter, dated 12.7.21, is published in Vovolinis, op. cit., p. 497.

to create a library the like of which does not exist in the East."[27] The first collection to be incorporated into the library was that of the Austrian Archaeological Institute of Smyrna, to which, after Karatheodoris's trip to Europe, 36 crates of rare books were added. Those had mainly been bought in Germany by Ioannis Kalitsounakis, Professor of Oriental Ethnology, to whom Karatheodoris wrote on his return to Smyrna in November 1921: "The High Commissioner is willing to provide a generous sum for the library and I am hopeful that our task will meet with success."[28] With the help of G. Ioakeimoglou, Professor of Pharmacology at Berlin and himself originating from Asia Minor, all the instruments and material for the microbiology laboratory were purchased and arrived in Smyrna.

By spring 1922, the laboratories and the nucleus of the library were ready, the professors' contracts had been signed and the first schools were ready to open their doors in September 1922. An important achievement was the rapid organization of the microbiology laboratory which was already in operation in August 1922 as part of the Institute of Hygiene. Its aims were to carry out tests free of charge, prepare vaccines, drips, antitoxins and antidotes, and help combat infectious diseases, such as malaria and TB, in co-operation with the Directorate of Public Health of the High Commission. At the end of August 1922, the central power-generating plant, an important part of the Ionian University's Engineering Laboratory, which had been built in co-operation with the Directorate of Public Works of the High Commission, was also ready to operate.

But whilst all these preparations were being made, the very future of the Greek presence in Asia Minor was being progressively eroded. Greece had received no clear mandate over the area so that its authority clashed with increasing frequency with the interests of the Allies in matters as crucial as customs and passport control, censorship and the application of the right of extraterritoriality to foreign nationals. No Greek civil courts were allowed to be established in the Greek zone and the law

---

[27] Letter published in Vovolinis, op. cit., p. 498.

[28] A detailed report by Karatheodoris on the creation of the collection, the personnel and the operational rules of the University Library is published in Vovolinis, op. cit., p. 500.

was flouted on a massive scale. The Allied High Commissioners in Constantinople acted as if Greece had not been asked by their governments to land in Asia Minor and most foreign consuls issued certificates of protection to Turkish nationalist leaders, who used every opportunity to wage war against the Greek occupation.

In the meantime, relations between Stergiadis's civil administration, on one hand, and the Greek military and religious leaders, on the other, went from bad to worse, exacerbated by persistent interference from Athens in favour of one faction or the other.[29]

In November 1920, the Greek electorate ousted Venizelos and returned King Constantine to the throne. The Allies chose to repudiate agreements with the previous regime and adopted a stance of neutrality between Greece and the Turkish nationalist forces, which increasingly challenged Greek authority.[30] This neutrality went as far as vetoing the sale of war material to Greece, while the French and Italians supplied arms and even uniforms to the nationalists through Chios, an undisputed part of Greek sovereign territory.[31]

---

[29] Within the first eight months of his presence in Asia Minor alone, Stergiadis submitted his resignation three times in protest against interference from Athens in the performance of his duties. MOFA, Φάκελος Σμύρνης 1919, Ελληνική Διοίκησις Σμύρνης, Διάφορα, telegram no. 12225/6.12.19, Stergiadis to the Minister of Justice.

[30] On the Allied reaction to the return of King Constantine and the collective measures taken against Greece see Documents of British Foreign Policy [DBFP], Vol. xii, no. 457/2.12.20, no. 451/4.12.20, no. 436/5.12.20.

[31] MOFA, Αρχείο Δ. Γούναρη, 1921, "Report on the Procurement of War Material to the Nationalists". Greek Military Intelligence, II Bureau, September 1921. MOFA, Αρχείο Δ. Γούναρη, 1920, telegram nos. 1825/26.5.21 and 2281/18.6.21, Rangavis to Minister of Foreign Affairs. Also: A.A. Pallis, *Greece's Anatolian Venture – and after* (London 1937), pp. 97-113, the section entitled "The Responsibility of France"; Ambassador H. Morgenthau, *I was sent to Athens* (New York 1929), p.30: "While the Greek campaign was going on, it soon became notorious to military observers of all nations that the Turks were being continually supplied with ammunition 'bootlegged' to them from the Italian base at Adalia."

In the face of Kemal's intransigence and the continuing warfare in Asia Minor, far from supporting Greece, whose entanglement they had themselves instigated, the Allies refused to provide any assistance in helping her extricate her forces from an impossible situation. The nationalists drove the Greek army all the way from the interior of Anatolia to the shores of the Aegean and all Greek civil and military authorities were obliged to evacuate Smyrna on 8 September 1922.

Immediately after their departure, looting and killing of Christians began and gathered momentum as the hours went by. The Allied representatives did nothing to prevent this massacre. On 13 September the Metropolitan of Smyrna and three church wardens were lynched by the Turkish mob. Later on the same day, a fire broke out in the Armenian quarter and spread to the Greek and European neighbourhoods, which were almost completely gutted, leaving the Turkish and Jewish areas unscathed.[32]

The twenty-one Allied warships in the Smyrna harbour did nothing to prevent the massacre and rapine which ensued on shore. The Greek venture in Asia Minor was at an end.

In the wake of disaster on such a catastrophic scale, the splendid vision nourished by Venizelos, Karatheodoris, Stergiadis and so many others to create the most modern higher education institution in the Balkans, an institution which would have brought together the cultural traditions of all the peoples in the area in peaceful coexistence and mutual understanding, was reduced to ashes at a stroke. The fledgling university, upon

---

[32] London's *Daily Telegraph* reported on 16 September 1922: "Except for the squalid Turkish quarter, Smyrna has ceased to exist... the problem of the minorities is here solved for all time. The refugees are being removed to other lands as far as possible. No doubt remains as to the origins of the fire. On the sworn testimony of the American Staff of the Collegiate Institute, the torch was applied by Turkish regular soldiers." For a detailed description of the events as recounted by the staff of the American Collegiate Institute, see G. Horton, op. cit. M. Housepian's *Smyrna 1922: The Destruction of a City* (London 1972) examines invaluable archival material on the subject and presents witnesses' accounts of the events.

which so many hopes had been pinned, was swept away with the mass exodus of the two million refugees from Asia Minor.

Karatheodoris, who had invested so much energy and devotion to the planning of the Ionian University, was faced with the sad task of packing up its instruments, books and archives. On 8 September 1922 the Professor and his colleagues departed for Athens with their model institution packed in a few crates. Seventy-five years after the Disaster this material remains dispersed in various schools of the University of Athens, a phantom of the Asia Minor utopia, with only the proud logo of the Ionian University "Εξ Ανατολών το Φως" to recall the great but still-born dream for the creation of contemporary Greece's second institution of higher education.

About the contributors

Roderick Beaton is Koraes Professor of Modern Greek and Byzantine History, Language and Literature at King's College London and Head of the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies there. He has published books and articles on Greek literature and oral tradition between the twelfth century and the present day, including *An Introduction to Modern Greek literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1994).

Sophia Denissi studied at the Universities of Athens and Massachusetts and holds degrees in English and American literature. Since 1988 she has taught at the School of Fine Arts in Athens. Her research is mainly concerned with prose fiction of the nineteenth century. Her publications include: *Το ελληνικό ιστορικό μυθιστόρημα και ο Sir Walter Scott, 1830-1880* (Athens: Kastaniotis 1994) and *Μεταφράσεις μυθιστορημάτων και διηγημάτων 1830-1880: Εισαγωγική μελέτη και καταγραφή* (Athens: Periplous 1995).

Michael Jeffreys is Professor of Modern Greek at the University of Sydney. His research and publications cover a wide spectrum of Byzantine and Modern Greek literature, from the *Chronicle* of John Malalas to the poetry of Yannis Ritsos. A particular focus of his interests is late Byzantine and early Modern Greek literature, on which he has published many articles and monographs. He is currently involved in a research project on the manuscript environment of late Byzantine vernacular literature.

Christopher Robinson is Professor of European Literature and Senior Tutor in Modern Languages at Christ Church, Oxford, his interests lying primarily in the literatures of Greece and France. His recent research has been centred on issues of sexual orientation and gender. His work includes a short study of the poetry of Cavafy (Bristol Classical Press 1988) and *Scandal in the Ink: Male and female homosexuality in twentieth-century French literature* (Cassell 1995).

Victoria Solomonidis studied at the Universities of Athens and London. Her research is particularly concerned with the Asia Minor Disaster, from the point of view of international relations and the structure of the Greek administration of Asia Minor. Her PhD thesis is entitled *The Greek Administration of the Vilayet of Aidin, 1919-1922*. Other research contributions include a detailed bibliography of the period, published in *Modern Greece: A Social Science Newsletter*, an annotated translation of G. Horton's *The Blight of Asia*, and articles on the controversial personality of the Smyrna High Commissioner Aristidis Stergiadis.