

JOURNAL

of the

HELLENIC DIASPORA

VOLUME 32.1&2 (2006)

SPECIAL DOUBLE ISSUE

FOLKISM AND WILD(ER)NESS: OBSERVATIONS ON THE
CONSTRUCTION OF NATURE IN MODERN GREEK CULTURE

by ERIC L. BALL

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND EXPEDIENCIES: BRITISH
EMPIRE, GREEK-CYPRIOIS AND THE QUESTIONING OF
THEIR NATIONAL DESCENT *by* THANASSIS BRAVOS

ANCIENT HELLENISM IN ANDRE CHENIER *by* MINAS SAVVAS

THE STORY BEHIND THE STATISTICS: VARIABLES AFFECTING
THE TREMENDOUS LOSSES OF GREEK JEWRY DURING THE
HOLOCAUST *by* MARCIA HADDAD IKONOMOPOULOS

NIGHT OF THE COUP D'ETAT: EVENTS OF APRIL 20 TO 21,
1967 (AN IMAGINATIVE RECREATION BASED ON FACT)

by THOMAS DOULIS

GREEK ARTISTS IN ROMANIA: CONSTANTIN PASCALI, THE
"MISSING" PAINTER CONSTANTINOS PASHALOPOULOS OF
THE "MUNICH SCHOOL GROUP"

by EVANGELIA N. GEORGITSOYANNI

HONORING PATRICK LEIGH FERMOR: REVIEW ESSAY

by WILLARD MANUS

BOOK REVIEWS

JOURNAL of the HELLENIC DIA SPORA

Editorial Office:

WEST CHESTER UNIV., WEST CHESTER, PA 19383

Tel.: 610-436-2901

Fax: 610-436-3150

e-mail: georgakas@hotmail.com

akitroef@haverford.edu

kmyrsiad@wcupa.edu

Publisher

LEANDROS PAPATHANASIOU

Editors

DAN GEORGAKAS

Queens College

ALEXANDER KITROEFF

Haverford College

KOSTAS MYRSIADES

West Chester University

Copy Editor

SUSAN ANASTASAKOS

National / International Advisory Board

STEVEN BOWMAN

University of Cincinnati

STAVROS DELIGIORIS

The University of Iowa

MARIOS EVRIVIADIS

University of Athens, Greece

ROBERT FAGLES

Princeton University

ELENA FRANGAKIS-SYRETT

Queens College, CUNY

ANDRE GEROLYMATOS

Simon Fraser Univ., Barnaby, Canada

YIORGOS D. KALOYERAS

University of Thessaloniki, Greece

NICOS MOUZELIS

London School of Econ., England

ALEXANDER NEHAMAS

Princeton University

PETER PAPPAS

greekworks.com, Paris, France

JAMES PETRAS

SUNY at Binghamton

ADAMANTIA POLLIS

New School for Social Research

WILLIAM V. SPANOS

SUNY at Binghamton

CONSTANTINOS TSOUCALAS

University of Athens, Greece

STELIOS VASILAKIS

greekworks.com, New York, NY

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.

New York University, Emeritus

EDITORIAL POLICY

The *JOURNAL OF THE HELLENIC DIASPORA*, a semiannual review, views the modern Greek experience in a global context in terms of its Balkan, Mediterranean and diasporic dimensions. The *JHD* maintains a vision of the Greek world as a paradigm for new conceptualizations of Western identity and society, standing as it does on the margins of eastern and western Europe and at the boundary of western and oriental constructs. The *JHD* takes a transdisciplinary perspective that examines the modern Greek experience from the point of view of anthropology, history, literature and literary criticism, philosophy and the social sciences.

The *JHD* welcomes widely ranging approaches that embrace a variety of methodologies and rhetorical perspectives. It accepts articles, review essays, and notes keyed to the Greek experience from the late eighteenth century to the present. The *JHD* carries reviews of books that deal with modern Greece, the Greek diaspora and the Balkan and Mediterranean worlds.

MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

All submissions must be in triplicate, should use parenthetical or internal citations and a works cited page following the convention of *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th ed. Articles should include a separate sheet with the author's name that should not appear elsewhere on the ms. Quotations and citations should appear in their original language. We cannot be responsible for returning manuscripts if the sender has not included a stamped self-addressed envelope. The Editors welcome proposals from persons wishing to guest-edit special issues. Authors wishing to submit non-solicited book reviews should contact the editors. Address all correspondence to the Editors, West Chester University, West Chester, PA 19383. Phone: (610) 436-2901; Fax: (610) 436-3150; e-mail: kmysiad@wcupa.edu or akitroef@haverford.edu.

Articles in the *JHD* are abstracted and/or indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *America: History and Life*, *Sociological Abstracts*, *Psychological Abstracts*, *Modern Language Association Abstracts*, *Language Bibliography*, *International Political Abstracts*, and *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING

The *JHD* is published semiannually in March and September. Annual subscription rates: Individual: \$20 (domestic); \$25 (foreign). Institutional \$30 (domestic); \$35 (foreign). Back issues: single \$10, double \$15 (each). Advertising rates can be had on request by writing to Pella Publishing Company, Inc., 337 West 36th Street, New York, NY 10018-6401. Tel.: (212) 279-9586. Fax: (212) 594-3602.

Published by

PELLA PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

337 West 36th Street
New York, NY 10018-6401

Copyright © 2006 by Pella Publishing Company, Inc.

ISSN 0364-2976

Printed by ATHENS PRINTING COMPANY, New York, NY 10018-6401

C O N T E N T S

ESSAYS

ERIC L. BALL

- Folkism and Wild(er)ness: Observations on the
Construction of Nature in Modern Greek Culture* 7

THANASSIS BRAVOS

- International Relations and Expediencies: British Empire, Greek-
Cypriots and the Questioning of Their National Descent* 45

MINAS SAVVAS

- Ancient Hellenism in Andre Chenier* 75

MARCIA HADDAD IKONOMOPOULOS

- The Story behind the Statistics: Variables Affecting the
Tremendous Losses of Greek Jewry during the Holocaust* 89

THOMAS DOULIS

- Night of the Coup d'Etat: Events of April 20 to 21, 1967
(An Imaginative Recreation Based on Fact)* 111

EVANGELIA N. GEORGITSOYANNI

- Greek Artists in Romania: Constantin Pascali, the "Missing"
Painter Constantinos Pashalopoulos of the "Munich School Group"*

WILLARD MANUS	
<i>Honoring Patrick Leigh Fermor: Review Essay</i>	147

BOOK REVIEWS

DEMETRA VAKA BROWN	
<i>Haremlik: Some Pages from the Life of Turkish Women</i>	
DEMETRA VAKA BROWN	
<i>The Unveiled Ladies of Istanbul (Stamboul)</i>	
(Review by Eleftheria Arapoglou)	157

ESSAYS

Folkism and Wild(er)ness: Observations on the Construction of Nature in Modern Greek Culture

by ERIC. L. BALL

My goal is to explore several examples of the relationship of nature and literature with respect to questions of nation-building and modern nationalism. I want to examine several textual instances that illustrate how literature and criticism represent nature and society/culture, especially in terms of the nation. I will do so primarily in the context of Modern Greek romantic-nationalism, and I will occasionally make comparisons to the case of the United States. I will be especially interested in ways that nature and romantic folklore ideology contributed to developments in Greek literature and criticism as part of the modern projects of nation-building and nation-consolidation: Greek romantic-nationalists, adopting the idea of national cultural continuity, constructed either an all-powerful nature that ostensibly determines the “organic” development of national culture, or an ambivalent nature that legitimates national culture’s hegemony but which blossoms only insofar as it cultivates nature’s wilder, more precarious elements. Often this plays out through representations of Greece’s “folk” variously as benevolent lovers-of-nature or as wild

ERIC. L. BALL is Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies at Empire State College, State University of New York, where he also chairs the undergraduate program in cultural studies in the Center for Distance Learning. He is interested in approaches to arts and humanities education that decenter those conceptions of art, literature, and culture that limit the potential of everyday traditions to foster the well-being of local communities. Professor Ball is currently teaching a fully online undergraduate course entitled “Exploring Place.”

animals in need of acculturation. Given the immense scope of the topic, my primary intention in this paper is to begin pursuing several textual instances of all this, not to offer a comprehensive theory or account Modern Greek cultural constructions of nature. I thus offer my arguments in the spirit of preliminary and exploratory support for the hypothesis that it is nearly impossible to consider “nature” in the context of Modern Greece without traces of “the folk” showing up whether or not these are welcomed.

Nation and Nature

The emergence of a national literature frequently involves considerations of nature, local places, and even local inhabitants. In modern Greece, intersections among literature, criticism, nation, place, and nature abound from the start. Indeed, facing the absence of a modern institution of literature altogether, yet aspiring to become Greece’s national poet, the Heptanesian Dionysios Solomos (1798-1857) began developing a new poetic idiom that referred to nature and engaged with the history and culture of various Greek-inhabited locales. For example, Crete figured prominently among the places Solomos referred to and relied on, though decades would pass before the island would become part of the Greek nation-state. In addition to looking to European models, he also drew heavily from the “folk” poetry of his Greek-speaking contemporaries (his own first language was Italian), as well as the literature of the Cretan Renaissance (Jusdanis 2002:279).¹ This is probably most evident in *The Cretan* (1833).² Here, Solomos combined the 15-syllable rhyming couplets of both Cretan Renaissance poetry and certain genres of Greek folk poetry—including the Cretan *mandinadba*³—together with the figure of an anonymous Cretan singing his woes—suggestive of Cretan impromptu *mandinadba* singing. In doing so, Solomos was able to embroider his work onto a larger Greek literary fabric, and thereby played an important role in its construction as a *national* tradition.

While he borrowed much in terms of language and form from folk and Cretan Renaissance poetry, Solomos also distanced himself from it by looking to the sublime of European Romanticism when it came to his use of natural imagery. Indeed, references to natural phenomena in Solomos generally differ sharply from those

in Cretan poetry, perhaps suggesting a new literary function for nature in the service of nationalism (Jusdanis 2002:282-283). In Renaissance literature, authors invoked nature in accordance with the pastoral tradition (Bancroft-Marcus 1991). They generally depicted nature as a reflection of the moods of their main characters. For example, in the late sixteenth-century work, *The Shepherdess* (author unknown), when the narrator-protagonist is in excellent spirits, he finds himself in an idyllic setting where trees blossom, deer graze, and birds chirp:

In a big country place, in a ravine,
one morning I went to my flock,
among trees, meadows, rivers,
cool and fresh reeds.

Among those blossoming trees,
where the dear deer were grazing,
in the fresh soil, in the vegetation,
where the little birds were chirping
(Alexiou 1979:65)

Upon discovering that his lover has died, however, darkness covers the earth, birds are silent, and living organisms die:

Let no shepherd come out from his cave,
let the clouds cover the sun
and the vegetation in the meadow freeze,
and let no flock come out from its pen.

Let no bird in the woods fly
nor the rooster crow at dawn,
let the little nightingale sing no more,
and let the eagle become blind and no
longer hunt.

At night, let the moon not come out,
let there be no more fish found in the sea,
let the springs and rivers run dry
and the fresh reeds dry out.
(Alexiou 1979:80)

In contrast, Solomos depicts nature in *The Cretan* not as a reflection of, but in a variable relationship with, the protagonist-narrator, a Cretan from the countryside who, reduced to the status of a beggar wandering in exile, sings of his adventures. This relationship begins as blatantly antithetical but is subsequently tempered by a mystical experience. The poem's central action is comprised of the Cretan's account of his attempt to save himself and his fiancée after a shipwreck. Nature's tempest impedes the Cretan in his struggle to save himself and his lover:

Three lightening bolts struck, one after the
other,
the seas and the sky echoed in the flash,
The shores and the mountains with all the voices
they had. (Solomos 1986:197)

In the midst of this life-threatening situation, however, the Cretan begins to experience beautiful visions. The sea miraculously appears to grow calm, and nature turns from a threat into a spectacle of beauty:

And the sea, which was jumping like a snail
being boiled in a pot,
Became calm and silent,
Like a garden it smelled and welcomed all the
stars,
Some unexplainable mystery made nature
Become decorated with every kind of beauty, and
leave behind its anger.
(Solomos 1986:198-199)

During this period of calm, as "the whole creation became a temple shining in every direction" (200), the Cretan sees in front of him an apparition—a beautiful "mood-clad" female. He feels relief as he conveys to her his woes about the Turks who killed his family back in Crete. Then, as the figure disappears, leaving a teardrop in his hand, the Cretan hears "the sweetest sound" (204). It is so sweet, he says, that it *cannot* be compared to any of the sweet sounds he knows from his days in Crete. He then proceeds to describe those sounds using pastoral language and imagery remi-

nissant of the Cretan Renaissance: the sound of a mistress in the forest singing about love to nature, the sound of a Cretan nightingale singing to the rocky cliffs with their wild animals, the sound of his own Cretan flute that he would play on Crete's highest mountain top to forget about his yearning and suffering.⁴ The Cretan becomes so enraptured by the sublime quality of the image/sound that, in an instant of hope, he grasps in its direction and shouts. As though in a trance, he no longer registers his surroundings—the sky, the sea, the shore, his lover—he only wishes to leave behind his flesh and follow the image/sound. As the sound fades, the Cretan becomes aware again of his predicament, and manages to get to shore with his lover where he realizes that, alas, she has died. Solomos, drawing on both Romantic pastoral images and European romantic attitudes toward nature, portrays a rural Cretan capable of experiencing the sublime.

Solomos's appropriation and representation of high and folk literatures, of nature, and of rural characters introduces some of the interesting intersections among modern Greek literary culture, nation, nature, and place. Moreover, insofar as his texts provide raw material for critical interpretation, they contribute to the multiplication of these intersections. Kapsomenos (1998), for example, interprets Solomos's treatment of the relationship between humans and nature as representative of modern Greek culture and its values:

The nature-human relationship, which is to say the nature-culture [literally: nature-civilization] relationship, provides a reliable criterion for understanding the basic orientation of any culture. This is because the way this relationship manifests itself (as dichotomy, opposition, equivalence) determines the work's mechanisms of signification at the level of worldview. Using this criterion, we see that there is a sense of harmony and equivalence between the two poles, characteristic of both folk and learned modern Greek poetry: nature=culture. This equivalence defines the coordinates of a dominant poetic and cultural tradition [in Greece] which differs from the major international models, where the relationship nature-culture generally appears as one of opposition. (Kapsomenos 1998:16)

Kapsomenos discerns in the poet's approach to nature a *uniquely* modern Greek cultural phenomenon. He elaborates on this argument by contrasting Solomos's (read: modern Greek) poetics with those of Schiller (read: non-Greek) and claims that Solomos's worldview organically synthesizes Hellenism and Christianity into a distinctive "Christian Hellenism" (93). Kapsomenos examines the relationship of Greek poetry to nature in order to assert and describe the distinctiveness of Greek national culture and, as a corollary, of the Greek nation.

Appeals by critics to something so utterly "natural" and apparently primordial as nature itself in order to demonstrate the legitimacy, distinctiveness, or significance of national culture is by no means unique to the Greek case. In the United States, dubbed "nature's nation" by the literary historian Perry Miller (Miller 1967), nature played a crucial role in attempts to construct a uniquely American national cultural identity. Indeed, Denis Cosgrove (1995) argues that "[t]he United States was the first nation to define itself primarily in terms of the land, and only secondarily in terms of the people" (40). Specifically, as Roderick Nash argues, it defined itself largely in terms of wilderness:

Creation of a distinctive culture was thought to be the mark of true nationhood. Americans sought something uniquely "American," yet valuable enough to transform embarrassed provincials into proud and confident citizens. Difficulties appeared at once. The nation's short history, weak traditions, and minor literary and artistic achievements seemed negligible compared to those of Europe. But in at least one respect Americans sensed that their country was different: wilderness had no counterpart in the Old World. (Nash 1982:67)

American nationalists thought wild nature could be appropriated as a resource for demonstrating cultural distinctiveness. Such distinctiveness, in turn, would provide a cultural grounding for political sovereignty, as well as compensate for the nation's sense of "inferiority" or "belatedness" vis-à-vis the Old World (Jusdanis 2001:160). Significantly, early Americans carried out this project to a large extent through the "quest" for a national literature: "American nature seemed to offer the firmest assurances of unrivaled literary achievements" (Spencer 1957:47).⁵

In what follows, I want to continue in an exploratory manner to examine certain intersections of literary culture, nature, and place in Greek culture. If wilderness provides perhaps the most salient point of departure for investigating such issues in the context of the United States, Solomos's poem about a rural Cretan suggests that the "folk" should be added to the mix when it comes to the Greek case. Thus, after a preliminary discussion of Greek romantic folklore ideology and nature, I will discuss examples of ways that nature, folk, and place have contributed to the emergence and development of Greek national culture.

Folkism

Romantic nationalist folklore ideology—"folkism" for short⁶—began taking shape in Greece during the nineteenth century, in the early national period. This project of modernization and nation-building required radical changes and developments at the cultural level, and many Greek nationalists saw literature and folklore as the most important vehicles for achieving such cultural goals.⁷ Indeed, scholars in Modern Greek Studies attribute the emergence of the modern institutions of Greek literature and Greek folklore largely to the nation-building cause (Herzfeld 1986; Jusdanis 1991). Authors, critics, and folklorists alike frequently worked to further the cause of nation-building and nation-consolidation, and one way their texts can be read, on the whole, is as an attempt to instill in readers a belief in, and a sense of belonging to, the nation.

Particular conceptions of nature and the folk, moreover, proved to be useful ingredients in attempts to represent the new nation. This was not something unique to Greece, either (see Dorson 1966; Wilson 1976, 1989; Dick 1989). The German Johann Gottfried Herder had assigned a central place to nature in his proto-romantic-nationalist doctrines. Appealing to the logic of geographical and climatic determinism, he asserted that particular groups of people in specific locations developed their own distinctive cultures in response to the unique natural conditions in which they lived.⁸ As a nationalist doctrine, this assertion justified the legitimacy of each particular group's sovereignty over their own particular landscape, over national "territory." Since early

Greek intellectuals were steeped in such doctrines, it is no surprise that national literature and criticism in Greece looked to nature and the folk in their attempts to write the nation.

Having solicited the financial and military support of European nations that believed the origins of civilized Europe lay in the ruins of ancient Greece, modern Greeks were able to bring centuries of Ottoman rule to an end and establish the modern Greek nation-state (Clogg 1992). The newly established Greek state, though, was faced with a paradox. On the one hand, the Greeks were supposedly believed to be both the descendants and heirs of the greatest European civilization ever to have existed. On the other hand, they were a largely rural population, predominantly Christian, whose ways and manners often seemed to have as much in common with the Turks' as with their ostensibly glorious ancestors. This generated many apparent contradictions or at least raised difficult issues. For example, the ancient Greeks were pagans; modern Greeks were Christians. The vernacular idioms of most Greeks had undergone changes due to foreign—including Ottoman—influence, and most Greeks had difficulty learning classical Greek, even in its compromised forms (*katharevousa*). To make matters worse, some European scholars, most notably Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer, were determined to prove the impossibility of Greek racial or cultural continuity. Faced with such difficulties, Greece had to come to terms with the fact that its viability as a modern nation-state depended in large measure “on the premise that its citizens were the same as the long-lost inhabitants of the land” (Herzfeld 1986:6).

The study of folklore, known in Greece as “laography” (*laografia*), thus came to play a significant role as the scholarly site par excellence for demonstrating Greek cultural continuity. Greek folklorists, working according to the romantic assumption that there had always existed an identifiable, organic, essential, Greek tradition, would excavate the past of the “simple” Greek folk—whose history had gone virtually undocumented for centuries—and emphasize those elements that could be interpreted as direct links from classical Greece, through Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire, to the modern nation-state. Owing to the centuries-long sociopolitical organization of Greek peoples into regions, the study of local cultures comprised a fundamental aspect in the project of the Greek folklorists. Place (*topos*) was, in fact, the basic unit

of early folklore research in Greece (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1977:44), and though it was gradually displaced by a more direct focus on Greek antiquity, even this was accomplished by viewing *local* Greek folk cultures as multiple refractions of a single transcendent, culturally continuous Hellenism (Herzfeld 1986:23). In short, Greek folklore rested on the conviction that modern Greece was comprised of several geo-culturally recognizable places (Crete, Thessaly, etc.), each inhabited primarily by a unique group of authentic, mostly rural, Greeks (Cretans, Thessalians, etc.) who could be identified by their “manners and customs” (*itbi ke ethima*), by their essential character, spirit, and folk culture. Such are the romantic-nationalist ideological convictions, along with their multiple discursive and institutional manifestations and consequences, that I refer to as “folkism.”

The collection and dissemination by folklorists of such folkloric items as descriptions of local manners and proverbs, folk songs, and legends—what many people conventionally think of as folklore’s task—was but one of folkism’s discursive manifestations in Greece. Greek Romantic poets—and consequently their critics—also portrayed the folk, as the example from Solomos demonstrates.⁹ In addition, a “folkloric” genre of prose fiction known as “ethography” (*itbografia*) developed in which authors combined elements from collected folklore with creative writing.¹⁰ Often written by the same individuals who collected folklore, ethnographic fiction depicted, on the whole, the regional folk and their lives.¹¹ In short, many Greek folklorists, authors, and literary critics asserted particular connections among nature, place, folk, and nation in their texts.¹² Thus, their texts offer insights into the relationship between national culture and nature-place-folk.

Inventing National Culture, Inventing Nature

Greek Romantic poetry of the nineteenth century is full of idyllic depictions of the Greek folk, as well as of Greek poets themselves, “in nature.” A *klefti*¹³ “has the mountain as a palace and the sky as his blanket,”¹⁴ while a shepherd “lies with his herd sprawled among the flowers.”¹⁵ The persona of the poet sleeps “in a bed of laurel and myrtle”¹⁶ or in the shade of “the perfect tree,”¹⁷ and professes his love for “the wild forest, the black darkness of the abyss,

its foliage which quietly shudders in the night breeze.”¹⁸ He falls in love with a shepherdess while “they sit in the blossoming greenery”¹⁹ or even wishes to become a shepherd himself:

How is it that you're not a shepherd and I'm not
a shepherd!
and together with you in the meadow
and together with you that I'm not guiding
a beautiful flock of lambs!

Leave the cities, and come, my girlfriend of the
soul,
into the freshness, into the greenery,

And place the simple and peasant poppy
into your hair,

in your lily-white breast, in your sweet kiss,
and in the springs and in the forest may I die a
shepherd²⁰

Because they circulated in the context of Greek folkism, even such seemingly naive and simplistic representations as these of the folk and nature made a significant contribution to the construction of a modern national literature. To illustrate this point more clearly, I will examine several critical texts that illustrate particular ways Greek nationalist scholars in literature and folklore theorized nature and the folk.

My first example comes from Greek folklore theory. It is an essay by folklorist Stilson Kyriakidis (1978 [1926]) on the relationship between the folk and nature entitled, “Love of Nature in Greek Folk Songs.” In it, Kyriakidis sets out to answer the question: Is there a love of nature among the Greek folk? He begins with a discussion of what “love of nature” (*fysiokratia*) means. In describing it as “human love of nature and life in nature, as opposed to the city and life in the city” (130), Kyriakidis suggests that nature signifies the opposite of urban. In other words, nature signifies the nation’s many rural regions. Next, Kyriakidis asserts that the concept of “love” is too vague and he seeks to clarify it by discussing love’s somatic and psychical source:

The first feeling of desire toward nature is born of protest: a reaction of the human body and soul to a chaotic and depressing life that wears away at one's spiritual and bodily strength, and a vivacious desire for change and salvation from the shackles of culture [literally: civilization] and a return toward natural and primitive freedom. (Kyriakidis 1978:131)

He then contextualizes the "psychological and biological need" of *fysiokratreia* in terms of history. He states that it arose in antiquity, especially during the Alexandrian and Roman times, waned during the Middle Ages along with the "retreat" of civilization, and rose again and spread to all of civilized humanity by the time of Rousseau and Romanticism. At most, Kyriakidis maintains, such biologically motivated *fysiokratreia* revels in the beauty of such nature as "the open horizon, the calm sea, the sweet sound of a babbling brook and the sparkle of the morning dew, the flowers and birds and the sweet light of the moon, and other elements of a beautiful idyllic landscape" (132). Thus, he distinguishes it from that which also has a "spiritual/intellectual" (*pneumatiko*) component, from that which takes into account "the feeling of hues of light and the atmosphere which give psychological depth and emotional unity to a landscape, [. . .] the feeling of the wild magnificence of the tall mountains, of the incredible grandeur of the tempestuous sea and of the storm, and of the unending monotony of the uniform plain and desert" (132). This component of *fysiokratreia*, Kyriakidis argues, comes about historically with Rousseau and the rise of European romanticism, and even Greek romantic poetry. In short, he constructs a linear progression that begins in antiquity with a weaker biological form of *fysiokratreia*. This develops into a stronger biological and spiritual/intellectual form with romanticism that celebrates the whole of nature and is nostalgic for a more "natural, true, and free life" (134).

Kyriakidis then uses this general account of *fysiokratreia* as a basis for his discussion of *fysiokratreia* among the Greek folk, the ostensible descendants of the civilized ancient Greeks who were out of contact with a European civilization built on a Greek foundation. He claims that he did not expect to find a love of nature among the Greek folk since, because they already live in nature, they have no reason to embrace it in reaction against the city. Fur-

thermore, he states that his own personal experiences with the folk suggested to him that they have no sense of the landscape's beauty. Nevertheless, he decides to examine Greek folk song texts as "the expression of [the folk's] deepest desires and ideals" (137). Upon analyzing the songs, Kyriakidis concludes that, to his surprise, the Greek folk not only have a love of nature, but that theirs is actually greater than that of the romantics. In fact, exactly because the folk's love of nature does not arise from nostalgia caused by life in the city, Kyriakidis feels justified in claiming that their *fysiokratreia* is *more authentic*.²¹ In a passage referring specifically to the *klefts*, he argues that their own *fysiokratreia* is "born of life, the outcome of everyday life" (144). Hence, he characterizes it as a *biological*—that is, a natural—feeling *analogous* to that which gave birth to Romanticism in the first place, and differing from it "only in its psychological source" (144).

Continuing his analysis of folk song texts, Kyriakidis attempts to demonstrate that the folk's love of nature also includes a spiritual/intellectual dimension, analogous to that of the educated romantics, that includes an appreciation of the entire range of nature's beauty, "from the lovely and idyllic to the magnificent and wild" (150). Thus, he argues, the folk are capable of expressing a feeling that is "much deeper and truer" than the "long-winded and rhetorical romanticism of the educated" (145). Feelings experienced in a natural setting are more authentic among the folk than among the romantics because the "expression of feelings of the folk is completely *natural* and *spontaneous*, and those feelings are *real*, *clear*, and *true*" (157).

In short, Kyriakidis connects a cultural group conceived of in *national* terms—rural, uneducated Greeks—with the rural places they inhabit. He authenticates this connection, moreover, by interpreting it as partly biological and natural. His appeals to nature contribute to the construction of Greek national culture by providing grounds for legitimizing Greek folk culture in the landscapes—the territories—it inhabits. In doing so, Kyriakidis also contributes to the construction of nature, both as a location and as a force. Defined as the city's other, nature is the sum of Greece's rural places. Defined as biology and psychology, it is the force that gives birth to the folk's feelings of love for those rural places. In both cases, moreover, Kyriakidis constructs nature as a quintessentially national entity.

In an essay on Greek Romanticism, the nationalist literary historian K. Th. Dimaras (1982 [1946]) contributes to a similar construction of nature. In the essay, Dimaras puts a new spin on Kyriakidis's essay in order to construct an organicist "literary history" argument. Whereas Kyriakidis invokes romanticism as a way to analyze Greek *fysiokratreia*, Dimaras invokes the Greek *fysiokratreia* established by Kyriakidis in order to understand the status of Greek Romanticism in Greek literary history. He begins by observing that romanticism was a movement so wide in its scope, affecting arts, politics, and life in general, overflowing "like a big river, flooding all of Europe," that it was inevitable that it should come to Greece, a nation open to "every kind of Western current" (3). Yet, Dimaras observes, none of the literary and historical preconditions giving rise to European romanticism existed in Greece. These observations motivate Dimaras to undertake a demonstration that Greek romanticism was not simply an "artificial" borrowing from Western Europe, but that, indeed, it did have roots in Greece after all.

Toward that end, Dimaras turns away from "grammatology," where no Greek precedents can be found, and looks instead to "psychology" (6). He posits several defining characteristics of European romanticism: "natural life" (6), the "love of nature" (7) or a "return to nature" (13), as well as "freedom, spontaneity, belief in the past, in Christianity, melancholic mood, and a pessimistic attitude toward erotic love" (6). Since he takes these characteristics as the essential indicators of the "Romantic psychology," Dimaras asks whether "Greek psychology" might not possess any of the same elements. (He mentions that he actually thinks *all* human beings share such characteristics to some extent, so the question is really a matter of degree.) The best textual evidence of "Greek psychology," Dimaras continues, is found in Greek folk songs. Because, he claims, folk songs are not so much the creation of individuals, but are created and re-created through centuries of oral transmission, they are the most "official" and "responsible" witnesses of the "foundational characteristics of the Greek soul" (6). Dimaras finishes his argument by demonstrating that each of the above characteristics exists in Greek folk songs. In particular, he draws on Kyriakidis's essay in order to show the parallel existence of *fysiokratreia* among the Greek people and European romantics.

According to Dimaras, then, it is the Greek soul that fosters the *natural* development of romantic literature in Greece (6). He draws upon the authentic bond between Greek nature and the rural Greek folk posited by Kyriakidis, and uses it to authenticate—since it is “physiological”—the development of Greek romantic poetry, and by extension, Greek literary history in general. He legitimizes the bond between Greek nature and Greek romantic poets that Kyriakidis found nostalgic and inauthentic: Though catalyzed by urban experiences or through contact with Europeans, Greek romantic poetry developed from the same psychological source—the same Greek soul—as did Greek folk songs, indisputably authentic expressions of *fysiokratreia*. Hence, it is an authentic expression of Greek *fysiokratreia* after all. Like Kyriakidis, then, Dimaras constructs nature as a quintessentially national location and national force. He also constructs culture as national. Regardless of differences between city and country, and regardless of *similarities* between Greek and European literature (romantic poetry), Greek culture is nevertheless a distinct entity whose rural and urban aspects both share a distinct psychological profile.

Further examples are readily culled from a Greek literary and artistic movement known as “aesthetic nationalism”²² or the “aesthetics of nativeness.”²³ Articulated theoretically by Pericles Yannopoulos (1869-1910) and carried out in literature by the so-called Generation of the Thirties (also known as Greek modernism), proponents of aesthetic nationalism sought to ground modern Greek culture in Greek nature and Greek folk culture explicitly. Yannopoulos aspired in his texts to teach fellow Greeks how to fulfill their national “duty” to know their “place” (Yannopoulos 1981 [1938]:16). He argued that a particular aesthetic reading of the Attic landscape—with its characteristic line and color—and of the folk who inhabit it—women and young gallants—would enable Greeks to find authentic expression in painting:

Line and color are the two fundamental elements and characteristics of Greek painting. The Greek line is soft, light, vigorous, sensuous, musical, and *bright*. It is the line of a mountain, of a gallant young man, of a woman, of a column, of a metope. Just as we see in nature and our everyday life, whether in the face of a mountain or a woman, utterly simple, tame, full of goodness, delicately sensual in

its stillness, vigorous and spirited in motion without ever losing its refinement and grace, like the dash of a young gallant, never reaching the point of harshness . . . (Yannopoulos 1981:40-41)

As Artemis Leontis (1995) notes, Yannopoulos “proffers the *topio* [landscape] of Hellas as a *national* landscape and the aesthetic of Hellenism as a *national* aesthetic” (86). Thus, like Kyriakidis and Dimaras, Yannopoulos invents nature as a national location and force. Whereas Dimaras invents culture in terms of a national “psychology,” though, Yannopoulos does so in terms of a national aesthetic.

The Generation of the Thirties was influenced by, and an enthusiastic proponent of, Yannopoulos’s theory. In fact, its two most prominent representatives, the Nobel prize winning poets and critics Yiorgos Seferis (1900-1971) and Odysseas Elytis (1911-1996), each wrote critical accounts of the Greek folk artist Theophilos that echo not only Yannopoulos, but Kyriakidis and Dimaras as well. For Yannopoulos, authentic Greek artistic expression reflects and is grounded in Greek nature and the Greek folk. Seferis and Elytis go one step further by arguing that some Greek folk, *because they connect so well with Greek nature*, manage to rise above folk art/literature to the level of art/literature proper. Theophilos, claims Yiorgos Seferis (1974 [1947]:463) is a “folk person” who found his way “fumbling along the paths of a highly cultivated group soul, which is the soul of our folk” (462). Yet, Seferis continues:

He might not be skillful, his lack of learning in such things might be great. But this most rare poetic rhythm—what else could I call it?—never before accomplished for the Greek landscape before him: a moment of color and air, suspended there in all its internal vivacity and the radiance of its motion, which connects the unconnectable, holds together the scattered and resurrects the mortal; this human breath which remained in a robust tree, in a hidden flower, or in the dance of a [traditional folk] costume; these things that we yearned for so much, because we missed them so much; Theophilos gave us this elegance, and this is not folklore. (Seferis 1974:460-461)

If, in Kyriakidis's view, Greek folk culture is the closest to Greek nature, it is high culture, according to Seferis, that gives it its most sophisticated—and always authentic—expression. Odysseas Elytis (1986 [1964]) makes a similar case. He recounts Theophilos's biography, following him "through the unending days of his journey under the chestnut trees of Pilos or among the olive groves of his home ground" (22), and, upon visiting the actual landscapes where Theophilos lived, discovers their embodiment in his paintings:

You would feel the correspondence among the olive trees and the wrinkled faces [of the rural folk], in the little gardens with roses and the seashores smelling of freshly opened watermelon, in the earthenware jars and the [traditional folk] britches, in the rosy mountains and in the quiet, primitive, caiques. And immediately, in the same moment, the correspondence that existed among all of these things and Theophilos's paintings. True olive groves at last, true people, true things. (Elytis 1986:28)

Such observations enable Elytis to promote Theophilos from folk artist to artist proper:

European historians of art usually characterize the folk artist, the primitive artist, as a chronicler of his age and limit his importance to just that, or, at most, to the freshness which his simplistic viewpoint brings to the space of flexible interpretation of the external world. This is, up to a point, correct. But, no matter how we look at it, this view is insufficient to account for the case of Theophilos. (Elytis 1986:73)

In short, Seferis and Elytis describe a union of artistry and folk artistry, that in turn removes folk artistry from the realm of the folk, and puts it in the realm of high culture. Literary and artistic culture are not only grounded in Greek nature via the folk. Rather, folk culture *is* high culture when it manages to express Greek nature to its fullest. In addition to constructing nature as a wholly national location and national force, Seferis and Elytis also invent culture, even more than Dimaras, as an organic national entity. For Dimaras, national culture's folk and high aspects remained some-

how distinct, their shared psychological profile notwithstanding. Seferis and Elytis allow for erasure of the boundary, provided that the artist is a perfect vehicle for the expression of Greek nature and its inhabitants.

This brings me back to the representations in Romantic poetry of shepherds and poets among the trees and flowers that I mentioned at the beginning of this section, or even to the Cretan character in Solomos's poem. Interpreted through the lenses of Greek folkist theoretical and critical discourses—by reading the shepherd, say, as a representative *Greek* shepherd—these poems clearly contribute to the emergence and development of national literary culture. (This is not to claim that this is the only valid interpretation, but that it would have been a particularly salient interpretation given the discursive context.) When literary texts portray the folk expressing *fysiokratreia* or communing with nature, they participate in the construction of a bond between Greek folk culture and Greek nature, between a people and its national territory. Also, insofar as literary texts suggest an interrelationship or overlap between folk culture and high culture—among wandering Cretan singers and published poets proper—they too participate in the construction of a bond between Greek literature—or high culture in general—and Greek nature. Moreover, they legitimize these bonds by suggesting that they are *natural*. Indeed, the following verse by Zalokostas can be read as a conceit with a perfectly romantic-nationalist message, taking the narrator=representative nationalist, garden=nation, tree=high culture, and apples=the fruits of high culture:

I desired to decorate my garden with a tree,
so that it might have tall branches and green leaves,
and so that I might sit in its shade below,
and see its red apples hanging.²⁴

Of course this is not the only way to read such a poem. Yet, insofar as the particular nature-culture connections in poetry and theoretical nation-centered discourses reinforce each other, such a nationalist interpretation is by no means far fetched in historical context.

Finally, apart from recognizing how such literary and critical texts ground Greek culture in nature, I should also note that these

texts do not merely “appropriate” nature for the sake of culture, they also participate in the construction of the concepts of “nature” and “culture.” First, they construct nature as the physical location of folk culture, and consequently as the place where high culture is born. Second, they construct nature as the force behind such developments in culture, through appeals to “psychology,” “biology,” “physiology,” and the senses (aesthetics).²⁵ Finally, in typical Herderian fashion, they construct nature and culture as quintessentially *national* entities: reading Solomos in light of Kyriakidis and Dimaras suggests the poem represents a distinctive *Greek* nature (as opposed to *Cretan* nature, say, or European nature). Still, as far as the project of modernization, urbanization, and nationalization goes, there seems to be a drawback in constructing the rural as the unequivocal source of culture. Indeed, as I will argue in the next section, Greek romantic nationalists found it useful or even necessary to construct nature in more ambivalent ways as well. The ethnographers, in particular, invented their own version of nature as national wild(er)ness.

Inventing Wild(er)ness

So far, I have argued that theorizations and depictions of the folk’s almost naive closeness to nature served to ground Greek national culture in nature. Nationalist authors and critics constructed nature and the folk in ways that could establish the legitimacy of a modern Greek nation-state with its own territory and culture. But, if the nation’s modernizers saw Greek culture as so firmly rooted in nature, the question remains how they could simultaneously justify their desire to change it, to establish and impose modern western social, economic, and political models and institutions in the new state. In short, why change what is natural? Of course, the last thing Greek modernizers wanted was to construct an identity for Greece as rural or traditional. Thus, they had to contend with the risk of appeals to nature that could also undermine their modernizing nationalizing intentions. Turning now to ethnographic prose, I will now consider examples of how modern national culture constructed nature in such a way that it could function not only as a means for establishing its own legitimacy, but also as a justification for the changes demanded by the quest for rapid modernization.

Critics have observed that folkist discourses celebrate the folk's proximity to nature only insofar as the folk express something viewed by the establishment as benign, like a "love of nature" (Mullen 2000). When nature is constructed as "wilderness," a proximity to nature can also mean the folk are "wild," uncultured, and uncivilized. As Cosgrove (1995) explains, "[w]ilderness was always correlated with origins and infancy, in the sense not only of innocence, but also of untamed human passions and undisciplined conduct. It also was correlated with Armageddon. The seeds of social development may be located in wilderness, but the wild itself is savage, animal, and presocial" (29). Romance and pathology are intertwined. In this scenario, wild(er)ness—wilderness as location, wildness as the character of its human inhabitants—is humanity's historical and evolutionary origin. It may continue to serve as a source of nourishment, but the wild within (human behavior) and the wild without (nature) must be tamed.²⁶ Here, nation-centered folkism constructs the folk as national culture's internal other.

Mario Vitti (1975, 1991) argues that authors with largely nationalist preoccupations wrote ethnographic prose in which rural tradition was portrayed idealistically and sentimentally (e.g. the idylls of Drosinis). Authors of a more cosmopolitan bent, trying to address serious domestic problems that plagued the young nation and attempting to provoke social reform, wrote literature that was critical of the traditional rural Greek community (e.g. works of "naturalism" like Karkavitsas's *The Beggar*). Authors portrayed the folk both idealistically and critically. Conceiving of Vitti's dichotomy as two poles of a continuum, allowing for depictions of the folk ranging from sentimental idealism to scathing critical reformism, it is possible to ask *how* these two positions described by Vitti played out in particular literary representations. What I would like to suggest, even if only as a provisional hypothesis warranting further readings of additional texts and authors, is that both idealist and reformist aspects can be seen coming into play in the ways that certain authors portrayed the folk vis-à-vis nature: as naive inhabitants of nature (in the idylls), as the wild beasts of nature (in Karkavitsas's naturalism), or some combination of thereof. That is, one way that late nineteenth and early twentieth century ethnographic fiction addressed and participated in the socio-historical situation of the nation was by constructing Greek nature as ambivalent wild(er)ness.

To examine how ethnographers accomplished this, it is useful to consider the particularities of modern Greek folkism and its interpretation of the classical past, and especially of how Nikolaos Politis—the founder of official Greek folklore studies—retooled Tylor's well-known evolutionary "doctrine of survivals." According to Tylor's doctrine, aspects of the folk not approved of by modern culture (for instance, their wildness) are considered to be survivals of humanity's primitive past. However, since European elites held Greek antiquity to be culture at its *best*, not something primitive, Politis turned survivalism on its head, so to speak, thereby rendering it relevant for modern Greek folklorists. Politis viewed the folk as embodying the surviving elements of not a primitive past, but a classical culture that was subsequently corrupted by the influences of barbaric—wild—foreign conquerors.²⁷ In other words, the customs of the Greek folk, *bewildered* by foreign conquests, still possessed traces of Ancient Greek civilization. Thus, ethnographic authors could portray the folk as both the legitimate inhabitants of Greek nature (authentic descendants of ancient Greeks) and as wild beasts (contaminated by non-Greek, especially Ottoman, conquest) in need of cultivation (especially that provided by modernization).

The specificity of the Greek case can be further understood in relation to the Carolyn Merchant's (1995) analysis of the American case in terms of a "recovery narrative" of Western culture. By positing the idea of a fallen Eden that needs to be recovered, Merchant argues, Euramericans have legitimated various "civilizing" missions—Christianity, modern science, technology, capitalism—that encourage redemption of both land and human through labor on earth. Eastern wilderness and western deserts must be transformed from their wild states into cultivated gardens. American Indians—the nation's wild inhabitants—must fulfill their potential by being tamed and participating in the recovery through farming. "The origin story of capitalism is a movement from desert back to garden through the transformation of undeveloped nature into a state of civility and order" (Merchant 1995:136). In Merchant's view, Americans positioned themselves on a gradual ascent from a post-Fall-from-Eden wild(er)ness toward paradisiacal civilization. Modern Greeks, in contrast viewed their plight as an already successful cultural ascent out of the wild(er)ness that peaked in the Classical period, a subsequent descent into wild(er)-

ness as they endured successive periods of rule by invaders (Romans, Arabs, Franks, Ottomans), followed by yet another ascent that began with the emergence of the modern Greek nation-state and continuing with the developments of modern Greek culture that aspires to reach or surpass the level of classical Greece. The Greeks, too, have a “recovery narrative;” it is not Eden that must be recovered, but “Zion.”

My first example of Greek ethnography’s construction of ambivalent wild(er)ness is Drosinis’s (1859-1951) *The Herb of Love* (1922 [1901]). It tells the story of a young Greek shepherd named Yannios Karanikos who becomes infatuated, against the conventions of his society, with a gypsy girl named Zemfyra, after she supposedly put the evil eye on him while he was dancing at a village celebration. Yannios himself begins to wonder if she has indeed performed magic on him, and when he confronts her about the evil eye she simply responds with a rhetorical question that heightens his infatuation. Later, when he gets together with Zemfyra and her father, and the two men eat, drink, and dance, he has an opportunity (after the father passes out) to tell her he is smitten. Yannios is now madly in love, but his love is “unholy, illogical, and pointless” (97), since Zemfyra is a gypsy. Yannios’s acquaintances make fun of him when they see him so love-struck, although they do not know with whom. Again he seeks her out, supposedly to buy some “snake-weed” from her, and then she also sells him “the herb of love” (103) which she says will make him and whomever he gives it to madly in love forever. One day he finds a way to sneak some to her, and later they meet in secret and profess their love to each other. Later, however, Zemfyra is upset because she knows Yannios must go away for two years to the army. She accuses him that he got involved with her in this way purposefully, knowing he could escape from the situation using the army as an excuse, and she gives him a charm to wear. When, after two years, Yannios returns from the army, he no longer cares for Zemfyra—who is no longer pretty—and he makes plans to marry another girl, Yannoula. When Zemfyra finds him and he claims that “they aren’t kids anymore” (181), and even goes so far as to blame Zemfyra for everything, she becomes upset. They have an argument, and when Yannios pushes her she falls off a ledge into the sea. The story ends with an official report of the suicide of Zemfyra and the mysterious death of Yannios from a blow to the head, apparently from Zemfyra’s father.

On the one hand, Drosinis packs his story full of the celebratory "documentation" of rural village life typical of Greek folklore studies at the time. There are extended descriptions of rural life and customs, including an entire chapter about "the story of a grain of wheat." Such descriptions are often accompanied by the introduction of italicized vernacular words that presumably would have been unfamiliar to educated, urban readers of the time. On the other hand, Drosinis also depicts the otherness of the non-Christian gypsies, the cunning and passionate nature of the female, and the absence of restraint in rural life, so that only through death can the unconventional relationship of Zemfyra and Yannios be "resolved." His narrative demonstrates the danger of certain Greeks behaving in a wild and uncivilized manner. Yannios is a Greek, but he is one of the Greek *folk*, not a modern. His Greekness is imperfect, corrupted by the wildness of Greece's conquerors. The authentic, quaint, idyllic aspects of his lifestyle are worthy of admiration, and can be called upon for evidence of Greek cultural continuity. But, at the same time, he is not sufficiently civilized to protect or free himself from wild passion and temptations, the wild sex (female), or a wild race (gypsies). In short, read through the assumptions of romantic-nationalist discourse, the idyllic aspects of folklife in the text serve as an alibi for the legitimization of Greek culture while the folk's wild side constitutes an alibi for quests to modernize.

A second example comes from Ioannis Kondylakis's (1861-1920) novel *Bigfoot* (1983 [1892]), which takes place in 1863 in a Cretan village. It is about an 18-year old Cretan shepherd named Manolis, nicknamed "Bigfoot" because of his big feet, who comes down from the mountains to the village in order to get married. Throughout the text, Kondylakis describes and explains Manolis's actions through references to his proximity to nature. His proximity to nature, however, is ambivalent.

On the one hand, the author portrays Manolis, especially in the opening parts of the text, as a shining example of the folk who are close to nature, express a love for nature, and are at home in nature:

He had shown from a young age so much love for pastoral life that it was with great difficulty that his father separated him from his sheep in order to turn him over to the teacher. (Kondylakis 1986:6)

Indeed, Manolis hates school so much that he escapes the town and goes back to the familiarity and comfort of his mountain home, where he revels in the natural surroundings he so loves:

When he arrived back up there, amidst familiar mountains, familiar trees and familiar animals, among his only true acquaintances and friends, he was overcome by the emotion and joy of a person returning to his homeland, which he never expected to see again. (Kondylakis 1983:7)

Manolis is able to read the book-of-nature, where he sees both the divine:

He considered thunder the threat of divine indignation, just as in the joy of nature, blossoming and sunwashed, he saw the smile of divine goodness. (Kondylakis 1986:10)

as well as his fellow humans:

In desolate areas, his imagination had personified everything, had formed a chimerical world, in which he never felt lonely. (Kondylakis 1983:11)

He is most at home conversing, not with humans, but with "Thodoris," the sound of his own echo in a narrow ravine. Manolis is portrayed as a perfect example of the kind of folk-in-nature that Kyriakidis and Dimaras theorized:

His true family was comprised of those harmless animals, and the even more noble trees, and the rocks, and the wildflowers that would greet him amicably, as it were, as they swayed on ledges. Living and non-living things alike smiled at him with the tenderness that he probably saw only in the maternal face. Even the ravens that flew around high in the air cawing seemed to him friends. (Kondylakis 1983:8)

Yet, Kondylakis also suggests that Manolis's closeness to nature is not an unequivocally positive fact. Manolis is *too* close to nature. He has been "in" nature for too long:

In the desolate areas, in the silence of the mountains and winter-retreats of shepherds, it didn't take long for Manolis to become completely wild. [. . .] He would get as scared as a wild animal and was ready to run and hide whenever he saw a human. The only people he wasn't afraid of were his companions, shepherds and cheese-makers, half-wild like himself. (Kondylakis 1983:9-10)

This is a great source of trouble for Manolis. Though "he could recognize the animals of his flock one-by-one (and there were more than a few)" he is unable to learn the 24 letters of the alphabet (8). Like his mountain companions, he is a hopelessly "uneducated and illiterate" (7) and "naive shepherd" (20). His wild appearance, characterized always by "nervous worriedness and the sparkling eyes of a completely untamed beast" (10-11), make it impossible for him to get close to other people in the village, "who began to figure out his anthropophobia" (11).

Nevertheless, upon growing into puberty, and seeing a male-goat "jumping" a female (15), Manolis makes up his mind that it is time to leave the mountains and go down to the village, a decision that he expresses in terms of wildness: "Am I going to keep living in the mountains like a wild goat?" (16). His father, of course, is delighted that "his half-wild son" has begun to show "tame/domestic tendencies" (17). The time has come for him "too, to join the class of humans" (17), for his "humanization" (21). Kondylakis dramatizes in a most conspicuous manner Manolis's own realization of the changes he is going through in terms of nature at the end of the second chapter, where he talks to his dog Triamati, and for the first time begins his transformation from wild animal into civilized human:

"We won't go anymore to the [wild] mountains, okay Triamati? It's good here in the village . . . and there are pretty girls. Did you see Pigi? With her pots of basil [note: basil is not a *wild* herb in Crete, but is planted in pots on porches and balconies of village houses] and her dark eyes? . . . We won't go anymore to the flocks, okay Triamati?"

Triamati, however, did not appear to be in agreement. He could not be satisfied in a place where he had so many enemies.

And so he responded to the cajoling of his master with gloom. At least that is what Manolis thought, who then said, "What! You don't like it in the village?"

And after observing him for several more moments, until he recognized for the first time that Triamati was not a human, Manolis told him, "If you too were Manolis [i.e. human], you would like it. But you're only a dog, poor old guy! What can I do?" (Kondylakis 1983:40)

The problem, though, is that Manolis is "not experienced" enough (60) to get married. So, although his father Saitonikolis gives his word to the Pigi's father (Thomas) that Manolis and Pigi will eventually get married, for now they are not given permission to get engaged and must therefore avoid one another, as traditional custom would not allow them to meet alone. In the meantime, Manolis should help with the building of his and Pigi's future house, learn how to do farm work—a "less wild" occupation than shepherding in the mountains—and "gain experience in the world" (60), and mature.

Manolis, however, is very much unable to harness his wild instincts and urges. Still unaccustomed to village morals, he finds himself constantly violating proper codes of behavior. Thus, although he tells Pigi that he prefers the village to "his animals" (64), his behavior indicates that he thinks he is still in the mountains with his flocks. He repeatedly visits Pigi secretly at her house, sometimes trying, "out of control" (124), to kiss her against her will. This leads to serious arguments with and threats from Pigi's brother and father. To complicate matters, there is another man, Tereres, who is competing for Pigi's love, and thus threatens to "tie up" Manolis should he pursue his relationship with her. With all the trouble, Manolis only knows how to react in—by village standards—extreme ways. His behavior around the village is "incorrigible" and scandalous (168-169). Acting as though he has lost interest in Pigi, he starts chasing after other girls in the village, in particular, Zervoudaina's daughter Margi (or Marouli). Margi is not interested in him, however, and even if she were, it would make little difference since Manolis's father will not go back on his word with Pigi's father. As the novel unfolds, there are various incidents in which Manolis gains, loses, and regains interest in each of the two girls, and many arguments between him and his

parents about whom he will marry. Also, Zervoudaina tries to get Manolis away from Pigi so that he will want her own daughter, and then later tries to convince him that Margi doesn't want the "wildman" (152). (Eventually, we learn that Zervoudaina, a widow, is in love with Manolis and wants him for herself.) On many occasions, in his disappointment, Manolis says that he is tempted to give up, "to turn his back on building the house, and take to the mountains" (86).

Throughout the ups and downs of these events (the main action of the text), Kondylakis portrays Manolis's immaturity in terms of the residual mountain wildness left in him.²⁸ One of the villagers (Astronomos), for example, observes that Manolis is afraid of the relatively harmless Tereres but not afraid of animals like mules that are, in fact, dangerous. Astronomos explains that "Since he had lived up until now with animals, he was not afraid of them, but he was afraid of people because he was not familiar with them" (118). Manolis does begin to learn, though. Following the advice of his father, he "punishes" (130) Tereres, for example, in a "manly accomplishment" (130) by tying *him* up and hanging him from an olive tree (129). Now, when in disappointment he thinks of escaping back to the wild mountains, he realizes that it is too late, that he is too connected to his life in the village and, in particular, by his love for Pigi (131). He does consider the possibility that the two steal away to the mountains, but Pigi responds with a characteristic reference to wildness:

Are you kidding me? You want us to go and live forever in the mountains? What, are we wild goats or something? (Kondylakis 1983:137)

Manolis, however, defends his previous life in the wild:

Well, the wild goats are better than many people like Tereres, like . . . [. . .] The wild goats, he continued embittered, don't call people names, and they don't bother those who don't bother them. (Kondylakis 1983:137)

Pigi's denial makes Manolis consider taking her against her will and eloping, and when he loses all self-control while making an attempt to kiss her, he whispers the "words of a wild erotic fit" (140).

By the novel's end, Manolis recognizes his own physical strength compared with other people, as Astronomos observes (172-73), and begins learning to harness and control it, putting it to more socially acceptable uses. At a village celebration, Manolis, unbelievably awkward up until now, suddenly leads the dance, the "lion of the village" (177), displaying rare bodily strength and robustness, without "rural crudeness," among the most beautiful of all the young men in the village (177). When some young Turkish men come and cause trouble at the dance, Manolis is one of the young Cretans who drives them away, thereby becoming a village hero with his "manly accomplishment" (183).

His wildness, now under control, comes in handy when he is pursued by the authorities, as he runs away "as fast as a wild goat" (182) to go into hiding in the mountains temporarily. When he comes back to the village, "grown more fully into a man" (185), he makes one last "crazy" mistake, attempting while drunk to kidnap Margi (to elope), but mistakenly taking Zervoudaina, who offers no resistance. Upon realizing his mistake, he returns to his family and consents to marrying Pigi as was agreed at the beginning of the story.

Kondylakis portrays Manolis throughout the book in ambivalent terms, as the main character gradually undergoes the transition from total wildness, to a much more restrained—perhaps cultivated, but definitely socially acceptable—masculinity. As the Cretan protagonist of the work, he appears in a largely positive light. He possesses many benign character traits. He is sensitive; his feelings are readily hurt when he is picked on. He is "handsome" (59), a "sensible boy" (78), "strong and brave" (78), and seen by many as the "best" (most eligible bachelor) in the whole village (104, 152). He is not "a bad boy" (92) like Tereres, and even performs his masculine duty by punishing him. Also, he possesses a true appreciation and love for nature. Simply put, he is a hero with a pure and noble heart, and thus in possession of the basic personality characteristics—heroism, individualism, gallantry, sensitivity, love of nature—that the modern Greek folk were believed to hold in common with their glorious ancient ancestors (see Herzfeld 1986:41, 50, 58). But, Manolis also appears as the immature boy who must learn to control his wild behavior if he is to become a true inhabitant of the village, and an able defender of his Greek virtues (such as from the troublemaking Turks at the village celebration).²⁹

By constructing wild(er)ness as ambivalent, Kondylakis tells a story that celebrates the folk but also illustrates their need for acculturation. In fact, he does more than that, since Crete at the time was still under Ottoman control and not yet part of the Greek nation-state. He allows Manolis to remain more wild than the protagonists of other ethnographic texts that take place in other parts of Greece already part of the nation-state, since Manolis's wildness enables him, for instance, to strike the troublemaking Turkish boys at the novel's end.³⁰ Nevertheless, the novel itself predicts that Crete will soon be part of Greece (61), and so it also begins preparing the way—through literary alibis—for justifying modernization and nationalization.³¹

Nature, Culture, Criticism

Folkism has had many effects on modern Greek culture—in the collection of folklore, the writing of literary texts, and developments in literary criticism. The emergence of a national literature in Greece involved literature and criticism themselves constructing particular conceptions of, and intimate relationships among, place, nature, and folk in accordance with the views of folkism and, more generally, romantic nationalism. In the poetry and theoretical texts I examined, authors constructed nature as a national location and as a force that bonded together the land and folk of Greece's regions in an organic unity, thereby enabling the nation's high culture to appear as the natural product of such bonds. In the ethnographic texts I considered, authors made such constructions of nature more complex by focusing on wild(er)ness. They constructed both aspects—the location (wilderness) and the force (wildness)—as ambivalent national entities. Cosgrove (1995) notes that: "In Europe wilderness existed in time; in America it could be found in space" (33). My examination of Greece, on the "margins" of Europe, suggests that a broader consideration of the European case reveals that wilderness was conceived there in time (as a primitive, barbaric force) *and* in space (as rural, especially mountainous, areas inhabited by shepherds, klefts and other folk). Greek authors did not merely revere the folk for being organically connected to their physical environment, but also presented evidence for the folk's need to modernize, especially in those regions

recently, or about to be, incorporated into the young Greek state. Their protagonists were vehicles for the expression of whatever ancient Greek virtues had “survived” in the folk’s bosom, but simultaneously warned of the folk’s need to be purified from any excess wildness and Eastern contamination, thereby serving as an alibi for modernization.

In many respects, the nation-building project has been a success. However, such nation-centered constructions of nature and the folk by nationalists have also paved the way for more local constructions of nature by regionalists, whose own goals and aspirations are sometimes at odds with those of the modernizing nationalists (e.g., Ball 2003). Also, nationalist constructions of the folk and their wild(er)ness in terms of specific regions have also provided a context in which later inhabitants of those same regions construct their own versions of such terms (e.g., Ball 2002). Inasmuch as the nation, nature, and place are dialectically, socio-ecologically mutually constitutive (Harvey 1996), this is not surprising.

Here I have begun to explore the relationship of nature and literary culture in ways that foreground the latter’s constructions of the former. Thus, my analysis is largely consistent with a “cultural studies” approach to literary culture that strives to understand its historical formation and reproduction. Whereas romantic nationalist criticism discerned the forces of nature behind the evolution of national culture, cultural studies critics have striven, in large measure, to do the opposite: to explain how culture—no matter how natural it may appear—is *socially* constructed. This tradition has its origins at least as far back as the 1950s when Roland Barthes investigated how particular uses of language, which he called “mythical,” function to de-politicize culture, transforming “history into nature” (1972:129). Extending semiological critique beyond language per se, he also argued that the connotative and denotative functions of images in mass advertising work together to make nature seem “spontaneously to produce the scene represented” (1977:45). Barthes provided an early account of how such “nature” facilitates the existence and perpetuation of a bourgeois society. By now, the dismantling of such appropriations of nature by culture is commonplace in literary studies.³²

As Neil Evernden (1992) writes in *The Social Creation of Nature*, “the examination of ‘nature’ must entail not simply the objects we

assign to that category, but also the category itself: the *concept* of nature, its origins and implications" (xi). At least one ecocritic, David Mazel (1996; 2000), has radically problematized nature from the perspective of American national culture. Inspired by Foucauldian genealogy, Said's notion of "orientalism," and Judith Butler's work on the body, Mazel examines the construction of a gendered and racialized national "wilderness" and "environment," as well as the constitution of ecological national subjects. He argues that cultural critics should analyze environmentalism, not as "*resistance* to power," but as "just one of many potential modes for *exercising* power [. . .] over the real territories and lives that the environment displaces and for which it is invoked as a representation" (1996:144). By problematizing "environment" itself, Mazel not only examines literature's discursive power to enable particular human-nature relationships, but also asks how national literature *constructs* nature itself (as a racialized, gendered national wilderness/environment). In a similar fashion, I have attempted throughout this article not merely to uncover appropriations of nature-folk-place that contributed to the emergence and development of modern Greek national culture, but also to emphasize that such appropriations in fact construct nature-folk-place in particular ways.

Yet, there are important limitations to the particular approach that I have taken. For one thing, insofar as my own analysis represents nature merely as something waiting to be appropriated by cultural processes, it borders on constructing nature as if it were nothing but a passive resource waiting to be used by an omnipotent society for particular political ends. From the perspective of a socio-ecological constructivism (Harvey 1996)—and not merely social constructivism—I have only been telling half the story. By focusing on the particular ways that national literary culture constructed nature-folk-place, I have risked constructing a view of the sociocultural as a transcendent force endowed with seemingly arbitrary power to construct nature however it sees fit. That is, I have risked implying that nature is "merely" constructed by culture in accordance with perceived social, political, and economic needs, irrespective of actual material, biological, and ecological processes.

And so I will conclude with one final observation: In light of contemporary environmental problems and ecological issues, a

pressing question for today's critics would seem to be how to examine and account for nature's constitutive role in the developments of culture, but without positing the kinds of nature-culture dichotomies that wind up turning nature into a legitimation strategy for culture, that use nature as a way to depoliticize culture. Like Dimaras and Kyriakidis, such critics would consider the role of physical nature in literary developments. Also, like Seferis or Elytis, they would take into consideration the role of the "folk" in such developments. However, unlike these critics, they would not explain such developments in terms of a transcendent nature (geographical location or force), but simultaneously trace literature and criticism's own role in constructing the concepts of "nature," "culture," and "folk." Thus, in the spirit of the approach I have taken in this paper, criticism would also seek to understand literature's appropriations and constructions of nature. The question remains: How can criticism accomplish this without purporting to explain such cultural constructions of nature in terms of a transcendent or omnipotent *culture* (national, capitalist, or otherwise)?

Notes

¹Scholars employ the term "Cretan Renaissance" to describe the post-Byzantine period of literary and artistic flourishing influenced by the Italian Renaissance, from the fourteenth century to the Baroque, on the Venetian-ruled island of Crete prior to its fall to the Ottoman Empire in 1669 (Holton 1991). Most other lands inhabited by Greeks had already fallen to the Ottomans by the time of Constantinople's fall in 1453 (Clogg 1992:10).

²All translations are my own and are intended to be as literal as possible.

³On the Cretan genre of folk poetry known as the *mandinadha*, see Ball (2000, 2002, 2006).

⁴Insofar as Solomos contrasts in detail the pastoral beauty of Crete with the sublime sweetness of the sound, one might argue that the poet *explicitly* distanced himself from the pastoralism of the Cretan Renaissance.

⁵Spencer points out several ways that nature was appropriated in the quest for a distinctive American literature: as the most sublime source of inspiration (13), as the most Arcadian source of inspiration (50), as a means of regeneration (47), as a means of cultural purification (28), and as the author's most authentic inner inspiration (71). Spencer also pointed out how, with the rise of the organic model of a national literature, some critics began to replace (and, in a sense, conflate) the idea of *national* literature with *natural* literature, a striking example of which was Charles T. Brooks's suggestion to typesetters that in their

printing proposals for American literature, they should everywhere substitute the word "natural" for "national" (see pp. 197-198).

⁶Instead of "folkism" I could have used the term "folklorism." However, the latter term has the disadvantage of conflating romantic nationalist approaches to folklore studies with the discipline of folklore itself, which, in many cases, has become highly critical of folkism. Also, the term "folklorism" (and "folklorismus") is already used to signify the (problematic) notion of "secondhand" or "commodified" folklore (see Bendix 1997:176). Another advantage of the term "folkism" (compare with "racism" and "sexism") is that it reminds us that romantic nationalist approaches to folklore also have undesirable consequences for actual people who are categorized as "folk" (or "peasants," "hicks," or "hillbillies").

⁷For a brief introduction in English to the early collection of Greek folklore, see Beaton's (1980) introduction. For a detailed outline and ideological analysis, focusing on nationalism, of the development of early Greek folklore as an academic discipline, see Herzfeld (1986). For a poststructuralist critique of Greek folklore, see Alexiou (1985).

⁸Consider the following passages from Herder:

Nature [. . .] has sketched with mountain ranges she formed and with the rivers she made flow from them the rough but definite outline of the entire history of man . . . One height created a nation of hunters, thus supporting and necessitating a savage state; another, more spread out and mild, provided a field for shepherd peoples and supplied them with tame animals; another made agriculture easy and essential; and still another began with navigation and fishing and led finally to trade . . . In many regions the customs and ways of life continued for millennia; in others they have changed, . . . but always in harmony with the terrain from which the change came . . . Oceans, mountain chains, rivers are the most natural boundaries not only of lands, but also of peoples, customs, languages, and empires; even in the greatest revolutions of human affairs they have been the guiding lines and limits of world history. (Herder in Wilson 1989: 24)

⁹Scholars do not agree on a conception of Modern Greek Romanticism. See, for example, Constantinides (1985). This is of little consequence to my own study. I do not want to propose a theory of nature in Greek Romanticism, but rather to examine how certain poems that have come to be identified as romantic participate in folkism.

¹⁰Scholars do not agree about how to "define" ethnography. See Beaton (1994:72), who conceives of it as "folkloric realism," for a brief discussion of the debate. This matters little for the purposes of my own study. Since I am not directly concerned with debates over "realism." My overriding concern is how such authors treat nature, regardless of their categorization as "romantic," "folkloric," or "rural," for example.

¹¹While it is reasonable to approach ethnography in terms of its rural/regional aspects, some critics unfortunately turn their analysis into a basis for more general, deterministic schemes for constructing Greek literary history.

Vitti's (1975) useful analysis, for example, explains the development of Greek prose via the (folkist) assumption that literature about rural folk, and its "country lore," can never be as complex as literature addressing modern urban life. He even states that the "moral and social aims which could be expressed through rural reality" are "limited" (38) and claims that by the twentieth century, the "possibilities of country life had been exhausted in fiction" (38). Ironically, this forces him to imply that Nikos Kazantzakis, Greece's only internationally renowned prose writer, is an aberration, out of step—that is, *behind*—his fellow Greek authors. Similar assumptions inform Beaton's (1994) account of modern Greek literary history.

¹²As did Greek geographers, historians, and archaeologists, as well (Peckham 2001).

¹³The klefts (*kleftes*) were brigand-guerrillas who played a military role in the struggle for national independence. Considered as important representatives of the "folk" in Greece, Greek folklorists have even invented a special category for their folksongs (see Herzfeld 1986).

¹⁴From the poem "The Kleft" ["O kleftis"] by Alexandros Rizos-Rangavis (Meraklis 1977:115).

¹⁵From the poem "In the Shade of the Pine Tree" ["Stis koukounarias ton iskio"] by Panayiotis Soutsos (Meraklis 1977:107).

¹⁶From "My Dream" ["To oneiron mou"] by Panayiotis Soutsos (Meraklis 1977:107).

¹⁷From "My Tree" ["To dendron mou"] by Georgios Zalokostas (Meraklis 1977:58).

¹⁸From "What I Love" ["Ti agapo"] by Angelos Vlachos (Meraklis 1977:144).

¹⁹From "The Kiss" ["To filima"] by Georgios Zalokostas (Meraklis 1977:58).

²⁰From Panayiotis Soutsos's "In the Shade of the Pine Tree" (Meraklis 1977:107)

²¹Kyriakidis's reference to authenticity aligns him with many of his contemporaries in Europe and America engaged in folklore research: "Folklore has long served as a vehicle in the search for the authentic, satisfying a longing for an escape from modernity. The ideal folk community, envisioned as pure and free from civilization's evils, was a metaphor for everything that was not modern" (Bendix 1997:7).

²²See Leontis (1995:84-89) for an account of Greek aesthetic nationalism, including "what may have been the first aesthetic approach to *topos*," the work of Pericles Yannopoulos.

²³See Dimitris Tziouvas (1989) on the "aesthetics of nativeness." Demosthenes Danielidis, for example, wrote about Greece's "atmosphere, full of the cleanest sun, a divine sunbath and purification from Eastern sluggishness" and its "harmony of sparse shapes and colors, an inexhaustible source of cultural energies for Modern Greeks" (77). Theotokas writes about Greece: "It is the land of pure and clean ideas. The goddess of Greece is a redemption from thought, a catharsis of the soul. [. . .] Here everything is simple, so beautiful, so deeply simple, that their simplicity has been named a *miracle*" (79).

²⁴From Zalokostas's "My Tree" ["To dendron mou"] (Meraklis 1977:58).

²⁵Danos (2002) points out that, in Yannopoulos's case, even "physiology" was more a matter of the senses than of race:

It must be emphasized, however, than Yannopoulos's concept of the "physiology" of the individual and of the race did not allude to biological—and, by extension, racist—characteristics. Instead, it was a highly aestheticised concept: the understanding of racial "physiology" was to be derived from an understanding of—better, an immersion into—nature; that is, through an excursion into Greek, particularly Attic, landscape. (Danos 2002:87)

²⁶Max Oelschlaeger (1991:25-27) argues that, according to history, longing for civilization and abhorrence of wild nature is not necessarily part of "human nature."

²⁷For further details, see Herzfeld (1986:102-104).

²⁸This is consistent, according to Cosgrove (1995), with nineteenth-century romanticism in general, wherein "[c]hildhood was considered close to chaos, thus requiring the civilizing process" (35).

²⁹David Mazel (2000), writing about the early national period of the United States, argues that "'Wilderness' misnames an anxiety as geography" (23). Similarly, in a text like Kondylakis's, "wild" misnames an anxiety (about those qualities of the folk perceived as incompatible with western modernity) as psychology attributable to a particular geography.

³⁰This is Peckham's (2001:110-111) reading of Kondylakis's novel in terms of "the frontier." He interprets Manolis's incorporation into village life as an allegory for Crete's incorporation into the Greek nation-state. Also, there are analogies with Mazel's (2000) treatment of wilderness in the United States. Just as the *preservation* of wilderness in the United States could "prove an effective vehicle for reconstituting the manhood of the new American patriarch" (25), so could positive representations of a degree of wildness in the Cretan folk prove effective in constituting masculine heroes who were able to fight against the Ottoman Empire for Greek national freedom.

³¹This interpretation of Kondylakis's work offers itself for comparison with another work by a Cretan author about a "wild" Cretan inhabitant: Nikos Kazantzakis's *Freedom or Death* [*Kapetan Michalis*]. Whereas Kondylakis narrates the gradual domestication of Manolis, Kazantzakis writes about the almost fantastic adventures of Captain Michalis in love and war. Captain Michalis, though, never undergoes a process of domestication at all; he scorns everything domestic. Indeed, it is arguably his wildness that enables him, at the novel's close, to rush headlong into a battle he knows he can not win, aware that freedom and death are inseparable. In this scenario, wildness is not something to be tamed (nationalized), it is something to be emulated in spirit: Captain Michalis, himself a "beast," is able to recognize and accept the fact that, at some level, all reality is hopelessly wild (red in tooth and claw), and that *no* culture can ever hope to deliver humans from this primordial fact. Captain Michalis, then, serves not as an allegory for acculturation or nationalization, but as a "spiritual" example for individuals who strive to achieve some kind of spiritual salvation that

rejects, and lies beyond, the non-existent salvation offered by nostalgic retreats to nature or faith in the deliverance of culture (national or otherwise).

³²Mary Louise Pratt's (1992) critique of European colonial imperialism provides a well-known recent example. She explores the "systematizing of nature" in relation to the development of a "planetary consciousness" (29) which, among other things, "overwrote local and peasant ways of knowing within Europe just as it did local indigenous ones abroad" (35).

References

- Alexiou, Margaret. 1985. "Folklore: An Obituary?" in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*. 9:1-28.
- Alexiou, Stylianos. 1979 [1971]. *Bergadis: Apokopos. I Voskopoula*. Athens: Nea Elliniki Vivliothiki.
- Ball, Eric L. 2000. "Negotiating Regional Identity in the 'Literature' of Everyday Life: The Case of a Cretan *Mandinadologos*" in *The Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, Volume 26(2):49-94.
- Ball, Eric L. 2002. "Where Are the Folk? The Cretan Mantinada as Placed Literature" in *The Journal of Folklore Research*, Volume 39(2-3):147-172.
- Ball, Eric L. 2003. "Greek Food After Mousaka: Cookbooks, 'Local' Culture, and the Cretan Diet" in *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Volume 21(1).
- Ball, Eric L. 2006. "Guarding the Wild: Place, Tradition, Literature, and the Environment in the Work of a Cretan Folk Poet" forthcoming in *Journal of American Folklore*.
- Bancroft-Marcus, Rosemary. 1991. "The pastoral mode" in David Holton, Ed. *Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 79-102.
- Barthes, Roland. 1972 [1957]. *Mythologies*. Translated by Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Beaton, Roderick. 1980. *Folk Poetry of Modern Greece*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beaton, Roderick. 1994. *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bendix, Regina. 1997. *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Buell, Lawrence. 1995. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Constantinides, Elizabeth. 1985. "Towards a Redefinition of Greek Romanticism" in *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 3(2):121-136.
- Cosgrove, Denis. 1995. "Habitable earth: Wilderness, empire, and race in america" in David Rothenberg, Ed. *Wild Ideas*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 27-41.
- Danos, Antonis. 2002. "The culmination of aesthetic and artistic discourse in nineteenth-century Greece: Periklis Yannopoulos and Nikolaos Gyzis" in *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 20(1):75-112.

- Dick, Ernst S. 1989. "The Folk and their Culture: The Formative Concepts and the Beginnings of Culture" in Robert J. Smith and Jerry Stannard, Ed. *The Folk: Identity, Landscapes, and Lore*. Lawrence: University of Kansas. 11-28.
- Dimaras, K. Th. 1982. *Ellinikos Romantismos*. Athens: Ermis.
- Dorson, Richard M. 1966. "The question of folklore in a new nation" in *Journal of the Folklore Institute*. 3(3):277-298.
- Drosinis, Yeorgios. 1922. *To Votani tis Aghapis*. Athens: Sidheris.
- Elytis, Odysseas. 1986. *O Zoghrapos Theofilos*. Athens: Gnosi.
- Evernden, Neil. 1992. *The Social Creation of Nature*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1986 [1982]. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. New York: Pella.
- Holton, David, Ed. 1991. *Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jusdanis, Gregory. 2001. *The Necessary Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jusdanis, Gregory. 2002. "Greek Romanticism: A cosmopolitan discourse" in Angela Esterhammer, Ed. *Romantic Poetry*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 269-286.
- Kapsomenos, Eratosthenis G. 1998. *O Solomos ke I Elliniki Politismiki Paradhosi*. Athens: Vouli ton Ellinon.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. 1981b [1950]. *O Kapetan Michhalis*. Athens: Ekdhoseis Elenis N. Kazantzaki.
- Kondylakis, Ioannis. 1983. *O Patouchas*. Athens: Galaxia.
- Kyriakidis, Stilpon P. 1978. "I Fisiolatreia eis ta dhmotika traghoudhia" in *To Dhimotiko Tragoudhi: Sinaghoi Meleton*. Athens: Neoellinika Meletimata.
- Kyriakidou-Nestoros, Alki. 1977. *I Theoria tis Ellinikis Laografias*. Athens: Moraitis.
- Leontis, Artemis. 1995. *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mazel, David. 1996. "American literary environmentalism as domestic orientalism" in Cheryl Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, Ed. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press. 137-146.
- Mazel, David. 2000. *American Literary Environmentalism*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Meraklis, M.G. 1977. *I Elliniki Piisi: Anthologia Grammatologia*. Athens: Sokolis.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 1995. "Inventing Eden: Western culture as a recovery narrative" in William Cronon, ed. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company. 132-159.
- Miller, Perry. 1967. *Nature's Nation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mullen, Patrick B. 2000. "Belief and the American folk" in *Journal of American Folklore* 113(448):119-143.
- Nash, Roderick. 1982 [1967, 1973]. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Oelschlaeger, Max. 1991. *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Peckham, Robert Shannan. 2001. *National Histories, Natural States: Nationalism and the Politics of Place in Greece*, London: I.B. Tauris.
- Pratt, Mary-Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.
- Seferis, Yiorgos. 1974 [1947] *Dhokimes: protos tomos (1936-1947)*. Athens: Ikaros.
- Solomos, Dionysios. 1986. *Apanda (tomos protos: piimata)*. Athens: Ikaros.
- Spencer, Benjamin T. 1957. *The Quest for Nationality: An American Literary Campaign*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Tziouvas, Dimitris. 1989. *I Metamorfoseis tou Ethnismou ke to Idheologyima tis Ellinikotitas sto Mesopolemo*. Athens: Odysseus.
- Vitti, Mario. 1975. "Rural Greekness in Greek prose fiction" in Peter A. Mackridge, Ed. *Greece: The Modern Voice*. Jamaica: St. John's University. 27-40.
- Vitti, Mario. 1991. *Idheologyiki Leitouryia tis Ellinikis Itbografias*. [3rd edition (expanded)]. Athens: Kedhros.
- Wilson, William A. 1976. *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wilson, William A. 1989 [1973]. "Herder, folklore and romantic nationalism" in Elliott Oring, Ed. *Folk Groups and Folklore Genres: A Reader*. Logan: Utah State University Press. 21-37.
- Yannopoulos, Pericles. 1981. *I Elliniki Grammi*. Athens: Ekdhoseis Ermeias.

International Relations and Expediencies: British Empire, Greek-Cypriots and the Questioning of Their National Descent

by THANASSIS BRAVOS

The Allegation

This essay was inspired by the finding of a document exchanged between the Colonial and Foreign Offices which contained a paper elaborated by Arnold Toynbee expressing his professional opinion about Cypriots' Greek descent.¹ That paper, written apparently after the 1931 Cypriot uprising, was finally published in the Survey of International Affairs attached to his article entitled *Cyprus, the British Empire and Greece*.² What puzzled Professor Toynbee in that Historical Note of his was the allegation from some official quarters that the contemporary Greek-speaking Orthodox Christian Cypriots were not historically true Greeks in the same sense as the contemporary Greeks of Greece. That unprecedented point of view was added to what could be called the Cypriot picture in the eyes of the British. Thereby, apart from the non-Greekness allegation, the notion, adopted by the Colonial Office and the Government of Cyprus³ that "there was no widespread movement for *enosis* (i.e. union with Greece),"⁴ remained unchanged till independence was obtained in 1960. Always in combination with this latter perception, however, was the third element of that "Cypriot picture," i.e. the opinion which maintained that the unionist movement had only been fostered by self-

THANASSIS BRAVOS, Ph.D in Modern History, currently works at the University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece.

seeking politicians and whipped up by a few fanatical clergymen without any real public support.⁵ It would actually be difficult to consider it coincidental that these three fixed ideas were circulated and endorsed by the British, to support their consistent stand against the Greek population of the island that there was no legal ground for enosis.

This being the case, on the chief controversial question—the conflict between the British Government and the Greek-Cypriots over the self-determination of Cyprus—the British side imported into the controversy another and quite distinct question: that of Greek-Cypriots Greekness.

In order to resolve Cyprus non-Greekness problem, Toynebee posed a twofold question: when was the island Hellenised by the Greek colonists and at what date did Greek become the prevalent language in Cyprus? To answer it, he made reference, on the one hand, to the evidence existing at that time of Ancient Greek inscriptions in Cyprus, of the geographical distribution of Ancient Greek dialects, and of Assyrian and Egyptian and Hittite historical records; and, on the other hand, to the prominent historians whose testimony “was weighty, because in their minds, when they were forming their opinions, the question of the “Greekness” of Cyprus was a purely scientific and academic question, and they gave their answers without any thought of their bearing upon current political controversies.” So saying, he implied, indirectly but explicitly, that the whole question was made up and it had nothing to do with real feelings and the Cypriots’ national consciousness.

The negation of Cyprus Greekness was not an opinion fostered by all British political spectrum. What is important, however, is that this view endured and with the passing of time irreparably poisoned British-Cypriot and British-Greek relations. Nor is it without significance that this specific British view toward Cypriots’ descent loomed large only during crisis periods, a fact that could justify the allegation the whole thing was nothing more than a political lever for quelling the enosis movement that represented the Greek-Cypriots’ will to unite with Greece.

The danger of Cyprus (through Greece) falling into the hands of France (at that time the only power challenging Britain throughout the Middle East area), made the London government acquiesce to the Admiralty’s insistence on the retention of Cyprus.⁶ It was so decided despite Venizelos’ statement before the

Supreme Council at the Paris Peace Conference, in 1919, for inclusion of Cyprus into territories Greece should take as war gains and despite the Cypriot delegation's memoranda calling for cession of the island to Greece. The British reasoning was that it would need the island to counterbalance the strategic advantage gained by France from her mandate over Syria and to execute British responsibilities in Mesopotamia and Palestine; Cyprus protected the approaches to the Suez Canal, and, being on the direct line from Taranto to Karachi, it would serve as a refueling station on the air route to India. In any case, Britain could not run the risk of Cyprus falling in the hands of a potentially hostile power.⁷

In 1931, the Greek-Cypriots, ruined and devastated in the wake of world economic depression, asked once more for more liberal economic measures on the part of the Colonial Government and eventually—for the first time, along with the Turks—they voted down the budget bill prepared by the latter, rose up against colonial forces,⁸ set fire to the Governor's house and demanded union with Greece.⁹ It was at that time Professor Toynbee felt obliged to refute the allegations about the "non-Greekness" of the island.

After the plebiscite of January 1950,¹⁰ the appearance of E.O.K.A. (National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters) and the initiation of an overt and armed struggle against the colonial forces, the "non-Greekness" issue again made its appearance. The views that the Cypriots could claim no Greek heritage, since they didn't speak Greek, or that they were Anatolian hybrids were heard not only in the pubs frequented by the British community and among government officials in Cyprus,¹¹ but in the House of Lords, by governmental representatives and even in the British government itself. Consequently, in February 1954, in the House of Lords, the Cypriot descent was questioned and it was said that Greece "had [over Cyprus] only some shadow titles based upon the division of the Roman Empire into the Eastern and Western parts,"¹² Furthermore, on 29 August 1954, the British government issued a terse statement maintaining: "Cyprus belonged to Greece only for a brief period in the fourth century."¹³ Moreover, when a British representative saw the American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in August 1954, in order to persuade the Eisenhower Administration to throw its weight against the inclusion of Cyprus on the Manhattan agenda, he told Dulles—as is recorded

into State Department's archives—that “the Cypriots were not Greeks at all, although they spoke the same language and had the same religion.”¹⁴ This view was more congenial to the Conservatives in Britain than to other parties as Mr. Noel-Baker, liberal MP and Attlee's government member, stated in the House of Commons, September 14, 1956, “the Tory Party still use, and I am afraid they still believe, those empty legends that Cyprus has never been Greek; that, anyway, the vast majority of the Cypriots want to stay within the Commonwealth as they are.”¹⁵

In a desperate efforts to prove that Cyprus should never be ceded to Greece, the British confused their argumentation regarding Cyprus Greekness or non-Greekness, sometimes saying that Cypriots spoke Greek but it was not clear that they were true Greeks, sometimes that Cyprus constituted part of Greece in antiquity only for a while and for that reason the latter couldn't lay serious claims to the island, or that, although Cypriots spoke Greek, Greece had no right to the island because “Cyprus had never in all its history been part of Greece and there was absolutely no case for Greece having it, except that there was a decided majority of Greeks, or at any rate, Greek-speaking people,” as the Secretary of State for War, Lord Milner, wrote privately to Fiddes, the Permanent Under Secretary for the Colonies, in January 16, 1919.¹⁶

Greekness Attested

In 1954, a statement drafted by the dean and professors' assembly of Athens University declared, “We indignantly rebut any negation of absolute Greek character of Cyprus and we describe it as malicious forgery of historical truth . . . We also rebut the British allegation that modern Greece has no historical right to Cyprus on the grounds that it has never been part of a Greek state. This allegation is not only historically unsubstantial but absurd too, since during the antiquity a united Greek state never existed. Nevertheless the island was considered part of the Hellenic world and for that reason was included both in Alexander the Great's and in the Byzantine Empire.”¹⁷

C.M. Woodhouse, put the view more bluntly, “Nothing could be more absurd than the fashionable slogan of the 1950s, that

'Cyprus never has been Greek'. What else has it ever been?"¹⁸ Many years previously, another Briton, the deputy Mr. Noel-Baker, on the same question of whether Cyprus has ever been Greek gave a disarmingly simple answer, "It has never been anything else since recorded history began."¹⁹ Furthermore, a contemporary historian states: "The island has been, since the Bronze Age, unmistakably Greek. It is possible to write this simple sentence, so fraught by later controversy, with some confidence . . . The Cypriot line of descent, passionately affirmed up to the present, can be attested by disinterested research. . . ."²⁰ Although it served in many ways as a Levantine melting-pot and entrepôt, although Phoenician influence is marked, and although the Cypriot dialect is distinctive even to this day, the Greek stamp was set on the island when recorded history began."²¹

Indeed, scientific research always talked about the Greek character of the island. Either single historians²² or teams of them working in collectives²³ agreed on dating the Greek colonisation of Cyprus immediately after 1400 B.C. remarking that the Greek colonists came to Cyprus before the Phoenicians who didn't reach there until the 11th century B.C. Besides, the evidence for the prevalence of the Greek presence and of their language in Cyprus is attested by an official record of a King of Assyria, Esarhaddon, when in 673 B.C., "the kings of Cyprus, nine Greeks and one Phoenician, tendered their homage to him." The appearance, at that time, of only a single Phoenician king in Cyprus and nine Greeks²⁴ underlined the predominantly Greek character of the island.²⁵ In addition, this was demonstrated during the Ionian revolution (499-498 B.C.) against the Persian yoke, when all the Cypriots—with the exception of the *Ἀμαθῶ 09ῶς* inhabitants²⁶—were on the side of their brethren.²⁷ Further support comes from the language which seems beyond any doubt to be a dialect of the Greek language, very similar to the Arcadic dialect of the pre-Doric migration.²⁸ The fact that the Greek language endured²⁹ more than 30 centuries despite various conquests is astonishing in itself and undermined or even disproved linguistic theories claiming otherwise.³⁰

The Turks were fully aware of the island's Greek character.³¹ Shortly after the 1821 Greek revolution and the legendary visit of the captain of a fire ship, Constantinos Kanares, to Cyprus between 19 June and 1 July 1821,³² the Turkish governor Küçük Mehemed,

fearing a full-scale revolt in Cyprus,³³ was trying to convince the Sultan of Cypriots' plans to revolt.³⁴ Finally, the extent of the Greek war and the European sympathy it aroused so alarmed the Sultan that he gave his order for the execution of the blacklisted 486 Cypriots.³⁵ So, the Governor was in possession of the order which would "legalize" his preliminary executions and also make it possible to apply it to those who he had so long wished to eliminate and plunder.³⁶ Disregarding Turkish opinion that this regrettable incident was the only one³⁷ which resulted in politically motivated executions during the entire 308 years of Turkish rule "full of peace and harmony,"³⁸ the fact is that Cypriot eyes were constantly on Greece.

Additionally, the memorandum Count Capodistria submitted to the three protecting Powers' Ambassadors at Poros in September 1828, expressing the desire for enosis of Cyprus with Greece, proved that Cyprus was always considered as an integral part of Hellenism.³⁹ Beyond this, the fact that three revolts took place between 1830-1833, could clearly demonstrate the view Cypriots held about their descent and that the movement for enosis with Greece had begun before the British occupation.⁴⁰

British Confirmations

Many prominent Britons, either officeholders or intellectuals, from the very beginning of British domination until Cyprus obtained its independence acknowledge the island's Greekness. For example, Sir Garnet Wolseley, first High Commissioner in Cyprus, shortly after assuming office, suggested the transfer of population from Malta to Cyprus in order to counterbalance the weight of the Greek element.⁴¹

William E. Gladstone, who was Prime Minister four times, openly stated that Cyprus was Greek. Speaking at Penicuik, Scotland, on 25 March 1880, while still in opposition, he emphasized his desire that, sooner or later, Cyprus should be united with Greece because, apart from other considerations, "the bulk of the people are Greek." On 17 December of the same year he suggested to Glanville (a leading Liberal politician) that Cyprus should be handed to Greece by Britain and Turkey "in sovereignty not in mere occupation." He was of the same opinion about Crete which

he wished to be ceded to Greece. He had repeatedly stated that Crete's union with Greece was not only desirable but essential. His third reference to the Cypriot problem was on 13 March 1897. Writing to the Duke of Westminster a long exposition of his half-century's experience of the Eastern Question, he expressed his hope of having the satisfaction "to see the population of that Hellenic island placed by a friendly arrangement in organic union with their brethren of the Kingdom and of Crete."⁴²

When Winston Churchill visited Cyprus as Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1907,⁴³ he made the salient declaration to the Greek-elected members of the Legislative Council about Cypriots' right of desiring union with Greece,⁴⁴ which ran as follows: "I think it only natural that the Cypriot people, who are of Greek descent, should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother-country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly, and fervently cherished. Such a feeling is an example of the patriotic devotion which so nobly characterises the Greek nation; and while I trust that those who feel so earnestly themselves will not forget that they must show respect for the similar feelings of others, I say that the views which have been put forward are opinions which His Majesty's Government do not refuse to regard with respect"⁴⁵. The changed version of this statement by Sir George Hill,⁴⁶ however, was rendered invalid by what Lord Crewe (who in April 1908 succeeded Lord Elgin as Colonial Secretary) wrote in the despatch of June 18, 1908 to the High Commissioner, Sir C.A. King-Harman (1904-1911). In that despatch he instructed him to inform the members of the Κυπριακός Σύλλογος of Nicosia that he recognised the reality of the Cypriot aspiration for union and agreed with Churchill's declaration to the Greek-elected members of the Legislative Council.⁴⁷

Lord Crewe's despatch contained a remarkably far-reaching recognition of Greek claims. Moreover, his statements carried greater weight than Churchill's expressions to the Greek members of the Legislative Council since they originated not from a junior Under-Secretary but from the calm deliberations of the Secretary of State's own offices in Downing Street and from the pen of a cabinet minister of first class standing. Moreover, Asquith, the Prime Minister, in 1908 considered Lord Crewe "as the ablest of his colleagues."⁴⁸ Sir C.A. King-Harman himself, similarly, seems to have expressed his sympathy towards the desire of the Greek-

Cypriots to unite with Greece, since he also believed that this attitude of theirs did not run counter to loyalty and legality.⁴⁹

After almost two decades, the Cyprus government's Colonial Secretary and Acting Governor, Herbert Henniker-Heaton, in the summer of 1931, recognized in a statement made on April 20, 1931 that "Cyprus has been Hellenic for three thousand years."⁵⁰ Although Henniker-Heaton attempted to neutralize his previous day's recognition of the island's Hellenic culture on the following day, in order to win the Turkish votes, his declaration was saluted by the member of the Legislative Council, Demosthenis Severis, as "noble and chivalrous one."⁵¹ Even Sir Ronald Storrs, Governor of the island from 1926 to 1932, who was involved in armed conflict with Cypriots in 1931 and much hated by them, felt obliged to write: "The Greekness of Cyprus is in my opinion indisputable. . . . No sensible person will deny that the Cypriot is Greek-speaking, Greek-thinking, Greek-feeling, Greek."⁵²

Several months after the 1931 uprising, Professor Arnold Toynbee, writing in the *New Statesman* and *Nation* on 23 April 1932, as in the *Economist* earlier, urged the cession of Cyprus to Greece. Toynbee's published opinion caused the Colonial Office's displeasure to such an extent that it called it "highly disparaging to British rule in Cyprus; tendentious, misleading, one-sided and insidiously pro-Hellene." The Colonial Office's reaction was proportionate to the weight it attributed to Toynbee's opinion. It was widely acknowledged that Professor Toynbee was totally aware of what was understood as "Eastern Question" and that he knew quite well all its parameters relating to Greece and Turkey, since it was he who, as a staffer of the Political Intelligence Department (P.I.D.),⁵³ shouldered, along with Harold Nicolson and Allen Leeper, the greater bulk of the work on preparing Britain's policy towards those two countries in the face of Paris Peace Conference (1918-1919).⁵⁴

In any case, one could find it strange that the British representative was trying to convince John Foster Dulles about Cypriot's non-Greekness,⁵⁵ while Sir Anthony Nutting (the Minister of State in the Foreign Office) was avowing in 1955 that the (national) identity of those who constituted the Cypriot problem were the Greeks, referring by that both to mainland's Greeks and to those of Cyprus.⁵⁶ In addition, E.L. Mallalieu, Labour M.P., during the debate of 2nd November 1954 in the House of Commons,

remarked, "It is quite foolish to say that 80% of the Cypriots are not really Greeks. What does it matter whether they are or not Greeks by race or origin, since they regard themselves as Greeks and want to be regarded as such by others?"⁵⁷

In the series of those who officially acknowledged Cypriots' Greekness, Harold Macmillan, the British Foreign Secretary, was to be next. Addressing the Tripartite Conference on the Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus in London, August 29, 1955, he stated, "Centuries of Hellenic culture, and they [the Cypriots] by inclusion in the east Roman and Byzantine Empires, have created undeniable links which no one will deny between Cyprus and the Greek world."⁵⁸ The same politician, in 1971, acknowledged once again Cypriots' Greek character by recognizing that Archbishop Makarios was *ex officio* guarantor of the island's Greek tradition.⁵⁹

The two British offers of Cyprus to Greece in 1912 and 1915 and the two promises in 1919 for the same reason, would render rather difficult the denial of what seems to be quite obvious: the deep conviction of the British that Cyprus was Greek. In December 1912, Venizelos went to London as head of the Greek delegation to the peace conference which sought to put an end to the first Balkan War. During the peace conference, he held talks—initially through the Greek consul in London, Sir John Stavridis—with Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer) and Winston Churchill (First Lord of the Admiralty). The British officials wished to secure the use of a naval base in the Ionian Sea (the port of Argostoli, Kefalonia island)⁶⁰ and a revision of Greece's naval policy in exchange for the cession of Cyprus to Greece. The negotiations proved abortive for the British refused to conclude an entente with the Greeks as long as the latter were at war. The important thing was that, although these discussions remained unofficial,⁶¹ Prime Minister, H. Asquith, and Foreign Secretary, E. Grey, were fully aware of them and they had granted them their approval.⁶²

Just two years later, David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill along with the Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey (later Lord Grey of Fallodon), had agreed to cede Cyprus to Greece—since the Admiralty had never been able to make proper use of the island⁶³—in order to enter the war on the Entente's side. Nevertheless, when Grey proposed the cession of the island to the Cabinet (20 January 1915), Lord H.H. Kitchener (Secretary of State

for War) rejected that on the grounds that Cyprus was very important from the strategic point of view because she was on the high road, via Alexandretta, to Mesopotamia and India. Grey's proposal was not carried.⁶⁴

The British Government's most official offer to completely relinquish possession of Cyprus in favour of Greece was conveyed in a telegram dated 16 October, 1915, from E. Grey to the British Minister at Athens, Sir Francis Elliot, which concluded as follows:

Now that Serbia has been attacked by Bulgaria, if Greece is willing to come to her aid, His Majesty's Government is ready to cede to Greece the island of Cyprus. If Greece joins the Allies for all purposes, she will naturally participate in the advantages secured at the end of the war, but the offer of Cyprus is made by His Majesty's Government independently of this consideration, and on the sole condition that Greece gives Serbia her immediate and complete support with her army.⁶⁵

That suggestion was based on that of Lord Robert Cecil, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, recorded in a minute to Grey on 14th October,⁶⁶ and was made without reference to the Cabinet with the exception of Asquith, Kitchener, Bonar Law⁶⁷ (Colonial Office), and A. Chamberlain (India Office), along with King George V who knew of the Cyprus offer. Apart from the negative response, on 20 October 1915 (officially on 22), of pro-King Zaimis government to that offer,⁶⁸ E. Grey faced serious opposition, since, as the news of the offer of Cyprus was about to become public, the Cabinet wanted to know what was going on. Finally, by 22 October, the offer was withdraw.⁶⁹ At the same time the Anglo-American press was in agreement with the *Manchester Guardian* and *London Times* in their editorials of October 22 in favour of ceding the island to Greece. Moreover, the *New York Times* (of October 21) quoted, on its front page, the editorial opinions of two London journals *The Chronicle* and *Daily Telegraph*, where the Britain's cession of Cyprus to Greece was described as "splendid" and "a tangible concession" to ensure Greek participation in the war.⁷⁰

In 1915, it was admitted that the cession of Cyprus was made out of desperation related to the exigencies facing Britain in vari-

ous theatres of war⁷¹. Along with that admission, however, another point of view was expressed which considered the 1915 offer strange and not genuine.⁷² In the final analysis, it is not of interest if the British offer was indeed a genuine one, but that the cession of Cyprus was offered as a lure to Greece to participate in the Great War, because the British recognized, in the first place, that Cyprus couldn't be ceded to anyone but Greece.

After the offers, came the promises. The first of those was made during the 13 May 1919 meeting of the Council of the Four (Clemenceau, Wilson, Lloyd George and Orlando), when Lloyd George expressed his will to cede Cyprus to Greece, without having any reservation about Turkish opinion, since "They have no right in a country which they had converted to mere desert."⁷³ The second one was made by Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Labour Party, in February 1919. Speaking to 102 delegates from 26 countries at the Socialist International Conference held at Berne, he emphasized that his party supported Cypriot self-determination and that, if he ever came to power, he would do everything he could to carry out his commitment. MacDonald, who led the short-lived minority Labour government of 1924 (22 January to 3 November) and that of 1929-1931, failed, however, to honour his pledge.⁷⁴ Even if the aforementioned two "promises" were to be considered indisputably sincere and genuine, what is of importance is that the British Foreign Office kept on thinking, even after the end of the Great War, of the possible cession of the island as a convenient pawn in hand.

Divide and Rule

A convenient pawn would turn out to be the island's Moslem population which had been very loyal to the British, as Churchill recognized in 1941.⁷⁵ The Moslems would constitute another weapon in Britain's arsenal and counterbalance the Greek element's weight to annul all its efforts for union with Greece.⁷⁶ It was in Britain's interest to widen the gap between the Greek and Turkish-Cypriots. The Legislative Council's composition and operation left no doubt about the British intentions. The British always used as a primary justification the Moslem minority's rights and welfare. When the Turkish-Cypriots protested, as early as

1881 against for Greek (Cypriots) nationalism, the British reacted by, whenever convenient, declaring *urbi et orbi*, that there was not any case for transferring Cyprus to Greece, as Joseph Chamberlain (Secretary of State for the Colonies) clearly stated on 4 August 1899. Thus, the British followed the same policy as in other areas of their empire,⁷⁷ creating differences between communal groups, and then generating antagonism between them to produce inter-group conflict.⁷⁸ Since, as a result of their policy, the differences became institutionalized, there was no other alternative but collision. The collision was unavoidable largely because the British has set the conditions. The British admitted, apropos the 1925 Constitution, "The simplest way seemed to be the divide and rule tactic . . . If there was no need to use the Turk against the Greek . . . the administration would be better based and it could be proud of its work."⁷⁹ Furthermore, the Colonial Office's principal clerk of the department dealing with Cyprus, A.J. Dawe, in a minute of May 21, 1929, bluntly observed that "the presence of the Turkish community [in Cyprus] is an asset from a political standpoint."⁸⁰

All those who opposed the cession of the island (Colonial Office, the Treasury⁸¹ and most of all the Military, Naval and Air Staffs) did not do so in the name of the non-Greekness⁸² of its population but in the name of the alleged strategic interests of the British Empire. As long as it remained in British hands, it could not be used against Britain.

After the stir caused about the future of Cyprus and the suggestion to the British that the island should be ceded to Greece in exchange for a naval base required for the preservation of peace, the Foreign Office, on 11 September 1945, informed the Chiefs of Staff that Cyprus might be ceded to Greece on condition that the Greek government granted Britain military rights and bases in Cyprus and also a base and other rights on the Greek mainland or on the islands.⁸³ Several days before, on 5 September, a draft memorandum by Orme Sargent (Deputy Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs) set out in detail the arguments in favour of such a cession. In brief these were: we ought to; it would strengthen our position in Greece, and we stand to lose nothing. The reply from the Chiefs of Staff to the Foreign Office initiative contained two main points. Firstly, the military advantages of maintaining the status quo considerably outweighed the advantages of accepting the suggestions contained in the letter; and secondly, Britain

should therefore retain her sovereignty over Cyprus even at the risk of increased agitation in the island and of unfavourable reaction in Greece.⁸⁴

The inter-governmental correspondence never mentioned any facetious argument about Cypriots' non-Greekness. On the contrary, apart from the trivial view about the non-existence of a genuine *enosis* movement, the principal argument against the cession of the island was its alleged great importance for the empire's safety. Even the island's alleged strategic importance was disputed after the occupation of Egypt in 1882. Moreover, despite all the British declarations about the imperative need of retaining the island in the name of its strategic value, and of the Ammochostos (Famagusta)⁸⁵ port in particular, the latter was never suitable for war use. In addition, despite Governor Storrs' attempts to use Cyprus as an aeronautical node on the way to Middle East through the Athens-Cyprus-Damascus-Baghdad routing, finally that of Athens-Crete, Gaza-Baghdad was preferred.⁸⁶

The British had no intention of using Cyprus in that manner. If they had so intended, they would have tried to develop it strategically as well as economically, since no place could be used as a strategic buffer zone or operations base, while retaining an undeveloped hinterland. It is this point that best supports Toynbee's refutation of a document describing the economic and social progress achieved in Cyprus under British administration and signed by Sir R. Storrs and B.J. O'Brien entitled *The Handbook of Cyprus*, (London 1930). To the allegation that the progress which had been achieved in Cyprus was exceptional, he replied that a "comparison with the progress of other ex-Ottoman territories, like Eastern Rumelia and Thessaly, during the same fifty years, and perhaps also with the progress of Crete, a neighbouring ex-Ottoman island which had become autonomous in 1897 and had secured its long-desired union with Greece in the First Balkan War in 1912, would have pointed out that the progress made in Cyprus, though manifestly creditable in itself, was nothing exceptional or extraordinary."⁸⁷ Apart from that, the picture remained the same some twenty years later. As late as 1953, the *per capita* income stood at only one-third of the British average. The infrastructure was inadequate, the processing sector rudimentary, and the colony ran a trade deficit. In spite of its geographical position, trade was oriented towards the West. Its main economic role in the

Middle East, according to a Foreign Office official, was "as a centre for goods smuggling between Israel and the Arab states."⁸⁸

On 11 December 1921, Commander N. W. Diggle, the Naval Attaché at the British Legation in Athens, submitted a report to Charles Bentinck on Cyprus from the point of view of the Navy and the Air Force. In it, after he well documented the island's strategic value, he noted in the end:

Cyprus might well be styled "The Heligoland of the Eastern Mediterranean." During the Great War we suffered severely from the error of having allowed Heligoland to fall into enemy hands, and I submit that the cession of Cyprus into foreign hands might well entail, in the future, similar disabilities.

Apart from war considerations, Cyprus might well, in the near future, owing to the increase in size and radius of aircraft, form the connecting link between Malta and Mesopotamia.⁸⁹

An examination of the Imperial Defence Committee's archives, however, does not confirm that Cyprus was directly connected with strategic interests of major importance. The chief strategic point in the Eastern Mediterranean, north of the Suez Canal, was considered to be Palestine, and this for two main reasons: its influence upon the general situation in Arabia; and its effect upon the security of the Suez Canal combined with that of the British position in Egypt. The strategic importance of Cyprus was connected with these necessities. "The establishment of a British naval base at Cyprus would happen only if the ports of Palestine fall into the possession of a hostile power and they would become a menace to the Mediterranean approaches to the Canal."⁹⁰

This observation agrees with the role the British attributed to the island during World War II as well: Cyprus remained a backwater.⁹¹ Despite its alleged strategic value, the Foreign Office, in the light of the Greek government's request of 1 April 1941 for "ceding Cyprus to Greece or, at least, a section of the island where H.M. the King George II shall inhabit and shall exercise the royal imperium from Greek soil,"⁹² the Foreign Office scrutinized afresh the future of Cyprus based on a well-documented report prepared at the request of the Foreign Office itself by the Foreign Research

Department of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.⁹³ The memorandum's positive point of view about cession of the island to Greece (based just on its Greekness⁹⁴), along with the comments of the Foreign Office services,⁹⁵ made Anthony Eden concur with its basic conclusions; he seemed to agree that the possibility of ceding Cyprus to Greece was in no way in opposition to the security requirements of the Empire. He did not rule out a preliminary agreement between the two governments relating to the conditions under which the sovereignty of the island would, after the war, be transferred from Great Britain to Greece.⁹⁶ Unfortunately, this positive approach of Cypriot problem was cancelled by Winston Churchill who emphasized that, "It will much better to leave all questions of territorial readjustment to be settled after the war."⁹⁷

After the war, however, and after the painful Middle Eastern lessons for the British policy-makers in the later 1940s, depending on leaseback arrangements and political "understandings" to guarantee key military facilities was unacceptable to the British interests. Only pure and undiluted sovereignty could ensure that the British forces would not repeat the same experiences they had endured since the end of the war in so many places. The Air Ministry conclude that "the strategic importance of Cyprus has grown enormously since the Second World War." and that Cyprus was a Crown Colony made her important as a nodal point of Britain's residual presence in the region.⁹⁸

After the signing of 1954 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, Britain was obliged to withdraw all her forces from her base at Suez. Britain's Middle East military and air headquarters was moved to Cyprus, but nothing was done in regarding the necessary fortifications or military preparations to justify Cyprus' alleged strategic value. The Suez crisis two years later demonstrated how wrong the estimation of Cypriot strategic advantage was, since the island was proved useful only as a supply base for the British air forces.⁹⁹

To further complicate the Cyprus question, in the frame of British strategic interests, the matter of oil was added. Prime Minister Eden, in a speech delivered at the Conservative Party Conference in Norwich on June 1 1956, made an attempt to justify his policy by saying that Cyprus was indispensable to Britain for the protection of her interests in the Middle East, above all, oil: "No Cyprus, no certain facilities to protect our oil supplies. No oil,

unemployment and hunger in Britain.”¹⁰⁰ As was predictable, all sections of liberal opinion in Britain immediately and vehemently protested. To the British press, the Prime Minister’s statement seemed particularly obnoxious (*Manchester Guardian*, 11/6/1956), and it was characterized as a bankrupt policy of an out-of-date imperialism (*Daily Herald*, 11/6/1956), since “The time for strong-arm action . . . is past” (*Spectator*, 8/6/1956). Unfortunately, the mindful phrasing “The old policy of oppression for oil’s sake just will not work” (*Daily Mirror*, 5/6/1956)¹⁰¹ remained empty words. Furthermore, Eden’s revealing statement caused a harsh reply from Greek Prime Minister, K. Karamanlis, who accused Britain of hypocrisy since, up till then, she had denied independence to the Cypriots to protect purely material interests and not for high strategic ones which she continually invoked as a pretext to impress and mislead the democratic peoples.¹⁰²

The Cyprus situation is a typical example of the enforcement of a Great Power’s will on a powerless population that ironically had expected in the past its emancipation from that very Power. Great Britain’s behaviour towards Cypriots’ aspirations for self determination did not meet the norms of international law; it could only be justified as Britain’s desperate effort to hold on to the status of first class power and to avoid destruction of its Empire.¹⁰³ Given this perspective, Britain wanted to prolong its presence on the island¹⁰⁴—even exploiting the internationalization of the Cypriot question.¹⁰⁵ Britain also would continue its divide and rule policy rendering the Turks,¹⁰⁶ the third factor in the Cyprus equation,¹⁰⁷ despite initial hesitations.¹⁰⁸ The rude allegation that the people of Cyprus—Greeks and Turks alike—were not ready for self-government¹⁰⁹ would be rendered almost tenable. The astonishing avowal that the national rights of the Cypriot people were much less important than the oil interests of the dominant British follows. That avowal was contrary to the customs of international relations and it was totally unacceptable to question the Cypriots’ national feelings, their own self image,¹¹⁰ their very soul,¹¹¹ in order to justify Britain’s imperial status.

Notes

¹Foreign Office (F.O.) 371, 15956, No 2635/6/19, Sir H. Wilson (Colonial Office) to Sir R. Vansittart (A Historical Note on the "Greekness of Cyprus," elaborated by Prof. Toynbee), London, 13 March 1932.

²Arnold Toynbee, "Cyprus, the British Empire and Greece," *Survey of International Affairs* 1931, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1932. I was not aware that that *Historical Note* was finally published until very recently and unfortunately after I had concluded my research on the topic dealt with in this paper of mine.

³It knew, however, that its allegation was not true, as a 1931 document, quite illuminatingly, disclosed by saying: "The Enosis movement has existed for a long time and it is backed by the entire population, with the exception of the officials and Moslems." CO 67/242/4, Colombo Report, No A68/1/103 dated 6 Nov. 1931, as cited in Niyazi Kizilyürek, *Κύπρος: το αδιέξοδο των εθνικισμών* (Cyprus: The Impasse of Nationalisms), Athens: Μαύρη Λίστα, 1999, 47.

⁴As Lord Winster, a former Governor of Cyprus, stated on 23 February 1954 in the House of Lords during a debate on the island's future. Stavros Panteli, *A New History of Cyprus. From the earliest times to the present day*, London-Hague: East-West Publications, 1984, 256; Nevertheless, professor Toynbee held the view that, as Governor's R. Storrs report entitled "Disturbances in Cyprus in October 1931" showed, "notwithstanding the (perhaps inevitably) hostile language in which this British official account of the Greek Cypriot national movement is couched, it is evident that the British authorities in Cyprus did not subscribe to the view, which was sometimes expressed in less responsible British quarters, that the Cypriot-Greek nationalists were merely a handful of unrepresentative and self-interested agitators. The British authorities did, however, hold the opinion that, at the time of the outbreak of October 1931, when the priests, the advocates, the school-teachers, and the urban population in the larger towns were, with few exceptions, in favour of union with Greece, and when the control of the Cypriot Greek press was in the Unionists' hands, there was still a majority, including the merchants, the farmers, and the peasants in general, who were either politically apathetic or else were in favour of British rule. Arnold Toynbee, 364; At that point, it should be mentioned that P. Papapolyviou, referring to the Cypriots' free participation during 1897 Greco-Turkish War and the Balkans Wars, established that the volunteer majority came from the rural population, thus rebutting the main British argument that the desire for union with Greece was felt by the larger part of the Greek population of the towns, without touching the great mass, that is the rural population. Petros Papapolyviou, *Η Κύπρος και οι Βαλκανικοί πόλεμοι. Συμβολή στην ιστορία του κυπριακού εθελοντισμού* [Cyprus and the Balkan Wars. Contribution to the History of Cypriot volunteerism], Nicosia: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών, 1997, 227-232 and *Φαινόεν σημείον ατυχούς πολέμου: Η συμμετοχή της Κύπρου στον ελληνοτουρκικό πόλεμο του 1897* [A bright spot of an unsuccessful war: The participation of Cyprus in 1897 Greco-Turkish War], Nicosia: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών, 2001, 268-272; Moreover, the voluntary recruitment en masse of Cypriots into the British army after the Italian

invasion of Greece clearly demonstrated how widespread the movement for enosis was among them. A detailed account on that issue in Andreas M. Georgiou, *Οι Κύπριοι στρατιώτες στο Β΄ Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο* (Cypriot soldiers in the World War II), Nicosia 2001.

⁵G. S. Georghallides, "Lord Crewe's 1908 Statement on Greek Cypriot National Claims," *Κυπριακά Σπουδαία* 34 (1970), 26; Achilleas Lymbouridis, *Η Αγγλοκρατία στην Κύπρο: από της κατοχής μέχρι του τέλους του πρώτου Παγκοσμίου Πολέμου* (The period of British Occupation of Cyprus: from 1878 until the End of First World War), v. 2 (Sir Malcolm Stevenson's Governorship 1918-1926), Nicosia 1986, 13; Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, *Το Κυπριακό Ζήτημα, 1878-1960: η συνταγματική πτυχή* (The Cypriot Question, 1878-1960: The Constitutional Aspect), Athens: *Ελληνικά Γράμματα*, 1998, 32; Niyazi Kizilyürek, 48; Peter Calvocoressi, *Διεθνής πολιτική 1945-2000* (World Politics, 1945-2000), Athens: *Τουρικής*, 2004, 531.

⁶Lord Curzon, too, was among the British politicians who, during World War I and the Versailles peace conference, argued most strongly for the retention of Cyprus. While Lord Balfour and others were prepared to entertain the possibility of ceding Cyprus to Greece, Curzon argued that the island was an essential link in the defence of British India and British interests in the Middle East and was important in curbing Russian, French, and Italian ambitions in the eastern Mediterranean. While some argued that the cession of Cyprus to Greece was against the interests of Cypriot Moslems and would anger Arab opinion, Curzon ignored humanitarian arguments in favor of an aggressive imperialism arising from his long experience of Anglo-Russian rivalry in Asia. John Fisher, "The Cyprus Proposition: Lord Curzon and Cyprus in British Imperial Strategy, 1914-1919," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 23 (1999): 140-163.

⁷N. Petsalis-Diomidis, *Greece at the Paris Peace Conference 1919*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1978, 335.

⁸For a detailed account of the 1931 October uprising and the Cypriots exiled after that in V. Leivadas—G. Spanos—P. Papapolyviou, *Η εξέγερση του Οκτώβρη 1931 (Τα Οκτωβριανά)* (1931 October uprising), Nicosia 2004.

⁹It is common to find Turkish scholars maintaining that the violent 1931 revolt was supported by the Greek state (Izzet Oztoprak, "Kıbrıs'ta 1931 İsyanı ve Yankılları" [The 1931 Rebellion in Cyprus and its Legacy], *Bellesten* 1998 62(233): 207-232); and that despite the explicit view, the Colonial government had expressed that "There is no evidence to show that the outbreak was premeditated or prearranged" (F.O. 371/15956, C 2760/6/19, "Disturbances in Cyprus in October 1931" 28, 31, see also Arnold Toynbee, 388); and despite Greek Prime Minister's, Venizelos, 23rd October vigorous statement that the "Cypriot question did not exist between the Greek and the British Governments" (F.O. 371/15970, C 1621/1621/19, Patrick Ramsay to Sir John Simon, Annual Report 1931, Athens, February 19, 1932, 15), whose statement was greatly detrimental to his political stature—and the British were well aware of that. Thanassis Bravos, *Ελλάδα και Μ. Βρετανία, 1932-1935: από την πολιτική των ίσων αποστάσεων στην εξάρτηση* (Greece and Great Britain, 1932-1935: from the equal distances policy to dependency), unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Thessaloniki 1993, 116.

¹⁰The plebiscite took place on two successive Sundays, 15 and 22 January 1950, in accordance with the resolution announced by the Holy Synod on 1 December 1949. Votes constituted 96,5% of the population, the remaining 3,5% representing the civil servants who were prohibited from voting. Voting took place amidst complete calm and with no incident so that a British observer with many years experience of living in the Levant was deeply impressed by what he estimated to be a dignified and orderly expression of national will. Robert Holland, *Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus 1945-1959*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, 18-19; As P. Pipinelis, then Foreign Secretary in Ioannis Theotokis provisional government, publicly admitted in an article of his in the newspaper *Kathimerini* (28 February 1959), he had assisted backstage the conduct of the plebiscite. Pantazis Terlexis, *Διπλωματία και πολιτική του κυπριακού. Ανατομία ενός λάθους* (Diplomacy and Policy on Cyprus question. Anatomy of an error), Athens: Κέδρος, ³2004, 91.

¹¹Lawrence Durrell, *Bitter lemons*, London: Faber and Faber, 1957, 120-121.

¹²Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, *Στρατηγικές του κυπριακού: η δεκαετία του 1950* (Strategies on the Cyprus Question: the fifties), Athens: Πατάκης, 2004, 134.

¹³Stavros Panteli, 258.

¹⁴Robert Holland, 42.

¹⁵In the debate of September 14, 1956, on the E.O.K.A. truce offer and its rejection. As cited in *British Opinion on Cyprus*, Washington 1956, 141.

¹⁶N. Petsalis-Diomidis, 133.

¹⁷University of Athens, Κύπρος. Αποφάσεις, διαμαρτυρίες και ενέργειες του Εθνικού Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών προς απαλλαγή του κυπριακού λαού εκ της καταδυναστεύσεως (Cyprus. Decisions, protestations and actions of Athens University for the Cypriot people to be released from oppression), Athens 1954, 8, 10.

¹⁸Stavros Panteli, vi.

¹⁹*British Opinion on Cyprus*, 141.

²⁰The Turkish representative in U.N., Selim Sarper, maintained from the rostrum of the General Assembly (14 December 1954), thereby agreeing in that with his British colleague, that the "Greek-speaking group living in Cyprus had absolutely no relation with Greeks, and they were part of another race, which the historians call Mediterranean or Mediterranean Levantine." Pantazis Terlexis, 59, 174.

²¹Christopher Hitchens, *Hostage to History: Cyprus from the Ottomans to Kissinger*, New York: The Noonday Press, 1989, 28-30.

²²Apostolos Dascalakis, *Chypre Hellénique. travers quarante siècles d'Histoire*, Athènes 1932; S. Casson, *Ancient Cyprus*, London 1937; S. Casson, *Greece*, Oxford 1942; E. Gjerstad, *Research on Pre-Historic Cyprus*, Uppsala 1926, as cited in Loucas Axelos, Κύπρος, η ανοιχτή πληγή του Ελληνισμού: αυτοδιάθεση, ανεξαρτησία, διχοτόμηση; (Cyprus, the unhealed sore of Hellenism: self-determination, independence, dichotomy?), Athens: Στοχαστής, 1994, 314-315.

²³Cambridge Ancient History, v. VI, Cambridge 1933.

²⁴Among those kings was reported the name of Οναςαγόρας (Unasagusu in the Assyrian records) king of Lidir. Lidir was identified with the city of Λέδρα, Λέδροι, Λέδρα, or Λευκοθέων πόλις, which retained this name up to 6th century A.D. From 6th century up to 15th century A.D. the name of the

city was Λευκουσία, and henceforth Λευκωσία. It is about the capital of Cyprus, Nicosia, which has always been called Λευκωσία by Cypriots up to the present time. Kyriakos Χατζιοαννου, *Η αρχαία Κύπρος εις τας ελληνικάς πηγάς* (Ancient Cyprus in Greek documents), v. VI, Nicosia: Έκδοσις Ιεράς Αρχιεπισκοπής Κύπρου, 1992, 173-174, 182.

²⁵H.R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, London: Methuen, 1913, p. 496, as cited in Arnold Toynbee, 393; Vassos Karageorghis, *Αρχαία Κύπρος* (Ancient Cyprus), Athens: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Εθνικής Τραπέζης, 1978, 48, 59, 71.

²⁶The indigenous population who refused to be Hellenized was concentrated in Αμαθούς. That solitary non-Greek city preserved its language and cultural tradition up to 4th century B.C. Vassos Karageorghis, 74.

²⁷Herodotus, V 104.

²⁸A researcher of the Greek language writes characteristically: "In our days, the Cypriot dialect is the only living dialect of the Greek language." Nicolaos Contosopoulos, «Η Κυπριακή» (Cypriote dialect), in M.Z. Copidakis (ed.), *Ιστορία της ελληνικής γλώσσας* (History of the Greek Language), Athens: Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο, 1999, 196; Arnold Toynbee, 393.

²⁹The monk, De Verona, who visited Cyprus in 1335, during Lousignan domination, wrote: "Everyone in Cyprus speaks mostly Greek, but they understand Arabic and French quite well." Loucas Axelos, 27; Rightly Wolf Seidl underlines, what links the ancient and modern Greece is not the purity of blood, but the unbroken cultural tradition and its instrument, the language. P. N. Tzermias, *Η Κύπρος από την αρχαιότητα ως την ένταξη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: «Γλυκιάς Χώρας» ιστόρηση* (Cyprus from antiquity to the European Union: the narration of a sweet land), Athens: Σιδέρης, 2004, 21 and for the Cypriot dialect's distinctiveness, through time, and its relation with Greek language see pp. 30-45.

³⁰Jacques Lacarrière, *Το ελληνικό καλοκαίρι* (Greek Summer), Athens: I. Χατζηνικολής, 181.

³¹On April 20, 1931, Misirlizade Nejati bey, member of the Turkish-Cypriot community and member of the Legislative Council and passionate adversary of the *enosis* movement, stated that "as this island is part of Asia Minor those who are strangers in it may go to Greece," thus recognizing that the Cypriots were Greeks. G. S. Georghallides, *Cyprus and the Governorship of Sir Ronald Storrs. The Causes of the 1931 Crisis*, Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1985, 613.

³²According to the tradition, on June 19 1821, Constantinos Kanares, sailing from Egypt, reached a small harbor in Cyprus near the village of Agios Sergios, and after a short stop he anchored his seven ships at the bay of Asprovryssi situated between the villages of Karava and Lapithos not far from the monastery of the Acheiropietos. It is said that Kanares and his men were met by leading Cypriots among whom, perhaps the most prominent, was Haji Nikolas Lavrentiou Protosygelou, a man of great wealth and prominence and a member of the *Philike Hetaireia* (Society of Friends). Then, tradition says, despite the apparent dangers, the Cypriots gave a cordial welcome to Kanares and provided him with money and "three shiploads of sheep, cattle, corn, barley and other supplies." Georghios I. Keriades, *Απομνημονεύματα των κατά το 1821 εν τη νήσω Κύπρω*

τραγικών σκηνών (Memoirs of the 1821 tragic events in the island of Cyprus), Alexandria 1888, 11, as cited in John T.A. Coumoulides, *Cyprus and the war of Greek Independence 1821-1829*, Athens: National Centre of National Research, 1971, 79. Nevertheless, recent research considers—since there is no written documentation—that Kanares' visit to Cyprus may have taken place in 1925, after his unsuccessful mission to Egypt, although, again, written evidence is lacking. It is not impossible, however, that it was another member of the *Philike Hetaireia* who visited Cyprus on June 1821 and not necessarily Constantinos Kanares. Petros Papapolyviou, «Η επανάσταση του 1821 και η Κύπρος» (The 1821 Revolution and Cyprus), *Annals* (newspaper Eleftherotypia 24-3-2004), issue 229: 47.

³³The Turks maintained that reliable evidence had come to light proving that the Greek Orthodox leaders had been in touch with certain underground political leaders in Greece, and were in communication with nationalist organizations which had begun preparations for a revolt against the Turks. The *Philike Hetaireia*, which was organizing the Greek revolt, was allegedly in contact with the Greek clergy in Cyprus and sent a succession of emissaries with the objective of drawing Cyprus into the struggle. Ahmet C. Gazioglu, *The Turks in Cyprus. A province of the Ottoman Empire (1571-1878)*, London: K. Rustem & Brother, 1990, 242; Indeed, some letters and certificates of initiation of the *Philike Hetaireia* have been found. It is not certain that this material was imported to the island before or during the Greek War of Independence with the purpose of recruiting Greek Cypriots into the Greek revolutionary forces. Petros Stylianou, «Συστατικά και πιστοποιητικά μύησης Φιλικών σε κυπριακά αρχεία» (Letters and certificates of initiation of the Philikon in Cypriot archives), *Κυπριακός λόγος* (1979) 11 (61-62): 37-38; What is certain, however, is that a number of young Cypriots from every corner of the island participated actively in the Greek struggle, having joined the revolutionary naval and land forces. John T.A. Coumoulides, 80. For a partial list of Cypriots who fought in Greece during the struggle for independence, see Loisos Philippou, *Κύπριοι Αγωνιστάι* (Cypriot Fighters), Nicosia: Έκδοσις Ιεράς Αρχιεπισκοπής Κύπρου, 1953. Constantinos Amantos (Σύντομος ιστορία της Κύπρου [Short History of Cyprus], Athens: Σύλλογος προς διάδοσιν ωφελίμων βιβλίων, 1956, 115) mentioned that some tens of Cypriots were killed in 1827 at the battle of Athens.

³⁴Nevertheless, the French Consul Mechain in his letter to M. David, August 6, 1821, had a different opinion about the true dimensions of the alleged danger the Turks faced and about the governor's real motives: "The governor secretly plotted the ruination of the island . . . dreaming up conspiracies and himself writing false letters implicating the people, he was able to present them as being involved in the revolution and to get the order from the government to punish them severely . . ." John T.A. Coumoulides, 80; see also Venediktos Englezakes, «Το τελευταίον γνωστόν έγγραφο του εθνομάρτυρος Αρχιεπισκόπου Κυπριανού 1821, Μαΐου 1821» (The last known document of the national martyr, Archbishop Kyprianos, 16 May 1821), *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί* 46 (1982), 116. Of the same view was J. Hackett (*A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus*, London 1901, 227-229) who wrote that the uprising in Greece was a ruse used by the Turkish pashas to justify their execution and hence reduce the power of the Orthodox hierarchy, as cited in Adamantia Pollis, "Intergroup

Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," *Comparative Politics*, v. 5, no 4 (July 1973), 588.

³⁵A list of a total number of 20 proscribed persons most probably drafted by Küçük Mehemed in I.P. Theocharides, «Σπουδαίο οθωμανικό έγγραφο σχετικό με τα γεγονότα του 1821 στην Κύπρο» (An important Ottoman document relating to the facts of 1821 events in Cyprus), *Κυπριακός λόγος* (1980) 12 (67-68): 152-153, 155-156.

³⁶John T.A. Coumoulides, 80-81.

³⁷By virtue of important information three unpublished Ottoman documents provided us with, it could be understood that during the first half of the 17th c. the Christians of Cyprus were in a desperate condition, so that William Lithgow noted in 1610 that "it is inenarrable the misfortune of the tortured population under the reign of terror of the infidels." They were permanently oppressed by heavy taxation, and the *devsirme* (the forcible collection of local Christian children to be raised as Moslems and later to serve in the Yanissary Corp) had a terrible impact upon them. Thus they tried to react dynamically by continuous appeals for help to foreign Christian European Powers or by organising armed revolts. In any case, the truly miserable living conditions resulted in a dramatic demographic decrease. According to Ottoman documents, a few years before 1648 "several rayahs died, some of them scattered and left the island, while others converted to Islam." The leader of the 1606 insurrection, Petros Aventanios in his memo to the King of Spain, Philip 3rd, possibly exaggerating, stated that all the Turks (Moslems) in Cyprus were renegades. However overstated that gloomy picture of the Christians of Cyprus might was, N.D. Hurtrel, who visited the island in 1670, conveyed to us the following piece of information: "because they (the Christians) could not bear any more this brutal tyranny, they were expressing the wish to be Turks (Moslems), but their petition was rejected by their masters, because had they all converted to Islam, the tax incomes would be drastically diminished." I.P. Theocharides, «Στοιχεία από την ιστορία της Κύπρου (μέσα του 17ου αι.)» (Notes on the History of Cyprus [mid 17th c.]), *Δωδώνη* 16(1), 1987, 210-214.

³⁸Ahmet C. Gazioglu, 79.

³⁹Loucas Axelos, 28.

⁴⁰Stavros Panteli, 61. Panteli maintains that a third of these revolts (that of 1833) had a much stronger enosist element, thus promising liberation from the Turkish yoke. Nevertheless, there is not enough evidence to endorse this view.

⁴¹Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, *Το Κυπριακό Ζήτημα, 1878-1960: η συνταγματική πτυχή* (The Cypriot question, 1878-1960: The Constitutional Aspect), Athens: *Ελληνικά Γράμματα*, 1998, 45.

⁴²Ronald Storrs, *Orientalisms*, London: Nicholson & Watson, 1945, 465.

⁴³For a detailed account of that, see G.S. Georghallides, "Cyprus and Winston Churchill's 1907 visit," *Thetis*, 3 (1995), 177-194.

⁴⁴Churchill's declaration about the right of the Cypriots to be united with Greece has been widely quoted by Greeks but its codicil hasn't. It read: "The opinion held by the Moslem population of the island, that the British occupation of Cyprus should not lead to the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire . . . is one which His Majesty Government are equally bound to regard with respect."

Christopher Hitchens, 34. It was obvious that the British would take into consideration *equally* Moslem apprehensions and Cypriot's will for enosis. Nevertheless, even if, after the Lausanne Treaty—when Turkey resigned all her rights and titles over Cyprus in favour of Great Britain—the London government was not bound by any agreement of any kind with any other state, it never ceased to take *equally* into consideration the minority's apprehensions and the overwhelming majority's will (The Turkish Cypriots constituted about one-sixth of the population according to the British census of 1921: 41,339 out of a total population of 300,715. James A. McHearry, *The Uneasy Partnership on Cyprus, 1919-1939*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987, 116).

⁴⁵G. S. Georghallides, "Cyprus and Winston Churchill's 1907 visit," *Thetis*, 3 (1995), 184; It is not accidental that Storrs put exactly the same words in the mouth of Winston Churchill. Storrs, *ibid.*

⁴⁶In his *History of Cyprus* two changes had occurred in the text of Churchill's statement: "The Cypriot people, who are of Greek descent" had become "the Cypriot people of Greek descent"; and "what may be called their mother-country" had become "what they call their mother-country." George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. IV, Cambridge 1952, 515-516.

⁴⁷*Cyprus. Correspondence relating to affairs of Cyprus*, C. 3996, London, April 1908, p. 21 as cited in G. S. Georghallides, *Lord Crewe's 1908 Statement*, 29.

⁴⁸*ibid.*

⁴⁹Christos A. Theodoulou, "Greek-Cypriot Manifestations of Allegiance to Greece and British Reactions (1915-1916), *Κυπριακά Σπουδαί* 35 (1971), 182.

⁵⁰C.S. Georghallides, *Cyprus and the Governorship of Sir Ronald Storrs*, 614.

⁵¹*ibid.*, 620.

⁵²Ronald Storrs, *ibid.*, 469-470

⁵³World War I ending, several government officials were concerned because of the lack of focus in British considerations about the post-war settlement. Thus, among other offices concerned with preparing negotiating material for an eventual peace conference, the Foreign Office in March 1918 established the most important of them, the Political Intelligence Department (P.I.D.). The P.I.D., comprising on average a dozen experts, each with a regional speciality, was assigned the task of collecting, sifting, and coordinating all political intelligence; thus it became the nucleus of the British negotiating team at the Paris peace conference. Furthermore, in October 1918 the P.I.D. was reorganized to take on the full weight of preparing Britain's negotiating brief. Erik Goldstein, "Great Britain and Greater Greece 1917-1920," *The Historical Journal*, 32, no 2 (1989): 340.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 341.

⁵⁵See also footnote 14.

⁵⁶Sir Anthony Nutting wrote grimly in a memorandum of his in 8 February 1955 that the only alternative to "the recommended policy of firmness in the present combined with reasonableness and open-mindedness in the future would be to fight it out with the Greeks." Robert Holland, 48.

⁵⁷Alexis Kyrou, 370-371; of the same opinion was Francois Crouzet (*Le conflit de Cypre, 1946-1959*, vol. I, Bruxelles 1973, 100); In that he maintained that "In the last analysis, the fundamental fact is this willingness of the Cypriots to

be part of the Greek nation," as cited in Ioannis D. Stefanidis, *Isle of Discord. Nationalism, Imperialism and the making of the Cyprus Problem*, London: Hurst & Company, 1999, 229.

⁵⁸John T.A. Coumoulides, 13.

⁵⁹Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, *The Cypriot question*, 33.

⁶⁰The suggestion of Cyprus' cession to Greece is verified by Metaxas' documents. The latter writes in his diary that Venizelos asked his opinion on the eventual cession of Cyprus to Greece in exchange for granting naval facilities to Great Britain's fleet in the port of Argostoli whereupon Metaxas was negative. Ioannis Metaxas, *Το προσωπικό του ημερολόγιο* (His personal diary), v. 2, Athens: Γκοβόστης, without publication time, 234.

⁶¹Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919-1922*, London: Hurst & Company, 2000, 14-17. Furthermore, when the Foreign Office, in July 1931, was asked to pronounce on the question, it declared no evidence was found in its records that Cyprus had ever been ceded to Greece in exchange of naval facilities to Great Britain's fleet in the port of Argostoli. J.P. Pikros, «Ο Βενιζέλος και το κυπριακό ζήτημα» (Venizelos and the Cyprus Question), in *Μελετήματα γύρω από τον Βενιζέλο και την εποχή του*, Athens: Φιλippότης, 1980, 182.

⁶²For a detailed record of these discussions see Helene Gardika-Katsiadaki, «Βενιζέλος και Τσώρτσιλ: Οι βάσεις της αγγλο-ελληνικής συνεννόησης (1912-1913)» Venizelos and Churchill: the Foundations of an Entente between Britain and Greece (1912-1913), in *Μελετήματα γύρω από τον Βενιζέλο και την εποχή του*, Athens: Φιλippότης, 1980, 87-98.

⁶³As Grey wrote to Lord Kitchener (Minister of War) on 19 January 1915. G.S. Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus, 1918-1926*, Nicosia 1979, 94.

⁶⁴J.P. Pikros, 186-187.

⁶⁵Arnold Toynbee, 358-359.

⁶⁶«And we ought also to offer to secure for Greece Southern Thrace with Smyrna and the hinterland, and, as a pledge of our sincerity in these matters to transfer to her, by the end of the war at any rate, the possession of Cyprus. It seems to me that if we could present the Greek people with the immediate possibility of occupying Cyprus, it would be more attractive than any amount of promises of advantage at the end of the War». C.M. Woodhouse, "The offer of Cyprus 1915," in *Greece and Great Britain during World War I*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1985, 80-81.

⁶⁷Bonar Law approved the offer without consulting the High Commissioner in Nicosia, Sir J.E. Clauson. C.M. Woodhouse, 82.

⁶⁸Stavros Terry Stavridis, "Greek-Cypriot Enosis of October 1915: "A Lost Opportunity?" *Balkan Studies* 1996 37(2), 300.

⁶⁹It was a rare opportunity and as William Miller put it aptly in his *The Ottoman Empire and its Successors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927, 567): "Such opportunities rarely reappear to the states," as cited in Pantazis Terlexis, 73.

⁷⁰Stavros Terry Stavridis, 304-305.

⁷¹As Grey admitted on answering a parliamentary question on 9 November 1915. C.M. Woodhouse, 88.

⁷²Stavros Terry Stavridis, 299, 307.

⁷³J.P. Pikros, 209; see also Stavros Panteli, 93.

⁷⁴Stavros Panteli, 94.

⁷⁵Constantinos Svoloopoulos, "Anglo-Hellenic Talks on Cyprus during the Axis Campaign against Greece," *Balkan Studies* 23(1), 1982, 208; The same opinion was expressed by George H. Hall, Secretary of State for the Colonies, in 1946, opposing Bevin's proposal for cession of the Cyprus to Greece. Leventis, *Cyprus: The Struggle for Self-Determination in the 1940s. Prelude to Deeper Crisis*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002, 140.

⁷⁶Petros Stylianou, Δεδομένα αγγλοτουρκικής συνεργασίας κατά της ενωτικής κινήσεως του κυπριακού λαού βάσει τουρκικών ιστορικών εγγράφων (Evidence of Anglo-Turkish collaboration against the movement for unity of the Cypriot people based on Turkish historical documents), *Κυπριακός λόγος* 1973 5 (29-30): 183-190.

⁷⁷Pierre Blanc, Ο διαμελισμός της Κύπρου. Η γεωπολιτική ενός διχασμένου νησιού (La déchirure chypriote. Géopolitique d'une île divisée), Athens: Ολλός, 2002, 21.

⁷⁸A typical example of that was what the Greek Consul in Nicosia, A. Kyrou, reported in a paper of his to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, A. Michalopoulos: "The British consulted first the Mufti (the spiritual leader of approximately 60.000 Moslems) and afterwards the Archbishop of 280.000 Greeks Orthodox or, in British men's expression, merely "Non Moslems." J.P. Pikros, 298.

⁷⁹Niyazi Kizilyürek, 54.

⁸⁰G.S. Georghallides, "Turkish and British Reactions to the Emigration of the Cypriot Turks to Anatolia, 1924-27," *Balkan Studies* 181 (1977), 45.

⁸¹According to the Treasury, in 1918, over 50% of the exports of the island were sent the United Kingdom and Egypt and about 40% of its imports came from the United Kingdom; exports to Greece were only 7% and imports from Greece only 5%. N. Petsalis-Diomidis, 133.

⁸²Just on 17 November 1918 British Ambassador in Athens, Lord Granville, wrote to the Foreign Secretary, Balfour that "in view of the smallness of the Moslem minority, our declarations on the subject of nationalities, and our previous offer, it would be exceedingly difficult to defend a refusal to cede the island to Greece. G.S. Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus*, 113.

⁸³The same proposal was made, at the beginning of 1922, by Charles Bentinck, the Chargé d'Affaires at the British Legation in Athens, suggesting the cession of Cyprus to Greece under conditions: 1) the retention by Great Britain of, say, Famagusta and/ or any other strategic point, and 2) the prohibition of any military works by the Greek government. He continued by saying "we might gain whatever advantage the island has to offer us and relieve ourselves from the stigma of retaining a foreign population under our rule against their will and in contradiction of the principle of self-determination". The Foreign Office's reply to Bentinck's report was representative of the British orientation at the time. "There is no question of the cession of Cyprus being entertained" concluded E.A. Growe, the Permanent Under-Secretary. Constantinos Svoloopoulos, "The Lausanne Peace Treaty and the Cyprus Problem" in

Greece and Great Britain during World War I, Institute for Balkan Studies: Thessaloniki, 1985, 239.

⁸⁴Stavros Panteli, 202-203.

⁸⁵The three service staffs never ceased to stress the strategic importance of the island. In January 1919 it was noted that Famagusta might be made into an excellent base for submarines and destroyers, while it provided facilities for aerodromes and flying-boat bases from which aircraft could operate over parts of Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and a large section of the Berlin-Baghdad railway. N. Petsalis-Diomidis, 133.

⁸⁶J.P. Pikros, 232-233.

⁸⁷Arnold Toynbee, 367.

⁸⁸Ioannis D. Stefanidis, *Isle of Discord. Nationalism, Imperialism and the making of the Cyprus Problem*, Hurst & Company: London, 1999, 112.

⁸⁹Constantinos Svolopoulos, *The Lausanne Peace Treaty*, 239-240.

⁹⁰Minutes of the 174th Meeting of Committee of Imperial Defence, July 12, 1923, as cited in Constantinos Svolopoulos, *ibid*, 241.

⁹¹Robert Holland, 20.

⁹²Constantinos Svolopoulos, *Anglo-Hellenic Talks*, 201; Petros Papaniolyiou, «Κύπρος 1940-1950. Ίδιες προσδοκίες, νέες αντιπαράθεσεις» στο *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού 1770- 2000* ("Cyprus 1940-1950. Same Expectations, New Confrontations," in *The History Neo-Hellenism 1770-2000*), v. 8, Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα 2004, 365-366; Nevertheless, it is strange indeed that, despite the Anglo-Greek exchange of memoranda for two weeks about the Greek request for the possible transportation of the King and his government to Cyprus and the British refusal of that, Winston Churchill, in his telegram of 13 April 1941 to General Wilson in Athens, proposed to help the King or even a section of the Greek army to be transported to Cyprus. Winston Churchill, *World War II*, v. 2 (The Great Alliance), Athens: Ελληνική Μορφωτική Εστία (without time), 379-380. See also P. Pipinelis, *George II*, Athens: Στέγη του βιβλίου, 1957, 122.

⁹³The full text of that memorandum in Constantinos Svolopoulos, *Anglo-Hellenic Talks*, 209-214.

⁹⁴The argument that Cyprus had never been part of a political entity called Greece was rejected. It was accepted that, since the colonization of the island by Greeks from the Peloponnesus as early as 14th century, Cyprus shared the general fortunes of the Greek-speaking world. Yiorghos Leventis, 118.

⁹⁵*Ibid*, 206-207.

⁹⁶*Ibid*, 207.

⁹⁷*Ibid*, 208.

⁹⁸Robert Holland, 21.

⁹⁹Peter Calvocoressi, 531.

¹⁰⁰The Eden Memoirs. *Full Circle*, London: Cassell, 1960, 401; Notwithstanding, at that very time, as is confirmed by British records, the three service staffs pointed out that the island didn't play any essential role in the Middle East area oil control. Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, «Εξώθηση και καταστολή, βόμβες και ψηφοδέλτια: η Βρετανία και ο κυπριακός αγώνα, 1954-1958» (Instigation and Suppression, Bombs and Voting-papers: Britain and the Cypriot Struggle,

1954-1958), *Βαλκανικά Σύμμεικτα* (periodical publication of Institute for Balkan Studies), 12-13 (2001-2002): 224.

¹⁰¹*British Opinion on Cyprus*, 43, 48-49.

¹⁰²Constantinos Karamanlis, *Αρχείο, γεγονότα, και κείμενα* (Archive, facts and documents), v. 2, Athens: Ίδρυμα Κ. Καραμανλής – Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1993, 92.

¹⁰³Evanthis Xatzivassiliou, *Instigation and Suppression*, 223-225.

¹⁰⁴Even if after 1918 the British policy makers recognized the inevitability of colonial self-government, they also believed that the road to self-determination of the colonies was very long and there was plenty of time until then. So, although they had recognized that colonialism could not be ever lasting, they wanted to postpone it as long as possible. Besides, during 1920s and 1930s, even if the age of imperialism-colonialism was on the wane, the evidence for its decline then was elusive. John Darwin, "Imperialism in Decline? Tendencies in British Imperial Policy between the Wars," *Historical Journal*, 23, no. 3 (1980): 657-659.

¹⁰⁵Constantin Privilakis, "La Grande-Bretagne et l'internationalisation de la Question Chypriote (1954-1955)," *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, 2001 115(3): 263-269.

¹⁰⁶There is also the opinion that the internationalization of the Cypriot Question on the part of the Greek government forced the British to quit the bipartite negotiation form and to counterbalance this internationalization, called Turkey to participate in the Cyprus problem solution. Pantazis Terlexis, 133. In any case, the fact is that until the 1950's no one recognized Turkish interest in or right to Cyprus. *Ibid*, 105.

¹⁰⁷Eden was convinced that the Cyprus problem would only be resolved between the three governments of Britain, Greece and Turkey. He maintained that view, however, not considering the Turks as an instrument for achieving the best result but to denounce all Greek moves; for that reason, however, he suggested that the Turkish press should play up the problem a bit more (Stavros Panteli, 263). Nevertheless, the British not only asked the Turkish press to get ready but the Turkish people to get mobilized as well, as a Foreign Office official put it bluntly: «A few riots in Ankara would do us nicely» (Wilding minute, 14 September 1954, as cited in Robert Holland, "Greek-Turkish Relations, Istanbul and British Rule in Cyprus, 1954-59: Some Excerpts from the British Public Archive," *Bulletin of the Centre of Asia Minor Studies* 10, 333). In the current climate of opinion, Foreign Secretary, Harold Macmillan, in a telegram of his from Geneva to Prime Minister, Eden (17 July 1955), noted among other points: "The stronger the position the Turks take at the start, the better will be the result for us and for them" (Robert Holland, *ibid*). Eventually, the British policy, adopting Eden's opinion about the great importance of Turkey in the Middle East, since he considered her the most significant ally in the area, was to tolerate the continual instigation of intercommunal conflict by the Turkish government in order to weigh down the Greek-Cypriots (Paschales Kitromilides, "Cyprus: the nature of the intercommunal conflict," in *The American Policy in Greece and Cyprus*, eds. Theodoros Couloumbis-S.M. Hicks, Athens: Παπαζήσης 1976, 206). That trend of British policy, which seemed to be iden-

tified with that of Turkey, didn't pass unnoticed and on this occasion it was reprehended both in the House of Lords and in the press (*British Opinion on Cyprus*, 158); On the other hand, Terlexis maintains that Turkey's concern about Cyprus was not set by the London government, but was inherent in Turkish fears regarding the Asia Minor coastline safety. Panatzis Terlexis, 138.

¹⁰⁸As late as 1953, Turkish Foreign Minister, Fuad Köprülü, was stating that his government did not believe there was a Cyprus question (Parliamentary Debates, Commons, v. 423, 586, as cited in Adamantia Pollis, 593). So, till the mid 1950's the Turkish government had not adopted the idea "Cyprus is and will remain Turkish." On the contrary, it had tried to constrain the nationalistic campaign (for the Turkish government's and press initial unwillingness to interfere with the Cyprus question, see Niyazi Kizilyürek, 62-71). On this account, on 29 March 1954, the senior official responsible for Cyprus in the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs warned the British Ambassador (Sir James Bowker) that "They [Turkey] considered the Cyprus question to be an Anglo-Greek one" (Robert Holland, *Greek-Turkish Relations*, 328). That stance on the part of the Turkish government was quite explainable since the Turkish state, after Kemal's advent to power, never phrased any claim over Cyprus, not even in the Pact of the Grand National Assembly, which expressed the Kemal leadership's boldest national aspirations (Constantinos Svolopoulos, *The Lausanne Peace Treaty*, 233). Besides, the fact that the Turks didn't consider the island claimable was proved by the seriousness with which the Turkish Government pursued the emigration of the Turkish Cypriots (according to the Treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923) to the Anatolian mainland. They, additionally, in order to encourage and assist the movement of the Turkish Cypriots, in June 1925, opened a consulate in Nicosia with A. Assaf bey as consul. The irony was that, as the Cyprus Government disliked the idea of losing the Cyprus Turks, since apart from other considerations 57% of the police were Moslems, the Turkish government protested about the Cyprus authorities' devious methods for discouraging emigration to Turkey, three times to the London government through the period 1926-1927 (G.S. Georghallides, *Turkish and British Reactions*, 44-47). On the other hand, one further reason could explain the Turkish stance. Turkey, at that time, felt vulnerable being under pressure by the Soviet Union in the north and surrounded by unfriendly states in the south. For that reason, she sought to secure her western flank through friendly relations with Greece. So, in order to conciliate her safety concerns arising from a possible Greek appearance 40 miles off her coasts and her wish to secure Greek military cooperation, declared that there was not a Cypriot question. When, however, the international status of the island was about to change, Turkey could not remain a mere spectator. Pantazis Terlexis, 139-140.

¹⁰⁹It should be noted that the same British Government, during the same period, adopted an opposing view about the people of Iraq—another ex-Ottoman territory under British tutelage—in which the majority of the population was still in a feudal or even in a tribal societal state. Arnold Toynbee, 363.

¹¹⁰As the High Commissioner himself, Sir J.E. Clouston, was obliged, virtually, to admit in his report to Bonar Low, 21 January 1916, regarding the attitude of Cypriots who hailed King Constantine's decision to become godfather, through his representatives, of the eighth child of any Hellene, whether a Greek

subject or an “unredeemed,” they considered him as *their King* rather than as a “foreign sovereign”; despite the Foreign Office’s warning that “the Cypriots who direct any [such] movement should receive a serious warning as to the illegality of British subjects in Cyprus either administering or taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign sovereign.” Christos A. Theodoulou, 182-183.

¹¹According to the great poet K. Palamas, Cyprus in her long history “though she changed many despots, she never changed her heart,” as cited in John T.A. Coumoulides, 13.

Ancient Hellenism in Andre Chenier

by MINAS SAVVAS

*“Galata, que me yeux desiraient des long temps . . .
Car c’est qu’une Grecque, en son jeune printemps,
Belle, au lit d’un epoux nourisson de la France,
Me fit naitre Francais dans le sein de Byzance.”*
(Elegies)

Arguably, France’s finest and most celebrated 18th century poet, Andre Chenier, proud of his Greek mother and his birth in Constantinople, found joy in the above lines upon encountering the Galata area where he first saw the sun’s light. He had just returned from Carcassone after an eight-year absence. Born in 1762, he left Constantinople when he was 3 and was sent to live in southern France with his father’s sister where, it seems, he had learned self-reliance and the love for independence.

When his French father was appointed a Consul in Morocco, Andre in 1773 joined his mother in Paris and entered the College de Navarre where, along with a superb education, he made several lifelong friends. Concurrently and in the years to follow, still under the strong influence of his mother, he was exposed to Greek culture. Elizabeth Chenier’s (maiden name Lomacas) was extremely proud of her ethnic origins. Though some Chenier critics have questioned whether she really was Greek or Levantine or Catalan, no one disputes that she herself believed she was Greek and proclaimed it with both proud words as well as actions. She performed Greek songs and dances in her home while her children were very young, invited many of her compatriots for Greek-oriented dis-

MINAS SAVVAS is a professor of English and Comparative Literature at San Diego State Univeristy. He has published widely on Greek culture and literature. His most recent work is *Peculiar Gestures*, translations and essays on Yannis Ritsos now available from Seaburn Press.

cussions, and frequently she even sported a variety of Greek costumes. Andre had heavy doses of her Greekness when he was reunited with her in 1773, at a time when Elizabeth was known as "*la Belle Grecque*" and kept a salon known for its Hellenic and Oriental decorations (Smernoff 18). The salon was a meeting place of several artists, like Cazes and David, and of notable intellectuals who were largely attracted by the gracious and glittering personality and hospitality of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Chenier, the person most responsible for Andre's early love of Hellenism, came from cosmopolitan parents of some wealth. Her father Antoine Lomaca was a Levantine Roman Catholic who was born in Chios but migrated to Constantinople. His mother (Elizabeth's paternal grandmother) was Greek but his father, it is believed, was of Catalan ancestry. Elizabeth's mother was Sapphira Petros, a Greek from Myconos, a cultivated woman who knew the history of the Cyclades intimately, who loved Greek history and literature and spoke Greek, French, Turkish and Italian. She taught her children [and Elizabeth, of course] about Greek myths and poetry, while, as one critic puts it, "above all she sang with her children old Greek songs, many of which echoed Homer" (Loggins 8-9). Of all the Lomaca children, Elizabeth was the most impressed and enamored with all that her mother taught her about Greece. "Few details failed to remain in the girl's memory," says Loggins, and adds: "The more she learned the greater became her pride in the Greek blood that flowed in her veins." (ibid).

It was that substance and affection for things Greek which Andre's mother passed on to her son. She taught him island dances, read to him stories, some from myth, others from more recent folkloristic sources, and urged him to read the Greek classics. Andre was mesmerized by the stories of Homer and not only from reading the epics but from paintings which his mother had commissioned Jean Louis Cazes to paint. She had asked him to paint a scene from every book of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In spite of the artistic deficiencies of Cazes's work [he was a mediocre talent], the young Andre was most impressed by the painted scenes of myth and adventure. It was with such experiences, both the implicit and explicit tutoring, that "his mother's pride in being Greek was also his pride." (Loggins 24).

In the College in Navarre, Chenier was further introduced to authors who were included in what constituted much of the canon

at the time: Homer, Plato, Aristophanes, Theocritus, Cicero, Catullus, Virgil, Lucretius and Cicero. His reading. Of course, also included many French writers such as Pascal, Moliere, Racine and Voltaire. In fact, during his eight years in Paris, the breadth and depth of Andre Chenier's education approximated and even surpassed the Renaissance ideal. In 18th century France, not noted for its great poetry, we find writers and critics who realized that the dormant Muse had to be awakened by a return to the life and writings of Greece and Rome. The need for spontaneity, simplicity and naturalness (as Rousseau was to suggest) could be found in the ancient genius. Chenier, more than the rest of his intellectual contemporaries, with all the Hellenic ideals implanted in him, embraced this principle to the utmost. He set to translating Greek and Latin poets in order to imitate them. Apparently meticulous, Chenier frequently displays an exactitude that aims to reach the minutest detail of his learning. Found posthumously in his papers, are a great number of notes on myths and fables, either complete or fragments of poems and prose writings, all organized under headings in different languages, English, Greek and Latin. Many identified by a Greek letter even when they were not about Greek subjects. (Dimoff 12).

Though he was never to visit Greece, still he imagined himself being there and, at least in his "Bucoliques," he wanted his readers to feel, as he once exclaimed, "I am in Italy, I am in Greece." In one poem a sailor describes Mykonos to his sailing companions by saying, "The gods did little for it . . . Mykonos has only figs and raisins . . . it's an arid rock . . . But it's my fatherland . . . This is where I opened my eyes for the first time . . . where my parents and the first friends I made are . . . I will go back with great joy and will not leave it anymore." Dimoff believes that such a description is strongly autobiographical since Mykonos was the birthplace of his grandmother's Saphira Petro's family. The description must have been one that he had heard from his mother who might have visited there, echoing the love and tenderness transmitted to him about the cradle of his Greek ancestors. (Dimoff 263-64).

After Navarre, in 1781, financial difficulties in the family, forced him to enlist as a cadet in Strasbourg. Military life proved to be most unpleasant, but Andre found solace in intellectual and poetic preoccupation. In a letter he wrote to his then-new friend

Marquis de Brazais, a captain in his regiment, Chenier, wrote: "*Les ruisseaux et les bois et Venus et l'etude/ Adoucissent un peu ma triste solitude*" ("The brooks and the forest and love and study/ Soften a little my melancholy loneliness") (Dimoff, vol.3, p. 187). That same friend, an aspiring poet, had recognized and admired Andre's poetic talent and, some months later, asked him for advice about how best to compose verse. In a few days, Chenier responded in the form of a verse-epistle. The response reflects his perennial connections with the ancients:

Who, I? Give you the lessons that only Apollo can teach?
I, a poet unknown, living in obscurity? Why, the true
nurslings
of Apollo would laugh at me with scorn if I should set
myself up
as one of their company!
In the beautiful art of making verse no man has been my
master.
Such a man, my friend, has never existed. The great poets
of the past
read them, reread, and long meditate upon; the gods,
humankind,
the heavens, universal nature—all should be studied
ceaselessly and admired and adored; in these we poets find
our sacred masters. These are our torch-bearing guides.
(Loggins, 54)

Further down in that same epistle, Chenier writes of how at the age of sixteen, when under the spell of a few lines he had surreptitiously read in Sappho, he began his own journey into poetry. A flower, he adds, a rushing brook, an intricate spider's web, a cloud's shape—they all inspire, they all make the themes of poetry. Later, when in the army, the poet met the great scholar Philippe Brunck (1729–1803) whose *Greek Anthology* was to become the source of many of Andre Chenier's poems. (Scarfe 190, 214). Besides Brunck, Chenier poured into the best of the annotated editions of the classics available in Italy, Germany and England, getting ideas and inspiration for his own work, the continuation of the literary Hellenic ideal. Like Montaigne, Chenier held that it is proper to borrow ideas and images already used by others, pro-

vided that they are transplanted, and relatively converted, into one's own soil and mingled with one's own insights and style.

Dimoff has noted the role of Chenier's masters at the College de Navarre in nurturing in their young pupil the love of Greece that his mother had first instilled in him (Dimoff 320). As for Chenier's contemporary Greece, which was then groaning under the Ottoman and Venetian yoke, the poet had an explanation. He drew an analogy (in *L'Invention*) between the artistic life of a nation and that of an individual. Just as the artist's genius is perverted and twisted by outside influences and leads to a lessening of his talent, so does intrusion of foreign impositions taint the intellectual milieu of a nation's collective genius. In 1781, the year he left Navarre, Chenier met and fell in love with a girl, a dancer whom he was to name Lycoris in a cycle of seven, Greek-inspired poems. This was a time when he was to write many of his bucolics and elegies, and perhaps large sections of his other works such as his epics and *L'Invention* and *La Republique des Lettres*. His persistent and increasing love for the ancients made him interested in penetrating their genius. He was "motivated by his desire to apply their methods to his own artistic works, the basis for his theory of 'imitative invention'." (Smernoff 36). The ancients may inspire the modern artist, but the modern must only be guided to create anew. Richard A. Smernoff puts it more specifically: "Although Chenier's reverence for the past was motivated by his conviction that the moderns too create immortal works, he suggested that only in assimilating the spirit of the ancients can the process of the original imitation be achieved" (Smernoff 47). It was around this time, at the age of 20, when Chenier was suffering from a bladder disease, that he felt that his death was imminent. He began one of his poems by saying, "The woes that crowd upon me have only contempt for my youth." He felt so close to death, in fact, that he even gave instructions to the living on how to deal with his death, including the inscription on his tombstone and the avoidance of religious rites.

We should remember that during the 18th century, the expansion of European trade had given impetus to a fresh interest in the Mediterranean. It was also a time when the disintegration of the Ottoman empire as a military entity was under way, inspiring an invigorated sympathy for its victim nations. This gave a newer appreciation for the achievements of ancient Hellas. As one histo-

rian points out, "The 18th century enjoyed a fuller appreciation of ancient Greece and her achievement than had existed since Roman times; and the result was an enthusiasm that was both intense and contagious" (Stern 194).

In Germany, classicists, like Johann Joachim Winckelmann, were promoting ancient Greek literature and culture. "Good taste," wrote Winckelmann, "was born under the sky of Greece." (Tsigakou 20). A novel by Johann J.W.Heinse, *Ardinghella und die gluckseligen Inseln* (Ardinghella and the Happy Islands), published in 1787, presented a society modeled on Platonic ideals, while underlining the glory that was Greece.

In England, Alexander Pope in the early part of the century was translating Homer. Moreover, "the English Society of Dilettanti" (a group of connoisseur aristocrats) was formed with the aim to foster and promote "the Grecian taste," and to help in advancing the love for classical Greece. (Tsigakou 18–19).

But it was primarily the French who had been impressed by the skills and the artistic perspicacity of the ancients since the Renaissance. The members of the Pleiade group, for example, were dedicated to a revival of classical letters and a promulgation of the methods and beauty inherent in ancient literature and ancient learning. C.A. Demoustier's *Lettres a Emilia sur la Mythologie* (1786), an anthology of poems and commentary on the heroes of Greek mythology proved to be very popular. Several other French authors, implicitly and explicitly, exalted the life and achievement of the ancient Hellenes. Lady Mary Montague, for example, recounted her impressions of the Greek islands in her *Letters* (1763), a volume that inspired the praise of Voltaire:

'Tis impossible to imagine anything more agreeable than
this journey . . . when after drinking a dish of tea with

Sappho,

I might have gone the same evening to visit the Temple of
Homer in Chios, and passed this voyage in taking plans of
magnificent temples, delineating the miracles of
statuaries,

and conversing with the most polite and most gay of
humankind.

(Halsband 65)

Another visit, this time in ancient Greece, was recounted in Abbe Barthelemy's popular *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grece* (1788). In this novel, a young Scythian roams the Greek mainland seeking and finding happiness and wisdom from an enlightened nation. Anacharsis's idyllic voyage became so popular that it ran through 40 editions and was translated in all the major European languages (Tsigakou 20).

Even closer to Chenier's aim and sensibility was Pierre Augustin Guys (1722–1801). Guy purpose was to remind his readers that there is also a modern Greece. His perspicacious comparison of ancient and modern Greeks triggered the emulations of several other writers. Guys's *Ancients et Modernes, Avec un Parallele de leur Moeurs, Par M. Guys, Negotiant, De l'Academie de Marseille* appeared in 1771 when the first Greek uprising started to cause some interest throughout Europe. Guys argues that the modern Greeks had preserved many interesting customs from antiquity and that the moderns help us to understand the ancients, just as the ancients help us to understand the moderns. The modern Greeks, Guys states, deserve as much attention as the ancient monuments which usually attract the tourists. Guys mailed a copy of his book to Voltaire who responded by praising the book, while regretting that he had never visited Greece, "that cultivated place" (Stern 215). In a subsequent edition, Guys included two letters by Madame Chenier who complimented the author and praised his comparison of the ancient with the modern Greeks "enslaved and subjugated by a barbarous people" (Stern 216). Equally angry with the enslavement of Greece was Choiseul Gouffier in his *Voyage Pittoresque de la Grece* (1782) who compared the ancient heroes as models for the emerging struggle of Greece for independence. But the most vehement of the writers against Turkish barbarity was Claude Etienne Savary. In his *Lettres sur La Grece* (1788), he writes:

Let me not be accused of painting the Turks in colours blacker than they deserve. I have travelled throughout their empire, I have seen the injuries of every kind which they have done to sciences, the arts, the human race . . . At the sight of these melancholy spectacles my heart groans, and is filled with indignation, my blood boils in my veins, and I would wish to excite all Europe to combine against these Turks. (Stern 216–17).

Chenier, under the strong influence of his mother—especially during his formative years—had not become oblivious to the plight of the enslaved Greeks, but he knew little of their sensibility and, it seems, he was reluctant to explicitly make cultural or ethnographic parallelisms. In the realm of literature and culture, however, other writers were, even above and beyond Greece, were more generally preoccupied with comparisons of the old with the new.

This eventually evolved in the age of Chenier into a debate about ancients and moderns and Chenier himself, with works like "L'Invention," was calling for a kind of compromise which asserted that an artist must imitate the ancients but should not be so servile as to eschew new ideas and themes. He explained about *L'Invention*, for instance, that it is an attempt to reconcile "*Sur des penses nouveaux, faisons de vers antiques.*" Pope himself (one of Chenier's favorite English writers) in his Preface to his translation of *The Iliad* had written that Homer was "allowed to have had the greatest invention of any writer whatever," and that he was "the greatest of poets who most excelled in that which is the foundation of poetry." (Kopf 102). "L'Invention" must have been strongly influenced by Alexander Pope's *Essay on Criticism* which emphasized the influence of the ancients on 17th century literary canons.

After an unpleasant period of military service in Strasbourg and an equally unpleasant, lowly job in London's French Embassy, Chenier in 1783–4 joined his family in Paris where he continued to endure several bouts with his bladder and with kidney stones. Around that time he composed his long, epico-didactic poems *L'Hermes*, *La Republique des Lettres*, and *L'Amerique*. Here the poet traces the history of humankind and the course of science and discovery. Overtly or covertly in all these works Chenier again displays his indebtedness to the ancient Greek and Roman writers. This was to be made more succinct later in *L'Invention*, which is Chenier's widely-discussed literary manifesto, and in which he praises Homer, Virgil, the Greek civilization and the Greek language. Chenier, in fact, came to believe like Plato that an artist does not really create a work of art, but simply finds it. It has been lying dormant in nature, and the artist brings it to life. And like Theocritus, especially in his bucolics, Chenier conceived nature's correspondences to Art hidden to the eye but recovered by the artist as he perceives the beauties of the physical world. Though he defined thirteen genres historically used in French verse, he

states that the Greeks knew twenty genres and never overstepped the limits of any of them, although their boundaries are "*souvent imperceptibles*." (Walter 646). *L'Invention* was a poetic manifestation of many ideas that he had expounded in his "*Essai sur les causes et les effets de la perfection et de la decadence des lettres et des arts*." There, along with the Bible, Voltaire and some other modern writers, Chenier includes a long prose discussion on the ancient Greeks—comments that contain the basis for his poetics and form the essence of his ideas in the 400 lines of *L'Invention*. "The Greeks," he states in *Essai*, "were born for fine arts more than any other people in the world. They alone, in the frenzies of enthusiasm, always knew how to follow nature and truth" (*Essai*, Pleiade, 646). The writers that Chenier came to dislike, in fact, were mostly those who did not share the Greeks' penchant for simplicity, beauty and truth. Shakespeare himself was among those who did not follow nature—according to Chenier—and were given to "barbaric convulsions," as were most of the rest of English writers. It should be pointed out, however, that Chenier's knowledge of English writers was limited and, in all fairness, his overwhelming love for Hellenism instilled some prejudices and restrictions to his poetics. Remy de Gourmont commented that "Chenier loved Greece because for him it was the embodiment of the good and the beautiful" (Gourmont 688). But on occasion, it is true, Chenier misconstrues some new venues of creativity in his assessments. "Although he understood Greek genius in terms of a patently executed craft," writes Smernoff, "his vocabulary in describing the Greeks—"burning imagination," "divine madness," "ardent chagrin,"—shows that he approached them in terms of their sensitivity rather their specific stylistic devices." (Smernoff 38).

In a later work, *La Republique*, Chenier expresses his most personal, humanistic principles. Here in a kind of invocation to Apollo, the deity of the arts, Chenier names his favorite French poets (Boileau, Voltaire, Corneille, Racine, La Fontaine, Le Brun). When next he discusses the ancients, he does not name likes and dislikes. He cites them as paragons of virtue and skill. Virgil's and Horace's genius overcame servitude at the court of the Emperor, while Anacreon, he argues, is honored for his refusal to bow to authority at the court of the tyrant Polycrates. Similarly, Archilochos is honored for his biting satire, while Catullus and Alcaeus are praised for their valor and liveliness.

Chenier's most characteristic work, which won him the name of "the French Theocritus," is in his shorter eclogues, elegies, idylls, and odes. Practically in all of these, some of them incomplete, Chenier "shows his devotion to ancient classical literature, especially to the Greek elegiac poets with whom his mind was pervaded. He carried into his poems their delicate grace and melody, giving expression in the old pagan spirit to his love of nature, youth and beauty." (*The Oxford Companion to French Literature*, 129). So strong is the Hellenic influence, in theme and technique, in these poems, that Gilbert Highet even goes as far as to say that "Many of Chenier's shorter poems might be translations from the Greek. They are true. They are re-creations of the eternal aspects of the Hellenic spirit in a modern language, with all the restraint which is the most Greek of poetic virtues." (*The Classical Tradition* 403). He even conceived of some epico-philosophical poems, like *Hermes* and *L'Amerique* which he never got to complete.

The elegiac poems of ancient Greece were emulated in poems like *L'Aveugle* (Homer welcomed on Skyros) and *Le Mendiant*, where Chenier through his characters Lycus and Cleotas dramatizes and emphasizes the moral values of antiquity. This poem, in fact, is a variation of the incident between Odysseus and Nausicaa's encounter in Phaacia, as Chenier more than likely, could first trace it back to Sapphira Petros. In *L'Aveugle*, Chenier envisions Homer as a blind old bard who speaks in the prophetic moral tones of an ancient divinity. Chenier's epic singer praises the shepherds who are pure and free and live in harmony with nature. With full understanding of the strategies in the Homeric epics, Chenier uses stock phrases, repetition and inversion. Though a mortal, Chenier's Homer walks with the gods with the confidence and strength of an equal by virtue of the superhuman eloquence, purity and integrity of his song and the richness of his moral stance. His knowledge and veneration of classical themes is also shown in *La Morte de Hercule*. This bucolic deals with Hercules's wife Dianeira who made her husband wear a tunic which she believed would make him faithful to her, but which in reality was drenched with the poisoned blood of the centaur Nessus. Tormented by unbearable pain, Hercules burns himself on the top of Mount Aetna.

Modeled on *vers antiques* was even Chenier's very first bucolic, *Xanthus*, a poem he wrote when he was only 16. It's a poem which imitates Theocritus in detail and technique and written in a mod-

ification of the alexandrine, a creative conception that is certainly impressive for a 16 year old. Xanthus is about the death of a young, handsome warrior who dies away from his mother, Xanthe, causing her much grief but affirming with his death the nobility and courage of his life as "*son corps palpitant roule sur la poussiere*" (his palpitating body rolls in the dust). *Le Malade* also deals with characters borrowed from ancient Greece, and it involves the power of love, whether maternal or erotic.

Most conscious of the Greekness that was instilled in him, Chenier does not tire to acknowledge it. "Twelve years I've sucked the lore of ancient Greece and Rome," he writes in one of his poems, "A bee amassing honeyed thoughts."

Even in the poems that are not specifically on Greek themes, Chenier illustrates his attachment to his classical learning. The song sung by Ophelia just before her suicide in the *Camille Elegies* corresponds, to his mind, with Ariadne's lament upon being abandoned, a tune which, more than likely, he had heard his mother sing. Longing for her lover, the maddened Ariadne of his poem ran wild on the mountains. In another iambic poem, Chenier invokes the acknowledged inventor of the iambic poem, Archilochos, who "equipped himself with flaming iambs" and "aimed them straight."

Chenier, moreover, displayed his abiding appreciation of his Greek heritage in all the diversity of his poetic forms. Idyls, elegies, epistles, odes, epics, iambics, pastorals, eclogues, Chenier tried them all, and all in the classical mode either as imitations or inspirations. "His knowledge and veneration of classical antiquity," writes Kopf, "appear on almost every page." (24). The many allusions and references to Greek authors and Greek myths can be found in every one of the genres that preoccupied him.. He summons, for example, four Greek philosophers—Democritus, Thales, Plato and Epicurus—as major representatives of the different conceptions of nature and the universe during ancient times, and then he juxtaposes them to four modern thinkers—Torricelli, Newton, Kepler and Galileo—who know more than their ancient counterparts but who would not know more if those ancients had not existed. "In all that he wrote, writes one notable critic, "it is obvious that his models were Greek and Latin. He adhered completely to the classical theory of the immutability of literary genres, though still he wanted to be original." (Dimoff 295). Even

Chenier's history of theatre, with choruses based on Aeschylus and Aristophanes, although not put into practice, defies the concept of French classical tragedy and that of the *comédie larmoyante* of his day. (Kopf 114).

Since the age was of one of revolution and largely-inescapable political consciousness, the last years of Andre Chenier's life were marked by an increasingly strong commitment to socio-political issues. The French Revolution was under way and the poet, while at first sympathetic to the Jacobins, came to slowly object and even to criticize their excesses. Schooled by the Greeks on the virtues of moderation, he adopted a courageous stand against the unfettered acts of the revolutionists—a stand that led to flight and then imprisonment and public execution. By 1790, when Chenier had returned to Paris, after some unhappy days in London, the Revolution had gathered momentum. Francois de Pange, a scholar of Greek, a member of the aristocracy and a long time friend and benefactor of Chenier, had published an article in which he denounced the Jacobins' practice of public informing and their rough justice of lynchings and "instant retributions." Chenier's complete public approval of the damning article by his closest friend rendered him as a dangerous opponent to the Revolution. (Scarfe 119). By then the royal family had been back to Paris from Versailles, church property had been confiscated, many intellectuals had been executed, pensions had been reduced or suspended, and mobs were burning and lynching practically at will. Changes and radical reforms of all sorts, many of them outrageous, were bound to cause people of unwavering prudence like Chenier to protest and resist. He, thereby, helped found the "Societe de 1789," a revolutionary club that turned critical and in opposition to the many acts of the Jacobins. Chenier eventually became the group's most formidable spokesman (Scarfe 220), and his verbal and written pronouncements from this public and important forum, in which he condemned the thoughtless actions in the name of liberty, added to his vulnerability.

Between 1790 and the time of his death on July 25, 1794, Chenier, in fact, had published about 27 articles and a few *iambes*. In most of these, he had found more to criticize than to praise in the Jacobins. He suggested that the excesses of the partisan factions were temporary and that the return to reason and good sense were imminent. Though he wrote with much cautious ambiva-

lence, his writings were interpreted as thinly-veiled frontal attacks on the Revolution. When the Reign of Terror was under way, Chenier, less ambiguous now, wrote his essay, "Advice to the French People on its Veritable Enemies" ("*Avis au peuple francais sur ses Veritables Enemies*") where he attacked the rampant anarchy and the atrocities. He did this at a time when many intellectuals were reticent or compromising about the dramatic events. Chenier's unwavering adherence to principles since venturing to political journalism, coupled with his defense of de Pange, rendered him an enemy of the Revolution in the eyes of the Jacobin leaders. In 1792, after another even more forthright tract, where he attacked the revolutionaries and defended the King, Chenier was forced to leave Paris and went into hiding in Rouen and Le Havre (Smernoff 127). With the execution of the King on January 21, 1793, the creation of a Revolutionary Tribunal, the assassination of Marat by Charlotte Corday, and the mass executions of the guillotine, the frenzy of the mobs had reached its apex. Chenier, after two years as a fugitive was arrested on March 7, 1794 in one of his periodic trips to Paris. He was interrogated and then taken to prison in Saint-Lazare. At his trial he was condemned as a friend of royalty and for counter-revolutionary activities, and was guillotined on the same day as the guilty verdict was reached. July 25, 1794.

Many have interpreted his death as heroic. Not necessarily in the manner of Umberto Giordano's sentimental opera on the poet, but by serious scholars and critics who have seen him as a poet who died for his unwavering principles of moderation and decent, activist patriotism. Even before the Revolution, Chenier had defined the artist as a moral legislator obligated to emphasize the moral imperatives of his age. As a poet, he felt—like Euripides or Pericles—that the artist must not detach himself from civic or political affairs. Besides his ancient mentors, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Condorcet had shaped his views on society. Works like the poems *La Liberte* and *Hymne a la justice*, written before the Revolution, evoked Chenier's love for freedom and justice and his sympathy for the downtrodden.

Even his approach to suffering and death was shaped by his French and Greek mentors. He says in one of his latest poems,

I am dying. Before nightfall my journey will be ended.
Barely opened to the light, my rose has faded.

Life did have for me sweet, fleeting moments;
I was barely tasting them, and here I am, dying.

The tone of gentle patience and discreet melancholy in announcing what he believes to be his imminent death displays, as Dimoff observes, his close kinship to the Greeks, in the manner that he approaches suffering death "with a sensibility which is both poignant and mellow, both moving and penetrating." (Dimoff 535). Even in his death, it seems, Chenier, faithful to his Hellenic influences, emphasized harnessing the excess of passions but without ignoring them in the least. To the very end, he was," writes Hightet, "one of the first of the many modern poets who can be called reincarnated Greeks." (402).

Works Cited

- Dimoff, Paul, ed. *Oeuvres Completes d'Andre Chenier*, 3 volumes, Paris: Delagrave, 1910. Unless from one of the cited sources, the translations from the originals found in Dimoff are mine.
- De Gourmont, Remy, "La Philosophie d'Andre Chenier," *Controverse et le Contemporain*, 2, serie 4 (1883), 673-699.
- Halsband, R. (editor), *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Worthley Montague*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1965-67).
- Hightet, Gilbert, *The Classical Tradition*, Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Kopf, Martin, *The Poetics of Andre Chenier*, Columbia University, Columbia Microfilms, 1972.
- Loggins, Vernon, *Andre Chenier, His Life, Death and Glory*, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1965.
- Oxford Companion to French Literature*, edited by Sir Paul Harvey and J. E. Haseltine, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Scarfe, Francis, *Andre Chenier, His Life and Work, 1762-1794*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Smernoff, Richard, *Andre Chenier*, Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977.
- Stern, B.H. *The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786* (Mansaha, 1940).
- Tsigakou, Fani-Maria, *The Rediscovery of Greece* (Caratzas Bros. Publishers, New York, 1981).
- Walter, Gerard, *Andre Chenier, Son Milieu et Son Temps*, Paris: Robert Lafont, 1947.

The Story behind the Statistics: Variables Affecting the Tremendous Losses of Greek Jewry During the Holocaust

by MARCIA HADDAD IKONOMOPOULOS

Greece has the ignominious distinction of having lost the largest percentage of Jews in any occupied country during the Holocaust: 87% of Greek Jewry was lost.¹ Many attempts have been made to explain these losses: the complicity of a quisling government,² Greek anti-Semitism,³ inadequate Jewish leadership (especially in the case of Head Rabbi Koretz of Thessaloniki),⁴ the conservative mentality of Jewish communities in Greece and, especially, that as late as 1943/44 (when deportations took place in Greece) little was known of the concentration camps and that the railroad cars were taking the Jews of Greece to their deaths.⁵ All of these variables are important but they still do not explain other pertinent facts: why, on arrival at the camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau, were a greater percentage of Greek Jews chosen to die in the gas chambers, and why was their ability to survive in the camps more difficult than that of Jews from other countries? These last two factors also added to the losses of Greek Jewry, but have never been adequately discussed before. It is the purpose of this paper to review previous attempts to explain the losses of Greek Jewry (primarily based on Jewish Greece during the Occupation and deportations that ensued), and to discuss these two additional variables

MARCIA HADDAD IKONOMOPOULOS is Museum Director of Kehila Kedosha Janina, President of the Association of Friends of Greek Jewry, and editorial board member for Sephardic House's publications on Greek Holocaust Memoirs and Studies.

(the journey to Auschwitz-Birkenau and life in the camp), variables that have nothing to do with the internal situation within Greece, but everything to do with what added to the tremendous losses of Greek Jewry.

There were 77,600 Jews living in Greece at the beginning of the Occupation (April 1941): the 1,700 Jews of Rhodes and the 100 Jews of Kos, which are counted as part of Greek Holocaust statistics (and will be included in discussion of Greek Jewry in this paper) were under Italian control, making for a total of 78,400.⁶ With the exception of Thessaloniki, where Jews made up one third of the city's total population, Jews represented a small minority in communities where they resided. Greek Jewry was composed of two distinct groups: Romaniotes (the indigenes, Greek-speaking Jews of Greece who date their ancestry back to the Roman Empire) and Sephardim (Spanish-speaking descendants of Jews expelled from Spain in 1492). There were also small numbers of Ashkenazi Jews (who had entered from German lands to the north and Russian lands to the east) and Jews of Italian descent on the island of Corfu. By the time of the Holocaust, these Jews had been absorbed by either the Romaniotes or Sephardim, and can only be distinguished by surnames that show their former roots. Salonika (Thessaloniki), alone, had 56,000 Jews in 1940 and was the most populous city of Sephardic Jews in the world for over 400 years.

Hagen Fleischer examined the extent of assimilation of various Greek Jewish communities and speculated on how this affected their ability to survive the Holocaust.⁷ He discussed the assimilated Jewish communities of Athens and Thessaly, the connections they had made with non-Jews in the area and how this assimilation had aided them. The statistics substantiate what he says (on this point): the losses in Athens and Thessaly are substantially less than those throughout the rest of Greece. His explanation does not take into account the over 90% losses in Ioannina, one of the most highly acculturated Greek-Jewish communities in Greece. He compared the survival ability of Greek-speaking Jews (for the most part Romaniote Jews) with those of Spanish speaking Sephardim, who spoke a medieval form of Spanish, often referred to as Ladino. His conclusion was that because the Sephardim, especially those living in insulated communities like Thessaloniki, had preserved their Spanish language and had not fully assimilated into the surrounding Greek-speaking culture,

their ability to survive the Holocaust was severely hampered. The explanation is too simplistic. True, the heavily Spanish-accented Greek spoken by native Ladino speakers in Greece made it more difficult for them to hide their Jewish identity, but numbers of native Ladino speakers in Thessaly (in communities like Larissa, Karditsa and Trikkala) were able to escape deportation in hiding and, as previously mentioned, native Greek-speaking Jews also suffered horrendous losses. True, connections with local non-Jews, both those in political positions, and those in religious authority, were of aid in some locales (specifically in Athens, Thessaly, Zakynthos and Chalkis) but in other areas (such as Ioannina) they proved meaningless.

A simplistic approach at explaining the statistics of Greek-Jewish losses is that of Greek anti-Semitism and Greek government complicity. As with all officially occupied countries during the Holocaust, the Germans put a quisling government in place in Greece to carry out their plans. The official Greek government was in exile in Egypt throughout the occupation. While no top government official protested the German's actions regarding Jews in the country, and in some instances, such as that of the Governor of Macedonia, openly supported the German policy, minor officials, such as the Chiefs of Police in both Athens and Piraeus, issued false ID cards to Jews, enabling them to elude the deportations. The head of the Greek Orthodox Church, Archbishop Damaskinos, issued a formal protest, the only one of its kind by the head of any major Christian religion in Europe, denouncing the German's intention to deport the Jews of Greece. This protest was signed by heads of major unions and educational institutions in Athens. In addition, Greece had one of the strongest resistance movements in all of Europe: EDES, which was government and Church affiliated, and EAM/ELAS, which was Communist controlled at the top. The latter formulated, as early as 1943, as part of its official policy, the saving of Jews in Greece. In a series of interviews of Holocaust survivors from Thessaloniki conducted by Erika Kounio Amariglio and Alberto Nar,⁸ many interviewed were asked if they could have escaped and if they had Greek Christian friends who had offered to help them. Most answered yes. Many related connections to the resistance movement. When asked why they did not choose to escape and avoid deportations, most gave personal explanations: "I was the oldest son—I could not leave my aging parents to care for

my many brothers and sisters," "My wife was pregnant—we could not go to the mountains," "I had an infant child—we could not leave," "My mother cried-my father pleaded with me not to go," "Families were not separated-we would bear out fate together," etc. These responses are reflective of the conservative nation of the Jewish communities (especially that of Thessalonki), which will be discussed later.

Much has been written about the adequacy, or inadequacy, of Jewish leadership during the Holocaust. One of the most controversial figures of the Holocaust in Greece was Head Rabbi Koretz of Thessalonki, whom many of the survivors consider a collaborator directly responsible for the demise of the Jewish community.⁹ There is no doubt that, as both the religious and political leader of the community (the Germans put him in the position of President of the community in addition to his position of Head Rabbi), and the fact that he called for the compliance of the community in following German orders and acted as a spokesman for their demands, disseminating their propaganda that the Jew were only "being sent to work in Poland," contributed to the acquiescence of the community and the reluctance of many to escape. There were other rabbis, such as Rabbi Pessach in Volos,¹⁰ and Rabbi Barzilai in Athens, who, with knowledge of what had happened in Thessaloniki the previous year, helped many in their respective communities to flee to safety. On the other hand, other leaders, such as the President of the Jewish Community of Ioannina, Sabbetai Kabelis, even knowing what had happened in Thessaloniki, chose to believe that they could best serve their communities by complying with the German demands.¹¹ The question of Jewish leadership during the Holocaust is always a difficult one. Rabbis and community presidents were not chosen, nor equipped to deal with the horrors of Nazi persecutions. They, especially the rabbis, were chosen as spiritual leaders. They were ill equipped to deal with the German methods of persuasion by fear and threats of reprisals.

The conservative nature of the Jewish communities in Greece was definitely a variable that led to their severe losses during the Holocaust. In many ways, most of the Greek Jews were decades behind their contemporaries in Western and Eastern Europe. It was only in the beginning of the 20th century that modern education (in the form of the Alliance Israelite Universelle¹²) came to Greece. Before that, women had no formal education, and most

young boys only received religious education. Even though there were wealthy Jewish industrialists in Thessaloniki, most of the Jewish population of the city, and of other Jewish communities in Greece, belonged to the lower-middle or lower classes. They were small shop owners, craftsmen, hamales who worked at the ports, and street venders. Families were large, often numbering eight or more children. Society was patriarchal: marriages were arranged. Children lived at home until they were married. Even when given the opportunity to escape to the mountains and the resistance movement, many young people chose to stay with their families. Many who did leave returned later to be deported with them.¹³

As early as the spring of 1942, knowledge on the mass extermination of European Jewry had reached those who could have helped: Churchill, Roosevelt and the Pope. Deportations did not begin in Greece until 1943. When the Germans arrived, they confiscated all radios and took over the newspapers, replacing them with their own propaganda press. Broadcasts from the BBC were heard in Greece by those who possessed illegal radios, but never once was there any mention of the death camps. Correspondences sent by Consul Burton Berry (stationed in Turkey) to the United States,¹⁴ repeatedly mentioned the deportations from Greece in 1943 and 1944. Both England and the United States knew that Jews were being killed in Auschwitz-Birkenau. They knew the Jews of Greece were being deported there.¹⁵ They knew the railroad lines that were taking the Jews of Greece to the Nazi extermination camps. The Allies bombed Greece from top to bottom. The one thing they never touched were the railroad lines leading Greek Jews to their deaths. There is no doubt that if information was available to Greek Jewry, and that if they did not honestly believe, as late as July of 1944, that they were being sent to work in Poland (or Germany depending on the misinformation given them at the time), they would not have so willingly entered the cattlecars. There is no doubt that the destruction of the means of taking Greek Jewry to the camps would have prevented their tremendous losses. All of this has been excellently dealt with in Dr. Michael Matsas' *The Illusion of Safety*. This is not the purpose of my paper.

While many variables within Greece influenced the 87% losses of Greek Jewry, one variable has never been fully explored before: how their journey to, arrival at, and their life within the

camps contributed to their losses. Exploring this multi-faceted variable and sheds new light on the losses of Greek Jewry. All statistics mentioned are taken from the Official Archives of Auschwitz as compiled by Danuta Czech for the Auschwitz Chronicle.¹⁶ Community statistics are those of Yad Vashem and the official statistics issued by the Central Board of Jewish Communities.

A limited number of "privileged" Jews (those holding foreign nationalities) were sent to Bergen-Belsen) and the Jews of Thrace were sent to their deaths in Treblinka,¹⁷ deported by the Bulgarians, but the final destination for most Greek Jews would be Auschwitz-Birkenau. The decision to establish a concentration camp in Auschwitz (Oswiecim), near the Vistula River on the outskirts of the industrial region of Upper Silesia, was made shortly after the German invasion and occupation of western Poland in 1939. Auschwitz was ideally situated at the junction of a major travel network and the camp could be protected and unnoticed by the Polish population in the area (something that would change with the mass exterminations and the smoke emanating from the crematoria). Himmler officially established the camp on April 27, 1940. Birkenau was established in the winter of 1941-42. In January of 1942, a conference was held at Wannsee (a suburb outside of Berlin) to discuss the implementation of the "Final Solution." The means used, up until that point, of exterminating Jews (the Einsatzgruppen) was not adequate: the number of Jews killed by firing squads were limited in number and, more importantly, there were demoralizing psychological repercussions for the German soldiers who had to actually view the women and children they were killing. The decision to use lethal gas was made at Wannsee. Statistics were presented on the numbers of European Jewry slated for extermination (11 million), among them the 77,000 Jews of Greece (the actual number estimated by the Germans was 69,000¹⁸).

The first gas chamber at Auschwitz (Crematorium I) began functioning on August 15, 1940.¹⁹ Attached to the gas chamber was a crematorium to incinerate the corpses. This would be the procedure used in all additional facilities erected at the camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Additional gas chambers and attached crematoria (a total of 4) would be erected in the camp of Birkenau. Two of the four crematoria were functional as of March 13, 1943,²⁰ just in time for the arrival of the first transport of Greek Jews from

Thessaloniki: the third would be completed in April, 1943 and the fourth in June, 1943, during the arrival of additional transports from Thessaloniki. Previous to the erection of the gas chambers and crematoria, the Nazis were limited in their capacity to kill arriving Jews. This is not to say that Jews did not die within the camp previous to this (and, of course, afterwards) due to starvation diets and harsh working conditions, but the ability to select Jews for immediate extermination upon arrival (those considered "unfit" for work—the children, the elderly, the infirm, pregnant women and young mothers carrying children) was hampered by the inability to murder in large numbers and dispose of the corpses. This was not true when Greek Jews began to arrive at Auschwitz-Birkenau: the means for their mass extermination were in place.

The first transport of Greek Jews, containing 2,800 Jews left Thessaloniki on March 15, 1943.²¹ They arrived at Auschwitz-Birkenau on March 20. According to the Official Records of Auschwitz: "2,800 Jewish men, women and children from the ghetto in Salonika have arrived with an RSHA transport from Greece. Following the selection, 417 men, given Nos. 109371-109787, and 192 women, given Nos. 38721-38912, are admitted to the camp as prisoners. The other approximately 2,191 people are killed in the gas chambers."²² From this transport, immediately on arrival in the camp, 78% would be sent to their deaths. The percentage would rise to over 80% with subsequent transport arrivals. There were, of course, Jews arriving at Auschwitz-Birkenau from other European countries at the same time that the Jews of Greece were arriving. Jews from Berlin, and other cities in Germany, began arriving in early March of 1943, before the completion of the crematoria. On March 6, two transports arrived: on the first transport 58% were sent directly to the gas chambers, and on the second, 59% perished immediately.²³ The difference in survival rates due to the unavailability of functional crematoria in the case of the German Jews, as opposed to that of the Greek Jews (when the crematoria were all functional) is apparent. The first transport to arrive after three of the four crematoria were in place (March 13th) was from Krakau (Krakow), Poland: of the 2000 Jewish men, women and children on the transport, 1,492 are killed in the gas chambers (72%).²⁴ Other transports arriving from other countries at the same time as Greek Jews were arriving from

Salonika (March-July 1943) show this same trend: the percentage of Jews sent directly to the gas chambers was substantially less.

The explanation of why this happened is simple: Greek Jews had to travel substantially longer distances to reach Auschwitz-Birkenau. The greater length of time spent in the cattlecars, deprived of water and adequate food, cramped into suffocating quarters unable to lie down, forced to relieve themselves in a bucket in the middle of the car, contributed significantly to their debilitated state on arrival. The German criterion for entrance into the camp was "usefulness," whether one was capable of working for the Third Reich. Those who were considered useless (the elderly, the lame, the infirm, children, pregnant women, etc.) were sent immediately to the gas chambers. Where the average travel time for arrival at Auschwitz from other points in Europe (Germany, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia and Poland) was one to three days, the shortage journey from Greece (from Thessaloniki in the northeast) was 5 days,²⁵ with most transports taking from 7-8 days. The transports in 1944 would take even longer. The Jews of Rhodes were taken off the island on July 23: they did not arrive at Auschwitz until August 16, a journey of 24 days.²⁶ Simply put, by the time the Jews of Greece arrived at the train station at Auschwitz-Birkenau, the young looked old beyond their years and many were too feeble to even walk, let alone appear fit for work. As reported by eyewitness, when the Jews of Corfu arrived in July of 1944 and the doors to the cattlecars opened, there was dead silence.

The testimonies of Greek Jews who endured the horrific conditions of the Journey to Auschwitz-Birkenau speak volumes:

Moisis Amir from Salonika (a young healthy man, recently married, from Salonika):²⁷ The cattlecars were intended for animals. People could not live in them. There were about 60-80 people inside each car. It was very difficult to lie down. We had two women who died on the trip. We screamed out to the Germans to remove the corpses because they had started to smell. I went and grabbed them and threw them outside. I was in charge of getting rid of all the dirt in the car. We emptied our bodily wastes out of the window while the train was moving. There was a wire covering and I would open it and throw out the

receptacle. . . . As for food, we had practically nothing. We had brought bread with us. We had filled two sacks with carob bread and that's how we got by. After about 6 days, (it was the end of April) we arrived at Auschwitz, at the ramp between Auschwitz and Birkenau. We arrived at four in the afternoon. I was exhausted. I could not even move. My father-in-law told me to watch his tools because that would be what would save us. We got down off the train to the sounds of shouting. There was so much commotion. They spoke to us in German. There was a Jew from Salonika who spoke to us in Greek. He told us to leave our things and that they would give them to us later. They tried to calm us down. The selections took place very fast. My wife and I went arm in arm. I was right behind my brother-in-law. The selection took place there. They separated the men from the women. My mother-in-law wanted one of my sister-in-laws to stay with her. She called out to her and she went from our line to be with her mother.

Iakov Attias, from Salonika, age 33, married with a young daughter:²⁸ The freight cars were like those used for hauling animals. There were about 80-90 people in the car. Excuse me, but inside the cattlecar, we peed, we shit, we did everything. There were no toilets, only barrels. The only food we had was what we had taken with us. They made many stops but did not open the doors. We were inside for eight days straight.

Leon Benmayer from Salonika, age 28, single:²⁹ We were loaded into the cattlecars early in the morning of April 26. The conditions were traumatic. They were railroad cars used for animals and rubbish: they were completely sealed. We could not breathe. There were two barrels inside each car, one for our bodily needs and one holding drinking water. The only food we had was what we had brought with us. The cars were filled to the point of suffocation. We tried to arrange ourselves so that we could sit. It was impossible to lie down. There was no room. We took turns lying down. The trip took about six or seven days. It was

very difficult. The train made one stop somewhere in the mountains. We got down, emptied the barrels and then started to move again. We made one other stop on the border of Austria and Yugoslavia. However, that time we were not permitted to get water. You can imagine how people were suffering. It was horrible. The children were crying and the elderly could not calm themselves down: the young people patiently tried to endure. Some seriously ill people died in some of the cars during the journey. We learned about that later on. Fortunately, we did not have such occurrences in our own car.³⁰

Moses Eskenazi, from Salonika, age 30, married with one young child:³¹ They told us that they would take us to live in Poland. First of all, we knew nothing. Secondly, we had families. We had no idea that we would suffer so much. If we knew, we would have stayed here. We would have fought like men. So, we went to Birkenau. We traveled in freight cars that were crowded and dirty. There was not even room to breath. Donkeys traveled in better conditions than we did. We were about 50-60 people in each car. They told us to take a large pot for water and another for our bodily needs. The trip took about 6-8 days. They made stops to get water but they did not allow us to go out of the cars. It was midnight when we arrived at the camp.

Mose Halegua (a young rabbi from Salonika):³² The trip alone took 8 or 9 days. The freight cars were the kind they used to transport horses. We were about 80 people in each car. We were spread out one on top of the others, with no place to lie down. People were crying out in the cars, wanting to lie down. Where could one lie down? On top of some rags? We had barrels inside for our bodily needs. We would empty them on the road when the train stopped. There was no food, only what they had given us in Thessaloniki. They had given us some loaves of bread, one kilo for each person. That's how we got by. We economized. They told us that was it and there was no more. In the streets, the Greeks gave us some small round loaves. Otherwise, we would have collapsed. I don't remember all the

details. After all these years, I cannot remember. This is the first time that I am speaking about it. The train would stop after a number of hours. It could not pass through. The railroad lines were being used by other trains. One evening, it was night, midnight. There were flashlights. We had arrived at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Benjamin Kapon, from Thessaloniki, age 16 (his family had escaped Athens but were informed on and deported in 1944).³³ Half of us were standing, and the other half were sitting so that there could be some room to breath. I don't remember us having any food other than the packages from the Red Cross. They opened the cars for water in Yugoslavia. If we left Athens in the morning, I think they let us down for water when they opened the cars. We went and filled up whatever containers we had with water. There was a barrel for our bodily needs. We would empty it when the cars were opened. I don't remember how many times the train stopped. I think there were people who died in the train, but I don't remember where they took them off. I think it was afternoon when we arrived at Birkenau. We got off the trains and they separated us, the men from the women.

Iakov Pardo, from Salonika, age 20.³⁴ We were packed into cattlecars made to transport animals. There were no seats. They had put a bucket in the corner with a curtain in front, so that we could go and urinate. Nothing else. We were crammed together inside. There was not even an open window, nothing. We were 60 people in the car. We could neither sit nor lay down. The only food we had was what we had brought with us. They had told us that the trip would last 8 days. They gave us water on the road. We did not get down from the cars. They had us locked in. They gave us cans of water. We arrived at Auschwitz. It was night. They said: "Those that can march on foot, go over there. Those that cannot walk will go by truck." Many young people were so exhausted, they could not walk and they went to the trucks. They did not know that they were going to their death.

Matty Azaria, from Salonika, age 15:³⁵ They were freight cars without windows. We had some food inside: grapes, olives, and lemons. We did not have water. Certainly, the freight cars made stops, now and then. We called out for water. They would bring the water about three or four meters from the windows and pour it out in front of us, and we remained without any water. Italians and Bulgarians would come to give us water when they heard us calling "water, water," but as soon as they saw the Germans approaching, they would leave. The train made many stops. As far as our bodily needs, everything took place inside the freight cars. When the train departed, we would throw our wastes outside through the window. There was a small window; one that the animals would use to get air. The wind would blow our wastes back in on top of us. My mother took out a good blanket that she had brought with her, and placed it in a corner, since she was afraid that the others would look at us, young girls that we were. We had no space to lie down. We sat day and night. We would stand up for a little while, take a few steps and then sit down again. There were little babies, and old people. We prayed to arrive as quickly as possible, even if we didn't know what would happen when we got to our destination. Those who couldn't stand on their feet were laid down. If they didn't leave the train rapidly enough, they were beaten. The Germans were accompanied by dogs, but they did not need to use them use them. How could we escape? Where would someone go in a strange land? There was one old woman who died in the cattlecar. As soon as we arrived there, they separated the small children with the old people. When we got out of the cattlecar, we saw trucks coming. They took the dead woman by her head and her feet and threw her inside one of the trucks. Our parents were in the truck along with her. I think the trip took seven days. When we arrived, it was dawn. As soon as we arrived, when the Germans said that we had arrived, my mother was next to the window. As soon as she stood up and saw the barbed-wire fence, she fainted. It was as if she sensed what awaited us. The Germans unloaded us and told us to place our things alongside the train and to make note of

the number of the car, so that when we returned we would find our things.

Oro Alfandari (age 26, married, a survivor of Block 10:³⁶ The train was the kind that was used to transport animals. It had a roof and a small window 50 points wide, with wire, so that no one could escape. When everyone went in, the cattle cars were sealed. We sat on the floor; there was no room to stretch out. (There were 75 people in each car). As we entered, an SS guard counted us. The trip took eight days, if I am not mistaken. We entered the cattlecars on the 9th of the month and arrived at Auschwitz on the 17th. The train made stops, but no one could leave . . . they called out. There were small children who wanted water, but no one could have water. No one could have water. Only those who had carried a bottle of water along with them. That was it. Because of that, many died before we arrived. There were as many as four or five people who died in our cattlecar. They could not withstand the trip.

Stella Abraham from Ioannina:³⁷ After nine-ten days (in a warehouse in Larissa), they gathered us all and loaded us onto trains. I can't tell you how many of us there were: one on top of the other. They kept pushing us. Then they threw a barrel in for us to use as a toilet. The Red Cross took care of us again, bringing us many things. But, in that train . . . one on top of the other. We were crying; we were trying to look out of the window but we couldn't see a thing. The only thing we knew was that the train was traveling on. After a while, we would stop; they would order the men to empty the barrels because they stank. Little children needed to go to the toilet, but we grown-ups were so ashamed, we could not. . . . This terrible situation lasted for nine whole days. Some old men died; they would stop the trains and remove the bodies. For so many days we weren't allowed to get off at all, not even to get some fresh air. We just stopped for a short time, they opened the doors, emptied the barrels, brought them in again and we went on, and on, and on. . . .

Joya Dostis (Ioannina):³⁸ In the most brutal way, they separated us by hundreds and loaded us onto the cattlecars, under appalling conditions. Each person tried desperately to stay with his family. I became separated from my older sister, Efthymia, who boarded another train; I never saw her again after that day. I was with my parents and my brothers, Moses and Aaron. When they separated the young from the elderly, I found myself in the same group as my sister Chrysi. At one point, I saw my parents in the back of a truck, taking their grandchild with them. We could not bear to be separated from them. My sister, desperate, fell at the feet of the Germans, begging them to let her go with her child. That was the last time I saw any of them; I was left all alone.

Chrysoula Politis from Ioannina:³⁹ On the trains, we were like animals in cars meant for horses, with no seats at all. Had there been seats, we wouldn't all have fit in. The windows were very small and covered with wooden planks so that we couldn't see outside. We began to sing and cry; we were together with the family of Matathias Raffael, Isaak Raffael's father; the whole family: mother, children, everybody, a big family. My father, from force of habit, still had the keys of the shop in his pocket. At one point, Matathias took them from him and threw them out of the window. "Here! That's how much they're worth now!" he said. Was it day or night? The sun rose and set, and we didn't know where we were going, what we were doing, where we were. We didn't know why we had been taken away. Nothing. We had nothing to eat; we had nothing. They didn't give us anything to eat. Oh, if the Red Cross happened to pass by. . . . but nothing was ever sent by the Red Cross to our car. We were starving. At one stop, I went out just for a moment and tried to talk to a German in French. "Please, some bread!" He showed me a truck full of Germans in front of me. "Go there!" he said. "They will give you some." I went there, thinking they would really give me some bread. The only thing I got were two kicks, one in my stomach and one in my back; then they sent me quickly back to our wagon, so that I wouldn't stay outside.

I was about 17 years old and my sister, Fortouni, two years younger.

Daniel Ischakis from Ioannina:⁴⁰ In Larissa, we were taken on foot to the railway station. We were loaded on wagons that had space enough for seven or eight horses. The car had just one window, fenced with barbed wire, so that we wouldn't try to bring in water, food etc. When we were boarding that train, we were given a loaf of bread and a box of threpsyni, a substitute for honey, which caused an incredible thirst. As soon as they closed the doors and locked the wagons, the trains slowly started off towards Auschwitz, without our knowing where we were heading; not knowing that we were on our way to Auschwitz in Poland. Moreover, to convince us that we were really going to settle in Poland, Eichmann had issued an order that we should exchange Greek money for Polish zloty. A huge crowd gathered in front of the exchange counters at the station, so that we could exchange all our drachmas for zloty. The train traveled day and night. We crossed Serbia; we crossed Austria, we crossed. . . . On the trains, we suffered from lack of water and food, and from lack of toilets; the latter were literally non-existent. One evening, we arrived in Auschwitz. There, for the first time, we saw the inscription "Arbeit macht Frei," which means "Work Makes You Free."

Survival within the camp was extremely difficult under the best of circumstances, but for Greek Jews their ability to survive was further hampered by conditions in the camp and specifics inherent to Greek Jewry.⁴¹ Greek Jews could not speak the languages of the camp: Yiddish, Polish and German, a fact that further hampered their ability to survive. Orders must be executed immediately; the inability to comprehend could mean instant death. Attempts at escape did take place at Auschwitz-Birkenau even though the odds of succeeding were slim. This option was not available to Greek Jews. Where could they go in a strange land where they did not speak the language? Only one Greek Jew, Alberto Errera, attempted escape. He was captured shortly afterwards.⁴²

Other Jews, Ashkenazi Jews, found the Jews of Greece (both the Sephardim and Romaniote) "strange", often doubting that they were actually "Jews": after all, these Greek Jews did not even speak Yiddish. They doubted the "Jewishness" of Greek Jews, a situation that often made their lives even more unbearable, especially since many of the "kapos" (inmates put in charge of the "blocks") were Ashkenazim. Greek Jews, like all Greeks were used to drinking vast amounts of water: the water in the camp was contaminated and even when told not to drink it, many Greek Jews could not resist.⁴³ The results were dysentery and typhus, often leading to death. Greek Jews had difficulty adapting to the harsh weather of Poland. They were used to a more temperate climate. Unlike the Jews of Poland, the Netherlands, Germany and other lands where winters were harsh, the Jews of Greece had an additional handicap to overcome: the weather. Many relate that they do not remember the sun ever shining at Auschwitz and that even the Polish spring and summers were harsh for them.⁴⁴

Dr. Clauberg began his experiments on sterilization on December 28, 1942, with a limited number of female inmates, all of whom were Jewish. On April 1, 1943, by order of the WVHA, Commandant Hoess places Block 10 of the main camp (Auschwitz I) under the command of SS Brigadier General Professor Dr. Carl Clauberg.⁴⁵ Clauberg has received permission to continue the sterilization experiments he had begun in 1942. Young Jewish women would be used. Therefore, coinciding with the arrival of Saloniklis Jews, Clauberg was ready to expand his experiments: many Greek-Jewish women would be chosen as his human guinea pigs, most of whom would die before liberation of the camp in January of 1945, adding to the statistics of Greek Jewish losses.⁴⁶ On April 28, 1943 (as specifically noted in the Archives of Auschwitz) 128 Greek Jewish women are transferred to Block 10, the experimental block.⁴⁷ This entry is especially important because it is one of the only ones that actually denotes the nationality of those chosen for the sterilization experiments.

Another variable that increased the losses of Greek Jews (in contrast to those from other Jewish populations in Europe) involved Greek Jewish men who served in the Sonderkommando. The special section was chosen to remove the corpses from the gas chambers, remove gold teeth and hidden valuables, and then

shovel the corpses into the crematoria. Sonderkommando were usually chosen from arriving transports. Strong, able-bodied men were needed. Greek-Jewish men were chosen disproportionately to their percentage in the camp population. Many had worked as hamales at the ports (especially in Salonika and Corfu) and were able to withstand the heavy physical labor involved. Sonderkommando were routinely exterminated every 3-4 months, and replaced by new arrivals, to assure that there would be no witnesses to the "Final Solution." Therefore, young, able-bodied Greek-Jewish men, who otherwise could have possibly withstood the hardships of the camp, were systematically exterminated. Among the last group of Sonderkommando (involved in the uprising at Auschwitz in October of 1944 known as the Revolt of the Sonderkommando) some survived to tell the gruesome story of their ordeal.⁴⁸

Reviewing general statistics of survival within the camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the numbers are revealing. From among all the people deported to Auschwitz, approximately 400,000 people were registered and placed in the camp and its sub-camps (200,000 Jews, more than 140,000 Poles, approximately 20,000 Gypsies from various countries, more than 10,000 Soviet prisoners of war, and more than 10,000 prisoners of other nationalities).⁴⁹ Over 50% of the registered prisoners died as a *result of starvation, labor that exceeded their physical capacity, the terror that raged in the camp, executions, the inhuman living conditions, disease and epidemics, punishment, torture, and criminal medical experiments.* Among Jews (Poles, Dutch, German, Belgian, French, Italian and prisoners from other countries), the figures were higher: approximately 70%.⁵⁰ A total of over 55,000 Greek Jews were sent to Auschwitz-Birkenau⁵¹: 42,509 (close to 80%) would be sent to their deaths immediately; 12,948 would be registered in the camp for forced labor. Of those, less than 2,000 would survive. Over 85% of Greek Jewry would succumb to the hardships of the camp as compared to 70% of Jews from other countries.

The statistics are as follows:

Transport Number	Date of Arrival at Auschwitz	Total number in Transport	Number Admitted to Camp	Number Sent Directly to Gas Chambers
1	March 20, 1943	2800	609	2191
2	March 24, 1943	2800	814	1986
3	March 25, 1943	1901	695	1206
4	March 30, 1943	2501	453	2048
5	April 3, 1943	2800	592	2208
6	April 9, 1943	2500	479	2021
7	April 10, 1943	2750	783	1967
8	April 13, 1943	2800	864	1936
9	April 17, 1943	3000	729	2271
10	April 18, 1943	2501	605	1896
11	April 22, 1943	2800	668	2132
12	April 26, 1943	2700	638	2062
13	April 27, 1943	3070	501	2509
14	May 4, 1943	2930	538	2392
15	May 7, 1943	1000	68	932
16	May 8, 1943	2500	815	1685
17	May 16, 1943	4500 ⁵²	700	3800
18	June 8, 1943	880	228	572
19	August 18, 1943	1800	300	1500
20	April 11, 1944	2500 ⁵³	648	1852
21	June 30, 1944	2044	621	1423
22	August 16, 1944	2500	600	1900
TOTALS		55,577	12,948	42,629

Conclusion

The story of Greek Jewry in the Holocaust is often called the "orphan child" of Holocaust research. For the most part, the story of the Holocaust has been told by the Ashkenazim, and the fate of Sephardic Jews has often been overlooked. It is only recently that their story and, particularly, the story of Greek Jewry is being told. Many factors led to the tremendous Holocaust losses of Greek Jews. There is no denying that factors within Greece and variables specific to Greek Jewry added to these losses. There is no denying that if information was available to Greek Jews on the concentra-

tion camps, information that was known at the time of their deportation, many of these losses could have been prevented. There is no denying that the timing of their arrival, unfortunately coinciding with the completion of the gas chambers and the crematoria, also added to their losses. There is also no denial that the longer journey of Greek Jews to the camps, and the fact that life was harsher for them once they arrived, added to their losses and that these losses were statistically disproportionate to those of Jews from other European countries. By analyzing these other variables, we are able to get a clearer, more complete, picture of why 87% of Greek Jewry were lost during the Holocaust. These explanations will never ease the pain but, hopefully, they will enable us to better understand the “why.”

Notes

¹Statistics of Central Board of Jewish Communities of Greece.

²M. Mazower, *Inside Hitler's Greece* (USA, 1995), 97-102

³M. Matsas, *The Illusion Of Safety, The Story of Greek Jews During the Second World War* (New York, 1997), 336; F. Abatzopoulou, “Η ΕΙΚΟΝΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥ ΣΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΠΕΖΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ” (The Image of Jews in Greek Prose) in ΟΙ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΙ ΣΤΟΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟ ΧΩΡΟ: ΖΗΤΗΜΑΤΑ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΜΑΚΡΑ ΔΙΑΡΚΕΙΑ (Athens 1995) 267-287.

⁴J. Ben, *Jewish Leadership in Greece During the Holocaust*, Proceedings of the Third Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, Jerusalem, 1979, pp 335-352; N. Eck, *New Light on the Charges Against the Last Chief Rabbi Of Salonika*, Yad Vashem Bulletin, Vol. 19, December 1965; *Holocaust in Salonika: Eye Witness Accounts*, translated by Isaac Benmayor, edited by Steven Bowman, NY, 2002, E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, ΠΡΟΦΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΕΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟ ΟΛΟΚΑΥΤΩΜΑ (Personal Accounts of Salonikan Jews on the Holocaust), Thessaloniki 1998.

⁵M. Matsas, *Ibid.* 420

⁶H. Fleischer, “Greek Jewry and Nazi Germany: The Holocaust and its antecedents” in ΟΙ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΙ ΣΤΟΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟ ΧΩΡΟ: ΖΗΤΗΜΑΤΑ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΜΑΚΡΑ ΔΙΑΡΚΕΙΑ (Athens 1995) 194-195

⁷*Ibid.*, 197-198

⁸E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, ΠΡΟΦΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΕΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟ ΟΛΟΚΑΥΤΩΜΑ (Personal Accounts of Salonikan Jews on the Holocaust), Thessaloniki 1998.

⁹E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, *Ibid.*

¹⁰R. Frezis, *Η Ισραηλιτική Κοινότητα βόλου* (The Jewish Community of Volos), Greece 2000.

- ¹¹R. Dalvin, *The Jews of Ioannina*, Greece 1990.
- ¹²R. Frezis, Alliance Israelite Universelle, Greece 2000
- ¹³M. Bourlas, ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ, ΕΒΡΑΙΟΣ, ΑΡΙΣΤΕΡΟΣ (Greek, Jewish and Leftist), Greece 2000.
- ¹⁴M. Matsas, Ibid. pp. 21-24, 34, 38, 50, 66, 68, 95, 98, 104, 107.
- ¹⁵M. Matsas, Ibid.
- ¹⁶D. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*, NY 1989
- ¹⁷T. Exarxou, *Οι εβραίοι στην Ξάνθη* (The Jews in Xanthi), Greece 2001
- ¹⁸H. Kounio, *ΕΖΗΣΑ ΤΟ ΘΑΝΑΤΟ* (I Lived Death), Greece 1982, pp. 183.
- ¹⁹D. Czech, Ibid.
- ²⁰D. Czech, Ibid.
- ²¹H. Kounio, *A Liter of Soup and Sixty Grams of Bread*, p. 195, NY 2003; E. Amariglio, *From Thessaloniki to Auschwitz and Back 1926-1996*, London 2000.
- ²²D. Czech, Ibid. p. 356.
- ²³D. Czech, Ibid. p. 347.
- ²⁴D. Czech, Ibid p. 354.
- ²⁵H. Kounio, *A Liter of Soup and Sixty Grams of Bread*, p. 185, NY 2003.
- ²⁶H. Franco, *The Jewish Martyrs of Rhodes and Kos*, NY, 1994.
- ²⁷Translated from Greek from E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, ΠΡΟΦΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΕΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟ ΟΛΟΚΑΥΤΩΜΑ (Personal Accounts of Salonikan Jews on the Holocaust), Thessaloniki 1998, pp. 231-240.
- ²⁸Ibid. pp. 241-244.
- ²⁹Ibid. pp. 299-314.
- ³⁰Leon Benmayor would later serve the Jewish Community of Thessaloniki as one of its most dynamic Presidents.
- ³¹Translated from Greek from E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, ΠΡΟΦΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΕΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟ ΟΛΟΚΑΥΤΩΜΑ (Personal Accounts of Salonikan Jews on the Holocaust), Thessaloniki 1998, pp 270-272.
- ³²Ibid. pp. 411-417.
- ³³Ibid. pp. 273-283.
- ³⁴Ibid. pp. 326-331.
- ³⁵Ibid. pp. 11-22.
- ³⁶Ibid. pp. 44-53.
- ³⁷E. Nachman, *Yannina-Journey To the Past*, New York 2004.
- ³⁸Ibid.
- ³⁹Ibid.
- ⁴⁰Ibid.
- ⁴¹E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, Ibid; R. Molho *They Say Diamonds Don't Burn: The Holocaust Experiences of Rene Molho of Salonika, Greece*, The Judah L. Magnes Museum, Berkeley, 1994; E. Sevillias, *Athens-Auschwitz*, Lycabettus Press, Athens, 1983.
- ⁴²H. Kounio, Ibid. p. 65-66.
- ⁴³E. K. Amarilio, A. Nar, Ibid.
- ⁴⁴Ibid.
- ⁴⁵D. Czech, Ibid p. 366

⁴⁶I. Benmayor, S. Bowman, *Ibid.* p. 205-210.

⁴⁷D. Czech, *Ibid.* p. 385.

⁴⁸R. C. Fromer, *The Holocaust Odyssey of Daniel Bennabmias, Sonderkommando*, Alabama, 1993; H. Kounio, *A Liter of Soup and Sixty Grams of Bread*, p. 67-70.

⁴⁹Source: official statistics from Auschwitz-Birkenau.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*

⁵¹Official statistics of Central Board of Jewish Communities and Yad Vashem.

⁵²These figures include the Jews from Didimotiko and Veroia; Nahon, Dr. Marco. *Birkenau, The Camp of Death*, University of Alabama Press, Alabama 1989.

⁵³Records for the deportations of Jews from Greece for 1944 are not complete. The Auschwitz records do not record all the deportations that left Greece in March of 1944. The figure of over 5,000 deported in March of 1944 is based on community records of Jewish communities involved.

Night of the Coup d'Etat*

Events of April 20 to 21, 1967

(An imaginative recreation based on fact)

by THOMAS DOULIS

My major objective in writing this was to present a narrative in as chronological a manner as possible. But the non-specialist who comes upon it can be forgiven if he or she senses a need to know the sources I've used.

I divide these in two. First there are the published accounts by those who actually lived the experiences or wrote about them as close to the events as possible, then there were those I interviewed myself.

In the first group I have culled the relevant passages from Amalia Fleming's, A Piece of Truth (1972), Andreas Papandreu's Democracy at Gunpoint: The Greek Front, (1970), Margaret Papandreu's' Nightmare in Athens (1970), Helen Vlachos's House Arrest (1970), Taki Theodoracopoulos's The Greek Upheaval: Kings, Demagogues, and Bayonets (1976), Melina Mercouri's I was Born Greek (1971), Laurence Stern's The Wrong Horse: The Politics of Intervention and the Failure of American Diplomacy (1977), and Mikis Theodorakis's Journal of Resistance (1973).

*Chapter 1 of *The Iron Storm*, "Culture and the Greek Military Junta" (revised March 15, 2006)

THOMAS DOULIS is a novelist, translator from the Greek (*Thanos Vlekas*) and literary historian of the modern Greek novel (*Disaster and Fiction*, *George Theotokas*, and *Out of the Ashes*, the 19th century *katharevousa* novel). Much of the research for *The Iron Storm* (now nearing completion) was done in Junta Greece, where he met most of the writers whose work he studied.

In the second group are those I've interviewed personally, notably General P. Panourgias, Nick Germanacos, Alexandros Argyriou, Kosmas Politis, Michael Cacoyannis, Andy Papachristopoulos, Lt. Colonel John Delistraty, and Kostis Skalioras, editor of the monthly periodical, Epoches.

The most troublesome section involves the references to Renos Apostolidis's actions on the eve of the coup. I heard three versions of his actions. The first from his friend, Ilias Petropoulos, then again from Tatiana Gritsi-Milliex's statements in Lexi (issues 63-64, April-May 1987), "Intellectuals and Dictatorship," and finally from Renos himself, whom I interviewed two years before his death. His narrative made the most sense to me, mainly because it was convincing in technical details. Tatiana Gritsi-Milliex supports his role in saving Theodorakis and casts into question George Giannaris's partial information, which is probably due to loyalty to Theodorakis who—for reasons of his own—did not want his political objectivity known at the time.

The behavior of the police toward Kosmas Politis can be found in Io Marmarinou's Portrait, and again in Tatiana Gritsi-Milliex's statements in "Intellectuals and Dictatorship, in Lexi.

Because the danger of a coup or an attempt on his life was always great, especially during the previous weeks when it appeared that the "ASPIDA" case would go to court, Andreas Papandreou had been using one of several apartments in Athens for concealment. For the first time in weeks, he decided to sleep over at his suburban home that Thursday evening.

Some time before, his father, George Papandreou, leader of the opposition Center Union Party and Panayiotis Kanellopoulos, the Prime Minister, had agreed to form a coalition government to prepare for the elections, much to the dismay of the Palace. Once a caretaker government was formed, Parliament would be dissolved and Andreas would no longer be shielded by immunity. He would be summoned by the investigating judge for his role in the ASPIDA case and arrested, because he would not respond to the summons.

The right-wing press of Greece, among them the paper owned by Eleni Vlachou, as well as the establishment and its institutions, began the campaign to have ASPIDA officers tried for treason.

ASPIDA (Αξιωματικοί Σώσατε Πατρίδα Ιδανικά Δημοκρατία) had been formed by democratic officers to counter IDEΑ (Ιερός

Δεσμός Ελλήνων Αξιωματικών: Sacred Bond of Greek officers) a conspiracy by Greek officers in 1944 in the Middle East as a way of keeping the armed forces Royalist and Right-wing. Members of IDEA, among whom were three officers soon to be well known, were fearful of having their activities exposed by General George Jordanidis, erstwhile Greek military representative to NATO, respected intellectual, and a liberal whose democratic orientation suited the political opinions of the Papandreous, father and son. Another organization, more representative of the center, FEA (Φρουρός Ελευθερίας Ανεξαρτησίας) was less intimidating and thus the main attack was to be against ASPIDA.

Elections were five weeks away, on May 28, and it was generally assumed that the only way the Right, the Palace, and the US Embassy could be assured of their continued dominance over Greek politics was for a military coup by generals loyal to the Palace before the elections.

But an aide to King Constantine had called early Thursday to schedule an appointment for Friday morning to discuss the coalition.

Since the Palace would be behind a coup, Andreas was lulled into thinking that a meeting for Friday morning was assurance enough that he would be able to spend the night at home. And so, after visiting a friend in hospital who had given birth, followed by dinner at the Hilton, Andreas and Margaret decided to leave for home. Tired after meetings all day, he fell asleep at once.

Brigadier Panourgias (intelligence Assistant Chief of Staff), should have known that something was afoot. Several days before, as Army A₂ (G₂ in American terms), Panourgias had heard from Colonel Nicholas Makarezos that Andreas and the Communists, supported by Lambrakis youth, were planning a coup d'état. According to Makarezos, one of the eventual triumvirate, the left, and especially the Lambrakides (a left-wing organization formed after the assassination of Grigoris Lambrakis, an event made famous by Z, the Costas-Gavras film) with hundreds of thousands of fanatical followers were ready to move on the government with weapons stored over the years. Panourgias knew this was absurd.

But he was puzzled because at 11 AM Thursday, April 20 the wife of Lt. Col. Lazaris had received a telephone call warning that "her husband and General Spandidakis, the Chief of Staff will be *struck*. It was the verb that puzzled him, since this implied a per-

sonal attack. There had been talk, and only talk, among senior officers that because of fears of an electoral victory of the Papandreou forces, it might have been wise for a caretaker government to take over for several months until the threat of a neutralist government had passed so that elections could take place in tranquillity. Panourgias, a Royalist, had directly asked Brigadier Pattakos, five years his senior and a man he had known for years, if he were involved in any "extra-parliamentary" actions. Panourgias got him to swear "on his honor as a soldier," as chief of the Armed Corps, that he would not be. Pattakos promised.

Renos Apostolidis had parked briefly on Kolonaki Square, seeing people walking about or having their coffees and ice creams in the Byzantion cafe. Then he heard the sound of tanks again, this time coming down Queen Sophias Boulevard. A quarter of an hour before from his home on Plateia Amerikis he had heard the unmistakable clatter of tank treads on Patisision Avenue coming down from Nea Philadelphia.

Though he would be a puzzle to most Greeks, at least those who kept up on the political and cultural news, Apostolidis believed himself to be a sincere anarchist. Regardless of his own assessment, Apostolidis had a dark past, and his enemies, of which there were many, wondered why his anarchic acts seemed always to undermine the shaky democratic foundations of Greece, but never the heretofore dominant right, which enjoyed the favor of the Palace and the United States Embassy. What made it hard to forgive him occurred during the summer of 1964 when he and several toughs entered Parliament while in session and created a disturbance. Needless to say, he has a less negative explanation for his actions.

He had been in his car since 1 AM, hurriedly driving past the Asphalia Headquarters on Bouboulinas Street to find them darkened and quiet, then past various ministries. The government, whatever was happening, was literally in the dark. Something was going on.

He claimed to have suspected something "untoward" politically to happen when Panayiotis Kanellopoulos a week before said he would bring quiet to Greece (την ομαλότητα) but not elections, which according to Apostolidis he should have said, since he and George Papandreou had agreed to elections.

He drove down Koumbari Street past the Benaki Museum and a hundred meters down Herodes Attikos, behind the Parliament building to the Royal residence. But an officer with raised revolver ordered him to back up, "without maneuvers" (i.e. to reverse his way out of the street).

Amalia Fleming and a friend, having had their ice cream, left the Byzantion 1:30 am and walked past Apostolidis as though he were invisible. After the death of Sir Alexander, the developer of penicillin, his widow had taken up permanent residence in Athens where she had grown up. Despite her title, Lady Amalia considered herself a democrat, remembering the time she had spent in Averoff Prison during the Occupation for resistance to the Nazis. She and her friend were among the many who distrusted Apostolidis. Why did this self-proclaimed anarchist choose to disrupt the parliament in 1964 and not one representing earlier governments? Would a sincere anarchist have been so selective?

After almost two and a half decades of German Occupation, civil wars, and the imposition of laws that made Greece a police state, at least for those whom the police viewed as security threats, the democratic center was in this case the Center Union party of George Papandreou, which held the majority with 171 seats, having triumphed in the February 16 elections with 53% of the vote.

The apartment of Lady Amalia was a block away, on 23 Kanaris Street, but she did not hear the sounds coming from Queen Sophias Boulevard. There was road work on nearby Scoufa Street and that probably disguised the clatter. She said good-bye to her friend and went upstairs.

What were tanks, Apostolidis wondered, doing on city streets at two in the morning? This was a *coup d'état*, but unlike Savvas Konstantopoulos, publisher of the reactionary daily, *The Free World* (*Eleftheros Kosmos*) and theoretician of the right, he did not delude himself that it would come from the Center Union or the Left. How could the revolution come from the Center, whose adherents had gradually been purged from the armed forces during the Metaxas dictatorship of the 1930s, in the Middle East by the British, and in the 1950s, when American policy, preoccupied by Cold War considerations, supported the military and the palace? How could the revolution come from the Left, disoriented and

guttled since its defeat in the 1940s and decades of executions without trials, executions with trials, police surveillance, persecutions legal and otherwise, and island exiles?

This was a coup from the right. But which right? The Conservatives? The Royalists?

There was a coup in progress, that was incontrovertible, but the Security Police and the official government did not seem to know what was happening, an insight confirmed for Apostolidis when on his way to a telephone at the kiosk on Kolonaki he ran into a right wing journalist named Τρουμπούνης who had heard rumor that there were soldiers outside the Prime Minister's apartment.

Apostolidis tried calling from the kiosk but the lines were down. He drove hastily back home and tried the telephone there, which perhaps because it was near the OTE building (Organization of Telecommunications of Greece) had not been tampered with, probably because of the fear of warning the technicians. Apparently lines 3, 8, and 9 were free (his own phone number was 86 46 977) and he took out his phone book and dialed Mentis Bostanzoglou, satirical dramatist and inspired caricaturist, whose wife Maria answered. He'd been hearing the sound of tanks (tsoulane tanks) and since he did not have Mikis Theodorakis's number, she should warn Mikis. She did so and hurried her husband out as well. Apostolidis then began to call others, left wingers primarily, since it was they who ran the greatest risk. All in all, he called 200 people. (Yermenakis, a reporter for the *Daily Mail* of London identified him a week later as having called all these figures, not realizing that he was exposing Apostolidis to danger.) He also called Yiannis Ritsos, who later confessed that he heard the phone ringing but was tired and ignored the call, to his loss, for he was arrested at 6 AM. (Later, Theodorakis, unwilling to credit "the anarchist" merely identified his caller as "R" and a few pages later as "the worker R." Upset at this, Apostolidis remembered that Theodorakis wrote, at the age of 16, a "Hymn to Metaxas." George Giannaris later did his bidding as well and did not identify the caller as Apostolidis.

A few moments later, Nick Germanacos, a young poet and the first translator of Yiannis Ritsos, was in Syntagma Square seeing an English friend off. The cheapest flight to London was an early one and they waited on the corner of Othonos and Queen Amalias,

across from the Royal Gardens and Parliament, when columns of tanks rumbled down Queen Sophias.

Germanacos, of Cypriot parentage and Welsh upbringing, having been spared the dubious privilege of military service, paused briefly, puzzled, then attributed the action to maneuvers. It was when the tanks turned and faced the Parliament that he began to suspect that something serious had happened. It was only when British Airways announced that all flights that night were canceled by order of the Greek government that Germanacos understood this was no maneuver but a *coup d'état* and began to sob for the end of Greek democracy.

Ritsos, still peacefully asleep and Germanacos had met earlier the previous day, Thursday, and the poet had agreed to help the young man translate his work, notably "Romiosyne," which Germanacos had heard some time before in a concert with Maria Farandouri and the music of Theodorakis. So impressed was he by the work that he decided then and there to devote the time necessary to turn it into English, and his is still an impressive translation. The following week, they were to begin their collaboration.

Less than a kilometer away, Panayiotis Kanellopoulos, Prime Minister of Greece, had been dragged out of his apartment on Xenokratous Street. Two lieutenants and ten soldiers knocked on the door. Kanellopoulos took a pistol from his bedside table and told his wife to go into a room with a second telephone, while he went downstairs. Two lieutenants and ten soldiers in battle gear stood at the door. A communist uprising had taken place, he was told, and he was to go with them. But he was having none of that. When she heard this, Nitsa called Admiral Spanidis, a close friend, and told him to signal the navy that something was happening. Then she called her nephew, Dionysis Livanos, but the soldiers burst in and ripped out the phone. Kanellopoulos struggled with the soldiers, who insisted on taking him into custody "for his own protection." As the leader of the right-wing party, ERE, Kanellopoulos always considered himself to be on the best of terms with the Army, though in retrospect he should not have been as shocked as he was. Since the early days of 1967, Savvas Konstantopoulos had published a series of articles in *Free World* reporting the investigations that KYP, the Greek version of CIA, was conducting on the Prime Minister.

In Kifissia there was banging on the outside door and Margaret shook Papandreou awake. Men were trying to break into the house. Gunshots shattered the night.

Andreas leaped out of bed, took his gun and a handful of bullets from the bedside table, and rushed to his third floor study. The phone line downstairs was probably cut but there was a chance that a second phone was still usable. It was. He dialed his father at Kastri and warned the bodyguard, Manolis, about the coup, then walked out to the terrace to look down. Men in black berets, holding automatic rifles and rifles with bayonets, had surrounded the house and were testing windows. George, his fifteen year old son, helped him up to the roof and hid in a dark corner of the terrace, while Andreas loaded the pistol and waited.

Glass shattered, boots pounded up the stairs, and a squad of soldiers burst into the terrace. Papandreou shifted and prepared to defend himself when an officer found young George and put a gun to his head threatening to shoot unless he told them where his father was.

Papandreou jumped up. "Here I am," he shouted, throwing away his pistol, but the captain, for reasons of his own, perhaps to separate him from eye witnesses, demanded that Andreas jump or he would shoot. It was twelve feet to the terrace and he broke his foot in the jump and cut a deep gash in his knee. Blood soaked his trousers.

Sometime after 2 AM the phone rang at the apartment of Brigadier General Panourgias. Lt. Colonel Katsaros was on the line to report that soldiers at that moment were breaking down the door of Andreas Papandreou. Puzzled and upset at the news, he dressed quickly in civilian clothes and hailed a taxi. At Ambelokipoi, where Vasilisis Sophias (Kifissias) and Alexandras meet, Panourgias came to a stop by three tanks and was challenged by a Captain Konsolas, who asked him for the password, which he did not know. But he refused to turn back and Konsolas, who recognized him, permitted him to pass.

Leaving Ambelokipoi, Panourgias went to the home of Spandidakis and was told by his wife that the General had been "seized." At the Ministry of National Defense Panourgias was stopped and led, a tommy gun at his back, to the fourth floor of the "Penta-

gon." When he saw Pattakos in one of the offices he wanted to enter the room to challenge him but was not permitted to do so. A Lt. Colonel Balopoulos took him directly to the third floor where, after a fist fight with Balopoulos, Panourgias was placed under arrest for two days with other officers.

Sometime after 2:00 AM U.S. Ambassador Phillips Talbot was roused from sleep by a visit from the nephew of Kanellopoulos who said that soldiers had forced their way into his uncle's apartment and taken him away. Dressing quickly, Talbot stopped at the American chancery on his way to Kanellopoulos's residence to send a flash cable to Washington. It went off in one sentence with an important comma missing: PRIME MINISTER KANELLOPOULOS ARRESTED BY SOLDIERS AND TANKS IN CONSTITUTION SQUARE. TALBOT." In Washington, D.C., Dan Brewster, the Greek Country Director, puzzled over the working. Why was "the elderly Prime Minister taken into custody by an armored force? And what was Kanellopoulos doing in Constitution Square in the middle of the night."

As George Papandreou and Panayiotis Kanellopoulos were being arrested, all the telephone lines were being cut. The telecommunications center was taken over without trouble, as were the radio stations, the Ministries, and the central police headquarters. There the director of the Athens police, Tasigiorgos, volunteered his help and asked his men to join the revolution.

At 3 AM, Eleni Vlachou and husband drove from their apartment to the offices of *Kathimerini*, seeing armored cars and tanks rumble up to the crossroads of Socrates, St. Constantine, and Piraeus Streets. Since the death of her father, George, founder of Greece's foremost conservative paper, Eleni Vlachou had overseen the publishing firm, now on its way to being considered an empire, for besides *Kathimerini*, the press brought out a paperback series, "Galaxias," that made accessible modern Greek classics, *Eikones*, an illustrated periodical noted for its flattering portraits and articles of the Royal family, and the newest addition to the stable, *Mesemvrini*, an afternoon paper.

Helmeted soldiers jumped out of armored personnel carriers and began to patrol the streets, deserted in the early morning. But

when they got to the offices, as news people they were mystified that none of the foreign stations or news agencies had sensed that they had been without contact with Greece for several hours.

Not far away, Security Police were smashing through the doors of Themelio Press, an important publisher of leftist and “progressive” books. Some were carrying out furniture to be sold, others were searching through records. They decided finally to truck away whole cabinets so that the accounts could be studied at leisure. One policeman found the plates and galley proofs of Andreas Frangias’s *Pestilence* (*Λιμός*), a novel depicting the harrowing experiences at the exile-island of Yioura, and destroyed them.

Besides the works of Frangias, Themelio boasted an impressive list of foreign writers like Mark Twain and Louis Aragon, and of Greeks, like the poets Yiannis Ritsos and Nikiphoros Vrettakos, prose writers like Vasilis Vasilikos, whose *The Plant, The Well and the Angel* and *Z* enabled him to transcend the borders of Greece, and the experimental and feminist Melpo Axioti. Among the other writers were Dimitris Hadzis, whose skillful and poignant stories recalled his model, Sherwood Anderson, and Markos Avyeris, the indefatigable critic of Greek and international literature, as well as the Turkish writer, Nazim Hikmet. Russians like Constantin Simonov, Maxim Gorki, and Nikolai Nekrasov. Though hardly leftist, George Theotokas, the “Cartesian” as Seferis and the others of the famed Generation of the Thirties called him, had published *The National Crisis* with Themelio during the feverish days of the decline of Greek democracy.

The other offices of Themelio in Thessaloniki and Chania, Crete, were sealed on the night of the coup, as well. Nor did they forget its impressive stock of books, which they carted out by the box load. Months later, according to critic Alexandros Argyriou, most of these texts had found their way to used book stores, where the Security Police, always on the lookout for pecuniary profit, had sold them.

Other publishers, not necessarily politically active, would soon be compelled to curtail or close their businesses, precipitating a crisis among typographers, book binders, editors, translators, book stores, and even the *plasier* who rolled their carts in the streets and sold books at deep discount.

Overnight, the intellectual climate of Greece was to change radically. The offices of The Association of Greek Writers (Εταιρία Ελλήνων Λογοτεχνών), the oldest and most respected organization for the support of the interests of writers (founded 1934) were sealed by the Security Police and its archives seized. Many valuable manuscripts and literary documents disappeared and its property was confiscated, notably the bequests of Ioannis Gryparis and Markos Avyeris. Past presidents of The Association included such distinguished writers as Grigoris Xenopoulos, Angelos Sikelianos, and Nikos Kazantzakis, while its rolls numbered more than 300 members. The Association's president, the aged Leon Koukoulas, who suffered from heart problems and other ailments, would be repeatedly summoned to the Security Police for questioning. Exhausted, from the ordeal, he was taken to a clinic where he died.

The Security Police burst into the offices of *Avyi* and *Rizospastis*, newspapers of the Communist Party, and seized the catalogues of names and addresses of their members and collaborators. In the morning, when Athenians woke up to the truth, most found it impossible to imagine that leftist newspapers and organizations, which had suffered throughout the Occupation, civil wars, and persecutions of all sorts during what they themselves considered the decades of a "police state," would have left all that personal information available to the authorities.

Panourgias saw General Spandidakis, who had just arrived in the "Pentagon" in the same car with King Constantine without revealing his involvement in the plot, visited Panourgias in the locked office and asked him to join the Junta, but Panourgias denied him, citing his duty as a member of his staff. Pattakos came also and Panourgias called him a traitor who had violated his oath as an officer of the army. A young, hot-headed officer pulled out his revolver to shoot Panourgias but was held back by Pattakos.

On the way to Goudi, the training camp for the armored forces, Andreas Papandreou, in great pain, looked out of the military vehicle as it passed tanks at scattered intervals. He hobbled out of the truck and limped down a dirt path to a dimly lighted barracks. As a medic attended to his injured leg, he saw political associates of his being marched in, nodding to him grimly. What they

expected had occurred. But in the next moment he felt disoriented, and it had nothing to do with his wound. He had recognized men of the Right, even ministers of the current government. Why did the Palace and the generals allow this to happen to their friends? If the Establishment were responsible for the coup, wouldn't they be comfortable in their own beds, not lying perplexed and angry on military cots next to men they considered enemies of the state?

EIR, the Greek National Broadcasting Company was silent until 6:00 AM, when the Army station began its day with a military march. "Athens calling," the announcer intoned. "Central Radio Station of the Greek Armed Forces. In a few minutes," he promised, "you will hear an important announcement."

The Military Police did not get around to rousting Yiannis Ritsos out of bed until then. He was a regular, though, a "usual suspect," having been imprisoned and exiled whenever anyone in authority felt threatened by one of his poems. Others, more dangerous, were paid earlier visits, and there were thousands of them, leftists and communists, as well as Center Union people, union leaders, anyone in fact that the plotters, with their efficient but grossly out of date intelligence services, considered would be the core of any possible resistance. They were rounded up, and given the exigencies of time and space, rushed into trucks and taken to Kallithea, to the grounds of the Hippodrome on Syngrou Boulevard. It was the most accessible location and away from crowded neighborhoods. There, and in other sports stadiums, and some hotels, they would be kept huddled until two the following morning, when they were driven to the island of Yioura, near Syros. It was a prison familiar to Ritsos, who had spent eight years of his life at various detention camps for his beliefs.

At dawn, after doctors had repaired Andreas Papandreou's leg but while he was still in pain, he struggled to his feet and claiming to go to the washroom, hobbled to the corridor to see his father in the distance, talking to Constantine Mitsotakis, one of the "apostates" of the Center Union party. Around them were parliamentary deputies, retired generals, leaders of the left and right. His disorientation increased when he heard—could it be true?—that Major

Makis Arnautis, the King's close advisor and personal secretary, had been arrested and beaten savagely when he tried to resist.

At seven the morning of the 21st, when Amalia Fleming tried to make a phone call, the telephone was not working. Good heavens! When would OTE, the state telephone company, ever become efficient? But at eight there was a knock on her door. It was a neighbor. A military coup had taken place. "They've done it," she said, meaning the generals' coup. He understood what she meant.

At 9 AM, having brought his wife breakfast in bed, Kosmas Politis, one of the greatest novelists of the Generation of the Thirties, discovered that Clara had died during the night. It was not unexpected. They were both in their eighties. He rushed to the nearby house of friends—the phone lines seemed to be down—but they were not at home. He slipped a note under their door. Io Marmarinou, a librarian, was an admirer of his work, and he would stop by later to tell her personally.

Next door there was an American couple with whom Politis had a nodding acquaintance and he knocked. Luckily, they were at home, and he told them about Clara. The American drove him into Athens to have the doctor sign the death certificate. While in town, Politis went to the "Office of Rituals," by which Greeks identify a funeral home, and ordered the funeral.

When he returned to his home with the doctor and the American, he was met by two policemen. They asked him to accompany them to the police station, several hundred meters away. His companions tried to intercede with no success. The cops had their orders.

At the police station, he was kept for two hours before being allowed to return home. But under no circumstances was there to be any one else in the house with him. Politis must stay in his house, alone, with his dead wife. He was a leftist, after all, and who knew what mischief he might have come up with if he were with another one of his communist friends.

In Paris, the ringing of the telephone in his room at the Hotel George V woke Michael Cacoyannis with shocking news from Greece. It was 7:30, time to be getting up anyway, and he was busy editing his first color film, *The Day the Fish Came Out*, a parable of

the technological hazards that were considered acceptable risks in a world polarized by the Cold War mentality.

In the three years after the economic and critical success of *Zorba the Greek*, Cacoyannis was beginning to adjust to a life of affluence, though he still remembered the days of frugality and narrow expectations. But the small, black-and-white films set in urban Greece like *Windfall in Athens* (1953–54) with Elli Lambetti, *Stella* (1955) with Melina Mercouri, *A Girl in Black* (1956) again with Lambetti, and *Our Last Spring* (1959), the sensitive novel of adolescence based on Kosmas Politis's *Eroica*, had provided him with an enviable reputation. In 1960, Cacoyannis scored an international success with a production of *Electra* that showed him to be the foremost interpreter of Euripides, in theater as well as in film.

He quickly dressed to go downstairs to see if the newspapers had any more news of the coup d'état, for the caller knew little besides the fact that tanks were in the streets. The possibility of a "non-constitutional" solution to the political deadlock the Palace and the Right felt themselves in was foremost in the mind of every Greek.

In the lobby he ran into Aristotle Onassis, who had heard the news. Onassis was furious, calling the colonels "bastards" and "gangsters," though like almost everyone he knew nothing of who they were. They were nameless to him, not men he would have known about, men familiar to the Palace and the Right.

"Men like you," Cacoyannis suggested, "can turn these people out in a week." Onassis looked at him quizzically. Ship owners always threatened to sail their fleets to other countries if strict tax laws were ever promulgated. "All you have to do is take your Olympic Airline planes and fly them out of Greece."

"It's not so simple," Onassis said.

For rich men, things are never so simple. Cacoyannis thought. Like the hawser ropes the ancients called *kamiles*, they always had problems getting through the eyes of needles. But they were very rarely arrested, beaten, or tortured. The future of Onassis, however, would not be as rosy as his present seemed to promise, for he would compete with other ship owners, but especially his current brother-in-law, Stavros Niarchos, for contracts for refineries that the Junta would dangle before him. Right now, Onassis too was riding high. The sadness that would eventually haunt him, that

not even his marriage to Jackie Kennedy could clear, would lead him to suspect that men of the Junta, with whom he would have bad dealings, were responsible for his son, Alexander's, death in a plane crash that has never been adequately explained.

The latest films of Cacoyannis had made him an international figure and, after the strong statements he would make to various news outlets, he would be condemned to reside outside of Greece for the duration of what would thereafter be called the Junta. But unlike most Greek artists, he would be able to pursue his career outside of Greece, while the others struggled to make ends meet.

Greek composers like Manos Hadjidakis, who did not believe in making political statements, would be allowed to travel as long as he kept quiet, and he did, much to the dismay of his more outraged countrymen, while men like Mikis Theodorakis, having been warned, would scurry from apartment to apartment, one or two steps ahead of the Security Police until he was betrayed. Painters like Yiannis Tsarouchis and Spyros Vassiliou kept their ideas to themselves, and the best of the actors like Elli Lambetti, Dimitris Horn, Giorgos Foundas, and Irene Papas, all of whom had worked with Cacoyannis, felt the constraint that all decent people feel when their friends and relatives are either being intimidated into silence or silenced with torture.

In New York, in the middle of the night, Melina Mercouri was wakened by a ringing phone. It was Manos Hadjidakis. There had been a coup in Athens. The army had taken over.

Melina was acting in *Ilya Darling*, the musical version of "Never on Sunday." The musical was not going well then. It had opened in Philadelphia to great applause, which continued in Toronto and Detroit, but Jules Dassin, her lover and later husband kept tinkering with the show. Despite this, the troupe had arrived in Manhattan with an advance sale of two million dollars, which Melina and Despo Diamandidou, her good friend and fellow cast member, calculated would have taken fourteen years, seven days a week, at capacity audiences to achieve at the Karolos Koun theater in Athens. But the major critics gave it mediocre notices and it was limping along.

A series of calls revealed that no one knew what was happening in Greece, neither the Greek Ambassador and poet, Alexander Matsas, who was ill and hospitalized, nor anyone on his staff, not

George Gavas, the consul in New York. There was no communication. All that could be learned after numerous calls to wire services was that there had been a military putsch.

From her father, Stamatis Mercouris, the only deputy outside of Greece that night, Melina learned that besides tanks in the streets of Athens, there had been wholesale arrests of trade-unionists, professors, lawyers, journalists, actors, civil servants of all ranks, members of Lambrakis organizations and other youth groups. Stamatis, speaking from a London hospital where he had undergone surgery, knew that all civil rights guaranteed by the constitution had been suspended as well as, ominously, the article forbidding physical torture. He reminded her that George Papandreou had warned the Greek establishment that if a dictatorship were to be imposed in Greece, church bells would summon the Greek people and hundreds of thousands would surge into the streets.

But there were no church bells and the streets were deserted, because anyone able to organize resistance was either in jail or in hiding.

On Friday morning, Andy Papachristopoulos and Kathy, his American wife, woke up with news from the American radio station in Athens announcing that "American personnel must report to their units immediately and avoid the downtown area." That was a problem for Andy, since his office was in downtown Athens.

The couple assumed that there was yet another demonstration, one of the unpleasant aspects of life in Greece, where they had settled in 1965 when Andy started his business as a manufacturer's representative and hoped to build a life.

Kathy took their car to the American school in Halandri when a column of tanks ground toward her. A soldier put his bayonet to her forehead and ordered her to turn around, park the car, and return home. Unaware of what was happening to Kathy, Andy went to Queen Sophias Boulevard to take the trolley to the "Pentagon" where he had been assigned the previous year to fulfill his military obligation, as interpreter and translator of reports of U.S. Army brass who inspected Greek army units.

But there was no public transportation and no crowds. The traffic policeman he asked what was going on, replied dejectedly

that "the military had taken over the government." That explained why a friend of his, assigned to the same unit of JUSMAGG (Joint US Military Aid Group Greece) had been puzzled when informed that there was no need for him to report for duty the following day. But Andy had not been relieved of duty.

The news of a coup was disturbing. The Greek Army could recall Andy's assignment, order him to live in the barracks, and resume wearing his uniform.

He began his walk to headquarters, stopped at virtually every intersection by armed soldiers, who allowed him to proceed when he showed them his military I.D. and said that he was trying to report to his unit.

A friend of Andy, Lieutenant Colonel John Delistraty, a Greek-American West Pointer from the Pacific Northwest, was stationed with JUSMAGG and was in Thessaloniki that morning, inspecting combat units of the Hellenic XXth Armored Division. As Armor Advisor to the Greek Army, he too was puzzled by unusual radio activity, attributing it to an emergency in progress. Possibly the Cold War threat from the north had materialized. XXth Armored Division was stationed near the Yugoslav and Bulgarian borders, and Warsaw Pact forces were believed to be aligned for invasion in the event of war with NATO.

Delistraty had spent the night at the JUSMAGG house in Thessaloniki and was ready to fly back to Athens and his family. Using alternate roads, the "Country Team" evaded roadblocks and reached the airport without incident to learn from the airport manager that normal operations were on hold. All aircraft were grounded by the military, probably due to local Communist disturbances. No telling when flights might be resumed. Something big was happening, though, for the disturbances seemed to be nationwide.

The US Consulate in downtown Thessaloniki would be in radio contact with the US Embassy, Delistraty thought. Outside the airport the group came upon an army roadblock manned by an Armored Forces Captain, who recognized Delistraty and informed him that a coup had occurred, but that since they were in uniform, they should have no trouble getting to the Consulate. When they arrived, the Consul radioed the U.S. Embassy and suggested that, since no adverse news had been received, they should proceed to

Athens by road. He wanted to learn the status of the highway linking Thessaloniki with Athens and the group should report their findings.

They started off at noon in a van the Consulate provided, using roads jammed with trucks and cars gridlocked by roadblocks, which they managed to skirt. Several trucks forced off the highway to make way for military vehicles, had rolled over, scattering cargoes of oranges. They came upon no military units until the tollbooths on the outskirts of Athens. They were waved through without incident. The 300-mile journey that normally took 5 hours had taken 6½ hours. When Delistraty was dropped off at his home in Kifissia, he learned that he'd been traveling during the curfew that prohibited travel.

Conservatives like Eleni Vlachou, of course, expected something like this to happen. It was clear to everyone that the Center Union would win the forthcoming elections. But Vlachou and her staff were in for a surprise with the next bit of news.

“In accordance with Article 91 of the Constitution, and following the recommendation of the Government, Articles 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 95, and 97 of the present Constitution are suspended throughout the country in view of the manifest internal threat to the country's public order and security. The Minister of the Interior will publish and implement this Decree. Given in Athens this day, April 21, 1967. Signed Constantine, King of the Hellenes, the Prime Minister, and the Members of the Cabinet.”

Constantine would not have signed such a decree, she was certain. This was clearly a fake. Neither would Panayiotis Kanellopoulos have countenanced the suspension of the constitution, not in this day and age. A colossal bluff was being perpetrated.

But there was more. “By order of the revolutionary committee: **One:** Arrest and imprisonment of any person is permitted without warrant from the relevant authority and without the person's having to be caught committing a crime; the duration of detention of arrested person is not subject to any restriction. **Two:** Release on bail for political crimes is forbidden, and there is no limit to duration of detention pending trial for such crimes.

Three: Any person, irrespective of calling, may be brought to trial before courts martial or special magistrates courts. **Four:** Any gathering or meeting, indoors or outdoors, is prohibited and will be dissolved by force. **Five:** The setting up of any association with trade union aims is prohibited and strikes are forbidden. **Six:** Searches in private homes, public shops, and civilian public service establishments are permitted at any time during the day or night. **Seven:** The announcement or publication of reports in any manner whatsoever, including the press, radio, or television, without prior censorship is prohibited. **Eight:** Letters and every form of dispatch are subject to censorship. **Nine:** Felonies, political crimes, and crimes of any other type, whether they affect private life or not, as well as those which fall under the jurisdiction of courts of appeal, are to be tried by special courts-martial. **Ten:** Any civilian committing a punishable offense, even if it is not directed at the security of the Armed Forces or the State, is subject to the jurisdiction of these special courts-martial. . . .

While she was absorbing all this, Eleni Vlachou was informed by an older editor that in about two or three hours an officer would come and will ask to see her. He'd been an employee of her father for decades before her assumption of command and had a long experience with these matters. But for her, this was something new. She had taken over the business when George Vlachos died in 1951 and all she had known was stability assured by a right-wing government working closely with the palace and the United States Embassy.

"Why will he ask to see me?"

"To give you orders."

She stared at him. "Orders" she would not accept. A dictatorship she had anticipated, certainly, but it would have been that of the generals, and though they would impose censorship, it would be of brief duration and, being who she was, she would be free to write what she wished. Her patriotism would not be questioned.

Who were these people? Provincials or peasants who became career soldiers to rise in society? From them she would not take "orders."

Unknown to Delistraty and JUSMAGG, the three officers he later learned comprised the Junta: Colonel George Papadopoulos,

Colonel Nikolaos Makarezos, and Brigadier General Stylianos Pattakos had invoked the "Prometheus," a NATO-connected plan designed to impose internal security and neutralize domestic leftist opposition in the event of war with a Warsaw Pact state. In this way, the three plotters had seized the communication networks and positioned key combat forces at vital national points. As far as Delistraty knew, the operation had been implemented without loss of life, but as later reports indicated, this was not the case.

When Delistraty got to Athens the phones were working and he reported in. He was ordered to write a few paragraphs providing information regarding the Junta personnel so that Ambassador Phillips Talbott, could meet with them and establish contact between the US and the Revolutionary Government. When Delistraty wrote that Brigadier General Pattakos, his counterpart in the Armored corps, was someone he had met while both attended the Advanced Armored Officers Course at the Armor School at Fort Knox, Kentucky and that Pattakos had been to dinner at the Delistraty home the weekend before the Coup, his JUSMAGG commander, Major General Eaton, mentioned this to Talbott, who decided to meet Pattakos at the Delistraty home a few days later.

Since neither the Ambassador nor Pattakos was fluent in each other's language, Talbott asked Delistraty to be the interpreter in their meetings.

Meanwhile, at the Hippodrome, thousands of men and women milled about, disoriented, hastily dressed, hungry and thirsty. They had been wrenched from their lives in the early hours of the morning, their homes and businesses broken into, their files seized, papers scattered all over floors, their children suddenly left alone in apartments, valuable items missing to be sold later by men who believed they were servants of the nation but who proved to be little better than burglars and vandals.

The Military Police thought they were being efficient but they were merely decisive, for their records were outmoded. Some of the prisoners had been intimidated in the past and had signed papers attesting to their repentance for "anti-national" activities. In most cases this meant being active in the resistance against the Nazis. Now many of them carried "Certificates of National Probity" without which they or family members could not be employed by

the State or enter schools of higher education. Many of the prisoners were infirm or aged. Vasilis Rotas, poet, and translator of Shakespeare, was seventy-eight years old. Tassos Vournas, a critic and historian, suffered from tuberculosis. Men like Stathis Dromazos, a theatrical critic and prose writer, Kostas Kouloufakos, poet and critic, Yiannis Negropontis, poet and prose writer, Yian-nis Imvriotis and D. Fourtounis, prose writers, all had one or the other ailments associated with the life of the dissident and regular exile in Greece: tuberculosis, spinal arthritis, intestinal problems.

There were others, men like Manolis Glezos, a deputy in Parliament, who had achieved fame twenty-seven years before when, on the night of May 30, 1940 and during the German Occupation, he and Apostolos Santas, climbed up to the Acropolis and removed the swastika from the flagpole. The police could not have men like this circulating freely.

At 7 PM on Friday, April 21, the new government was sworn in by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Constantine Kollias, Queen Frederika's friend and her collaborator in trying to cover up the assassination of Lambrakis—lending what authority he possessed to the coup d'état—became Prime Minister. Gregory Span-didakis, Chief of the Army General Staff (G.E.S) became Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defense; Colonel Makarezos, Minister of Coordination; Brigadier Stylianos Pat-takos, Minister of the Interior; and Colonel George Papadopoulos, Minister to the Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Kollias then pronounced the Dictatorship legal.

On Sunday, April 23, from his hiding place, Mikis Theodorakis called for the people to resist the Junta. Periodically, he would smuggle out tapes of his exhortation and songs to the Greeks, his voice low so as not to be heard by the neighbors.

On Great Thursday, Tatiana Milliex called to tell Kosmas Politis that she'd stop by to see how he was doing. She was not to bother, he suggested, for "the lads" were here. Meaning the police.

He would probably die at their hands, she knew. Who could help? She ransacked her memory. Who had declared himself to be on the side of the Junta? She called Andreas Karandonis, noted lit-

erary critic who in 1930, with the publication of Seferis's first collection of poems, *Strophe*, had written a long critique in which he predicted a great future for the young poet. Karandonis's phone was not working. The phone line of George Katsimbalis, famed after Henry Miller's *Colossus of Maroussi* had given him an international reputation, and also on record for welcoming the coup, was also unavailable. Who can help, she asked her husband, the cultural attaché of France to Cyprus. Roger Milliex called Seferis, a Nobel Prize winner a few years before, who might be able to help. His reputation would weigh much among men eager to win a favorable press.

There was the problem, though, of the antagonism of Politis and Seferis. Both were refugees from Smyrna, both of the upper middle class, but Politis was an outspoken leftist and Seferis, as a civil servant and later Ambassador, studiously avoided politics. "With those gentlemen I don't have any contacts," Seferis responded in what seemed to Milliex was a haughty tone. "I can't do anything for him." It did not occur to her that he might not have wanted to be in the dictators' debt.

That same day, Thursday, 27 April at 11:15 AM, Milliex went to the office of Brigadier—now Minister of the Interior—Pattakos on Klathmonos Square, showing her French passport. By now, she and all Athenians knew that Pattakos, Makarezos, and Papadopoulos had used the NATO plan for their putsch.

"I am a writer and must speak about the greatest novelist in Greece today, Kosmas Politis."

"The man with two names?" Pattakos had learned that "Kosmas Politis" was a *nom d' plume* and that his legal name was Paris Taveloudis. To his military mind, there was something fishy there.

"But as a director of a bank he needed to dissociate himself from his literary work."

The man, she pleaded, whatever his name, was senile, a wreck. Pattakos would let him go. He would get rid of her. One less worry on his mind.

But at the Psychiko station, the police claimed not to know where Politis was. They were lying, of course. She had just talked to Pattakos, she stared at them meaningfully. If she could use their telephone she would speak to the Minister directly and he would tell them that he had much on his mind, had already decided that

the novelist should be released, and resented being bothered continually. They stalled, clearly frightened. When she went back to Politis's home he, suddenly aged, was waiting for her at the front door.

"Only you could have overthrown the Junta and freed me," he said with his ironic smile. "But what does the temporary freedom of an individual mean when the meaning of freedom is lost."

During the week after the Coup, Mary and John Delistraty hosted the first meeting between Ambassador Talbott and Brigadier Pattakos. When the date was set, Mary was phoned by an American official (believed to be with the CIA) who requested that she excuse "any children, servants, or pets" and to close all the house shutters prior to the arrival of the VIP's.

An official car picked Delistraty up and escorted him to the acting Minister Pattakos's office in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Delistraty joined him and his driver who raced through Athens to Kifissia where Mary and the Ambassador awaited them. Due to a mix-up in the rendezvous time, the Ambassador was half an hour early, which gave him and Mary time to get ready. Fortunately, they had all met previously at Embassy functions and at school activities where Talbott's and the Delistraty daughter were classmates. Mary was able to brief the Ambassador on their background and relationship to Pattakos. On arrival, Delistraty introduced the men while Mary served refreshments. Although that April was generally cool, the shuttered living room prevented sufficient ventilation. Brigadier Pattakos was in full dress uniform with a high collar. The tension of this first meeting and lack of ventilation soon had Pattakos perspiring. After about an hour of Talbott's grilling, asking about the well-being of several well-known Greek figures, he advised Pattakos not to harm any of them. Pattakos assured Talbott that no harm would come to any of the men imprisoned and that they would be released shortly as soon as it was determined that they were no threat to the New Government. Talbott reminded him that any harsh treatment of these individuals might be viewed as Fascist treatment by NATO Allies. Pattakos left to meet with King Constantine at Tatoi, the summer home north of Kifissia, in order to brief him on the meeting with the US Ambassador.

On April 28, Orthodox Great Friday, the United States and Great Britain recognized the Junta as the new government of Greece.

Greek artists in Romania: Constantin Pascali, the “missing” painter Constantinos Paschalopoulos of the “Munich School Group”

by EVANGELIA N. GEORGITSOYANNI

Introduction

The history of Hellenism in Romania is deep-rooted and dates as far back as Antiquity. It last enjoyed prosperity at the time of the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), signed between the Russians and Turks. As a result of the Treaty, the Danubian Principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia) acquired political and economic independence and hitherto started the process of creating the modern Romanian state (1857) (Stavrianos 2001:290-291, 339-363). During this period large numbers of Greeks emigrated to the neighboring country, attracted by the ample financial opportunities that had arisen. Most of them were engaged in commerce, in particular cereals and wood, in the merchant navy and in the leasing of large domains. They created vibrant communities, each with its own communal organization, churches and schools, the most important of them being those at Brăila, Galați, Giurgiu, Constanța, Sulina, Tulcea and Bucharest. The Greek communities in Romania flourished until 1947 when they were dissolved by the communist regime.

The Greeks of Romania on the whole established good relations with the natives and contributed a great deal to the financial and cultural life of the country. They took a profound interest in

EVANGELIA N. GEORGITSOYANNI is associate professor in Harokopio University, Athens.

education, arts and letters and were deeply involved in the development of sciences in the country. They also developed a rich editorial activity of books and newspapers. (Papacostea-Danielopolu 1969 VII.2: 311-333; Papacostea-Danielopolu 1969 VII.3: 475-493; Belia 1983:6-62; Deliyannis 1995; Cicanci 1995; Papacostea-Danielopolu 1996; Georgitsoyanni 2000: 42-84.)

In painting, the activities of several Greek painters in Romania are referred to, artists about whom very little is known at present.¹ The present article deals with the life and the activity of a painter of the Greek Diaspora in Romania during the period in question, Constantinos Paschalopoulos. The artist has until today only been known in Greek bibliography as a name, as one of the Greeks who studied in Munich in the nineteenth century (the so-called "Munich School Group"), but since then traces of his activity have been lost and his work remains completely unknown.² According to research we conducted, Constantinos Paschalopoulos is identified with the painter Constantin Pascali (or Pascaly) who lived and worked in Romania.³ His work is known to the Romanians, although nothing that is complete has yet been written about him and his Greek origin is ignored.⁴ This article gives a general presentation of the painter and aims firstly, to show aspects of the work of Greek artists in Romania in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and secondly, to fill a gap in the history of modern Greek painting. Old newspapers from Romania (Greek and Romanian), archives, paintings and published works were used as sources.

Constantin Pascali (Constantinos Paschalopoulos): Life and activity

Constantin Pascali (Constantinos Paschalopoulos) was born either in 1858 or in 1860⁵ in Turnu-Măgurele, a small commercial town of Wallachia on the banks of the Danube river.⁶ A small but flourishing Greek community, whose members were engaged in the commerce of cereals, existed in the area (Belia 1983: 13, 18, 21; Paraskevopoulos 1998: 181). His father, Antonios Paschalopoulos, a merchant from the town of Kessani (Keşan) in Eastern Thrace (in today's Turkey)⁷ was one of the founders of Turnu-Măgurele. He was also regarded as the "patriarch" of the Greek community there, because he was the oldest of its mem-

bers. After the early loss of his wife, Antonios Paschalopoulos moved with his three sons—Constantinos was the second—to Athens, where they stayed for more than ten years. When the boys grew up and left for their university studies in Europe, the father returned to Turnu-Măgurele, where he died in 1888 (*Syllogoi* [Associations], no. 3706 (15th/27th March 1888): 3). Constantinos, in particular, went to Munich in order to study painting at the Academy of Fine Arts. His studies were paid for by his father (Lydakis 1972: 105, 259; Lydakis 1976: 238; *Syllogoi* [Associations], no. 2539 (1st/13th Apr. 1884): 4; no. 2688, 6th/18th Oct. 1884): 3).

Due to the Bavarian origins of the first king of Greece, Otto, Munich, was during the nineteenth century a favorite study destination for Greek painters. The Academy had acquired then international repute and attracted students from the world over. More specifically, the Greek artists that studied in the Bavarian capital created the so-called “Munich School Group” and played an important role in founding modern Greek painting, which came into existence after the War of Independence (1821). Greek nineteenth-century painting is characterized by a renunciation of the post-Byzantine tradition and the adoption of European artistic values.

The most important masters were: Nicolas Gyzis (1842-1901), who later became professor at the Munich Academy, Nicephoros Lytras (1832-1904) and Constantinos Volanakis (1837-1907), later professors at the Academy of Fine Arts in Athens. They were students of the famous Karl Theodor von Piloty, professor and director of the Munich Academy, who painted in a “romantic neo-baroque” style. These artists belong to the first generation of Greek painters who studied in the Bavarian capital. They were followed by younger artists, among them George Iakovidis (1852-1932), later professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Athens. Munich’s importance as an artistic center for Greeks gradually declined in the decades that followed and eventually disappeared completely at the end of the nineteenth century. All Greeks—besides Gyzis, Lytras and Volanakis—who studied in Munich had as professors painters that followed Piloty’s style (Lydakis 1972: 27-130; Lydakis 1976: 105-312; Christou 1981: 25-34, 40-48; Kotidis 1995).

Constantin Pascali (Constantinos Paschalopoulos) started his studies at the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich in 1879 (Lydakis

1972: 105, 259; Lydakis 1976: 238). His professor was Ludwig Löfftz (*Ateneul Roman, Expoziția Retrospectivă*, 26.12.1927: 19), who later became director of the Academy. Löfftz' painting, which is characterized by a remarkable delicacy, had earned him considerable fame which attracted many students. Among them were other Greek contemporaries of Pascali (Paschalopoulos), such as—the formerly mentioned—George Iakovidis, Symeon Savidis (1859-1927) and Nicolas Vokos (1859-1962), to mention only the better known ones. In subsequent years Löfftz also taught many younger Greeks, mainly after the death of Gyzis, with whom he had developed a friendship (Lydakis 1972: 52-5; Lydakis 1976: 112, 184, 204, 211, 224-238, 240, 255, 273, 275, 278, 280, 304, 305).

During his stay in Munich, Pascali (Paschalopoulos) participated in three exhibitions of paintings. His works, which were mainly portraits, received praise from the German newspapers and Greek newspapers of Bucharest.⁸ The young artist also belonged to the circle of Greek students in the Academy, but it is not known with whom he cultivated relationships. After the end of his studies, he left for Romania in the autumn of 1886 (*Syllogoi* [Associations] no. 2688 (6th/18th Oct. 1884): 3, no. 3267 (7th/19th Sept. 1886): 3, no. 3322 (12th/24th Nov. 1886): 3).

Pascali (Paschalopoulos) at first settled in Turnu-Măgurele. In 1887, though, he moved to Bucharest, where he founded his own atelier. During this period he painted mostly portraits, a theme in which he was to specialize.⁹ He also participated in exhibitions (*Românul* [Romanian], no. XXXIII (29th Jan. 1889): 1]. In July 1893 he was appointed professor of painting¹⁰ at the School of Fine Arts in Jassy in Moldavia, founded in 1860¹¹ (Archives of the Romanian State, Jassy, School of Fine Arts, dossier 2/1893: 109, 120, 146, 148, 161, 190, dossier 4/1893: 172). It should be mentioned here that Romanian painting followed a parallel evolution to the Greek painting. Also founded in the nineteenth century, it had likewise disengaged itself rapidly from the post-Byzantine artistic tradition and devoted itself to absorbing and using the European style. Many and diverse artistic centers in Europe, including Munich, simultaneously had an impact on Romanian nineteenth-century painting (Oprescu 1935: 43. Drăgut et al. 1971: 126, 161).

The painters of Jassy enjoyed particularly close links with the Bavarian capital, since the founder and first director of the

School of Fine Arts, the eminent Romanian painter Gheorghe Panaiteanu-Bardasare (1816-1900), had been a student of Piloty. Besides, the later directors of the School Constantin Stahi (1844-1920) and Gheorghe Popovici (1859-1933) had also studied in Munich (Drăgut et al. 1971: 126-127, 161-162, 170, 173, 178, 191, 204; Ateneul Roman, Expoziția Retrospectivă, 26.12.1927: 19). Thus Pascali (Paschalopoulos) must have found himself in a familiar artistic climate.

Besides his professional activity, he participated actively in the artistic movements that took place in Romania in the late nineteenth century. More specifically, after 1891 he took part in many exhibitions held by the "Artistic Circle" Society, which was founded in Bucharest in 1890 and aimed at developing art in the country.¹² In 1893 he also became a member of the Administrative Board of the above Society, but left the post in 1897 when he founded with other artists and personalities the "Society for the diffusion of artistic taste in Romania, *Ileana*." It was created chiefly by some of the so-called "Independent Artists," who in 1896 had inaugurated in Bucharest their first Exposition, as a reaction against the academism of the official Salon. The founders of *Ileana* wished to revive art in Romania. The society numbered 300 members, the most important of them being, besides Pascali (Paschalopoulos), the painters Stefan Luchian (1868-1916), Nicolae Vermont (1866-1932) and Constantin Artachino (1871-1954). *Ileana* was created in the context of similar movements taking place in Europe at the time, such as the "Secession" in Munich.¹³ Although *Ileana* was only in operation until 1899, it is considered to be an important step in the evolution of Romanian art towards modernism (*Adevărul* [Truth], no. 2878 (7th July 1897): 1; Predescu 1940: 638; Oprescu 1943: 218; Oprea 1969: 20-40; Drăgut et al. 1971: 167-168).

Yet, despite his participation in the society, Pascali (Paschalopoulos) never neglected academism.¹⁴ He always remained a moderate conservative in his paintings, while other artists, such as Stefan Luchian, followed the impressionistic style. Pascali (Paschalopoulos) is regarded as essentially a perpetuator of academic art in Romania, although not as one of its major figures, namely the painters Theodor Aman (1831-1891) and Gheorghe Tatarescu (1820-1894).¹⁵ He was though a highly capable painter. It is evident that his studies in Munich provided him with a sound

technical basis. As can be concluded from an examination of his works, such as *The Portrait of Mrs. M. Simpom* (1905), his design pays attention to detail, his lines are precise and firm and he is a good colorist preferring somber colors. He also demonstrates a very good knowledge of the human anatomy, as is apparent in the nudes that he painted, such as the *Study of Nude* (1889).

As regards subject-matter, he was interested mainly in portraits. In these paintings the individuality of the figures is often surprising, but the rendering of their psychology is unbalanced. During his life he was a favorite portraitist of the Romanian upper classes, as can be concluded from the figures represented in the portraits that he painted, showing the elite Romanian society around 1900. Some of his models were: King Carol I (fig. 5) and the Queen; eminent personalities as C. Nacu, senator and professor at the University of Bucharest, Alexandru Bogdan-Pitești, art critic and art collector, Constantin Aricescu and Mihail Simonidi, painters, Parthenius, metropolitan bishop of Moldavia, George Manu, general, Ion C. Brătianu and his son I.I.C. Brătianu, prime-ministers; ladies and little girls of the aristocracy (*Patris* [Fatherland] (24th/6th July 1893): 3; 21st Nov./4th Dec. 1904: 3; Pascali 1912: 7-11; Predescu, L. 1940: 638; National Museum of Art-Bucharest (portrait of Simonidi).

Besides portraits, Pascali (Paschalopoulos) produced also a few nudes (fig. 4), genre scenes and religious paintings (Pascali 1912:7-11). It is known that he created together with the painters Stefan Luchian and Constantin Artachino the wall-paintings and the icons of the iconostasis in the Cathedral of St. Alexander (1898) in the town of Alexandria in Romania (Episcopia Alexandriei și Teleormanului 2000: 22-23). Moreover, he has drawn several designs (Museul A. Simu. 1910: 42; Museul National de Artă al României 1988: 20-22). In the National Museum of Art in Bucharest some of his designs have been preserved representing mostly women in different positions, portraits of—anonymous—men and women and some landscapes (Museul Național de Artă al României 1988: 20-22).

Opinions expressed about him during his time are the comments of the Romanian newspaper *Adevărul* written on the occasion of the exhibition of *Ileana* in 1898, which was the first international exhibition of paintings in Romania:

Mr. Pascaly is distinguished as a portraitist in the exposition. The portrait of Mr. Danieleanu is as successful as it can be, as is also that of Mr. G. Dinicu, though in both the vigorous technique that is observed in the master portraitists of abroad is missing. Although [the painting] *A Blond* appears to me to be a concession made towards common taste, the *Head of Expression* [Tête d'Expression] denotes a great liberty in conception and execution that permits us at ease to appreciate the talent and the agility of the painter. (*Adevărul* [Truth], no. 3103 (3d March 1898): 1)

His most representative works were displayed in March 1912 when a retrospective exhibition of his work was held at the Palace of Athenaeum in Bucharest. It comprised sixty-eight paintings dating from 1887 to 1912 (Pascali 1912: 7-11). They are all accomplished productions, remarkable because of their excellent design, the fine modeling of the figures, the refined choice of colour and the technical skill of the artist (figs. 2-8). His works were purchased by several museums and institutions¹⁶ as well as private collectors in Romania.

Constantin Pascali (Paschalopoulos) died in 1924 at Jassy (Museul Național de Artă al României 1988: 20).

Conclusion

In brief, we may say that Constantin Pascali (Constantinos Paschalopoulos) is a distinguished artist of the Greek Diaspora in Romania who was active in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Trained as a painter in the Bavarian capital, he was influenced by the academic tendencies and the artistic climate of the Munich School, which he transformed into his own personal artistic idiom. In spite of his academicism, he was actively involved in the artistic movements to regenerate art in Romania. During his career, he produced a multitude of paintings centering on portraits. The painter in question constitutes an interesting case-study of the artistic creation of Greek immigrants in Romania.

Works Cited

- Ateneul Roman, Expoziția Retrospectivă [Romanian Athenaeum, Retrospective Exhibition] 26.12.1927. *Catalog* [Catalogue]. Bucharest.
- Belia, E. 1983. "O Ellinismos tis Roumanias kata to diastima 1835-1878 (Symvoli stin Istoría tou epi ti vasei ton Ellinikon Pígon)" [The Hellenism of Romania during the period 1835-1878 (Historical Contribution based on Greek Sources)], *Deltion tis Historikis kai Ethnologikis Etairias tis Ellados* [Bulletin of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece], 26, 6-62.
- Cicanci, O. 1995. *Presa de limbă greacă din România în veacul al XIX-lea* [The Greek Press of Romania in 19th century]. Bucharest: Omonia.
- Deac, M. 2003. *250 Pictori Români. 1890-1945* [250 Romanian Painters. 1890-1945]. Bucharest: Medro.
- Deliyannis, D. 1995. *Roumania-Ellinismos-Techne-Orthodoxia* [Romania-Hellenism-Art-Orthodoxy]. Athens: Adam.
- Drăgut, V., V. Florea, D. Grigorescu, M. Mihalache. 1971. *La Peinture Roumaine en Images*. Bucharest: Meridiane.
- Episcopia Alexandriei și Teleormanului. 2000. *Biserici din Teleorman* [Churches of Teleorman]. Alexandria: Editura Biserica Ortodoxă.
- Georgitsoyanni, E. 2000. *Panaghis A. Harokopos (1835-1911). I Zoe kai to Ergo tou* [Panaghis A. Harokopos (1835-1911). His Life and Activity]. Athens: Livanis.
- Ideru, N. 1898. *Istoria Artelor Frumose* [History of the Fine Arts], Bucharest: Gutenberg.
- Kotidis, A. 1995. *Elliniki Techni. Zografiki 19ou aiona* [Greek Art. 19th century Painting]. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon.
- Lexico Ellinon Kallitechon* [Lexicon of Greek Artists] 1999, vol. III. Athens: Melissa.
- Lydakis, S. 1972. *Geschichte der griechischen Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Prestel.
- Lydakis, S. 1976. *Oi Ellines Zographoi, III: I Istoría tis Neoellinikis Zographikis (16os-20os aionas)* [The Greek Painters, III: The History of Modern Greek Painting (16th-20th century)]. Athens: Melissa.
- Ministerul Instrucțiunii și al Cultelor [Ministry of Education and Cultes] 1916. *Expoziția Oficială a Artiștilor în Viață* [Official Exhibition of Artists in life]. Bucharest.
- Museul A. Simu [Museum A. Simu]. 1910. *Catalog* [Catalogue]. Bucharest: Poporul.
- Museul Național de Artă al României. Cabinetul de Desene și Gravuru [National Museum of Art in Romania. Cabinet of Designs and Engravings]. 1988. *Repertoriul Graficii Românești din Secolul al XX-lea* [Repertory of Romanian Graphics in the 20th century], vol. V. Bucharest: Museul Național de Artă al României.
- Oprea, P. 1969. *Societăți Artistice Bucureștene* [Artistic Societies in Bucharest], Jassy: Editura Meridiane.
- Oprea, P. & Brezianu, B. 1964. "Cu privire la Salonul artiștilor independenți" [Concerning the Salon of Independent Artists], *Studii și Cercetări Istoria*

- Artei* [Studies and Research in the History of Art] 11.1, 138-140.
- Opreescu, G. 1935. *L'Art Roumain de 1800 à nos Jours*. Malmö (Sweden): J. Kroon.
- Opreescu, G. 1943. *Pictura Românească în secolul al XIX-lea* [Romanian Painting in the 19th century], Bucharest: Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă.
- Opreescu, G. 1945. *Grafica Românească în secolul al XIX-lea* [Romanian Graphic Arts in the 19th century], vol. II, Bucharest: Fundația Regele Mihai I.
- Papacostea-Danielopolu, C. 1969. "La vie culturelle de la communauté grecque de Bucarest dans la seconde moitié du XIX siècle," *RESEE (Revue des Études du Sud-Est Européennes)* VII.2, 311-333.
- Papacostea-Danielopolu, C. 1969. "La vie culturelle des communautés grecques de Roumanie dans la seconde moitié du XIX siècle," *RESEE* VII.3, 475-493.
- Papacostea-Danielopolu, C. 1996. *Comunitățile Grecești din România în secolul al XIX-lea* [Greek Communities in 19th century Romania]. Bucharest: Omonia.
- Papadopoulos, N. 1929. *Apo to Parelthou tis Kessanis* [From the Past of Kessani]. Athens.
- Pascali, C. 1912. *Expoziția Retrospectivă. Catalog Ilustrat* [Retrospective Exhibition. Illustrated Catalogue]. Bucharest.
- Paraskevopoulos, G.P. 1998. *I Megali Ellas* [Great Greece]. Athens: Ekati
- Predescu, L. 1940: *Enciclopedia "Cugelarea"* [Encyclopedia "Cugelarea"]. Bucharest: Cugelarea.
- Salonul Oficial [Official Salon]. 1907. *Catalog* [Catalogue]. Bucharest.
- Stavrianos, L.S. 2001. *The Balkans since 1453*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Vakoufaris, P. 1984. "I Koinotiki Dioikissi meta tis Othomanikes Metarythmissis (Tanzimat) kai oi Kanonismoi Kessanis kai Alexandroupolis (Dedeagats)" [The Communal Administration after the Ottoman Reforms (Tanzimat) and the Regulations of Kessani and Alexandroupolis (Dedeagats)]. *Thrakiki Epetirida* [Thracian Journal] 5, 17-50.

Notes

¹In the Greek newspapers of Romania of the late 19th century the names and some information about some Greek painters who lived there are from time to time referred to such as: George Lefkopoulos, Gerasimos Rossolimos and D. Theodorides at Brăila (*Sylogoi* [Associations] (15th/27th March 1884): 3), (9th/21st Febr. 1893): 3; *I Iris* [Rainbow], no. 1279 (6/12/1897): 3. The painter most frequently referred to is C. Paschalopoulos. In addition, the names of some distinguished Romanian painters, such as Mihail Simonidi, Jean Al. Steriadi, Michaela Eleutheriade, Lucia Demetriade-Bălăcescu, suggest a possible Greek origin (Drăgut et al. 1971: 218-221, 239, 276, 250. Deac 2003: 173).

²Lydakis 1972: 105, 259; Lydakis 1976: 238; Christou 1981: 33; *Lexico Ellinon Kallitechon* 1999: 487.

³The painter was initially only referred to as Paschalopoulos in the Greek newspapers of Bucharest, but from 1886 onwards the name Paschalis, a shorter

version of his name, was also used (*Sylogoi* [Associations], no.2539 (1st/13th Apr. 1884): 4; no. 2688, (6th/18th Oct. 1884): 3; no. 3267 (7th/19th Sept. 1886): 3, no. 3322 (12/24 Nov. 1886): 3), no. 3502 (28/10 July 1887): 2, no. 3459 (6th/18th May 1887): 3, no. 3706 (15th/27th March 1888): 3; *Patris* [Fatherland] (24th/6th July 1893): 3; (21 Nov./4th Dec. 1904): 3. The artist signed his paintings either as C. Pascali or C. Pascaly (Pascali 1912).

⁴Idieru 1898: 329-330. Museul A. Simu 1910: 42. Predescu 1940: 638. Oprescu 1945: 94. Museul Național de Artă al României, 1988: 20. Deac 2003: 159.

⁵1858: according to the School Register of the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich, where he was enrolled in 1879 at the age of 21 years (School Register of the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich 1841-1884, no. 3707; Lydakis 1972: 105, 259; Lydakis 1976: 238). 1860: according to Romanian sources (Museul A. Simu 1910: 42. Predescu 1940: 638. Museul Național de Artă al României. 1988: 20).

⁶According to many citations of the Greek newspaper of Bucharest *Sylogoi* [Associations], no. 3322 (12th/24th Nov. 1886): 3, no. 3459 (6th/18th May 1887): 3, no. 3706 (15th/27th March 1888): 3, and to Romanian sources (Museul A. Simu 1910: 42). In contrast, in the School Register of the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich 1841-1884, Athens is mentioned as his birthplace (Lydakis 1972: 105, 259; Lydakis 1976: 238). We believe though from the above mentioned evidence that he was born in Romania.

⁷About Kessani, see: Papadopoulos 1929; Vakoufari 1984: 24-51.

⁸In particular, he exhibited his works, according to existing information, in the autumn of 1883, the spring and the autumn of 1884 and in the autumn of 1886. The first two times he participated in exhibitions held in the halls of an artistic society, while the later ones in the Artistic Exhibition of Munich (*Sylogoi* [Associations], no. 2539 (1st/13th Apr. 1884): 4; no. 2688 (6th/18th Oct. 1884): 3; no. 3322 (12/24 Nov. 1886): 3).

⁹It is also mentioned that in 1888 he executed the portrait of the well-known Romanian singer Theodorini (*Sylogoi* [Associations] (22th/4th Oct. 1888): 3).

¹⁰More specifically, he taught the following courses: Nudes, Heads of Expression, Draperies and Compositions (1st year), Heads according to nature and Static Figures (3d year), Figures painted according to alive models (4th year) (Archives of the Romanian State, Jassy, School of Fine Arts, dossier 4/1893: 172).

¹¹There were two Schools of Fine Arts in the Romania, one in Jassy and one in Bucharest (Drăgut et al. 1971: 161).

¹²Its first president was Ion Georgescu, the most important Romanian neo-classical sculptor of the 19th century. The Society lasted until 1947 (Oprea 1969: 20-30).

¹³The "Secession" (1892) was the first organized movement against academism (Lydakis 1976: 115)

¹⁴He also participated in several Official Exhibitions in Bucharest, such as the Official Salon of 1907, where he was also member of the jury and the Official Exhibition of Artists in life, of 1916, where he received one of the second

prizes (Salonul Oficial. 1907: 18-19; Ministerul Instrucțiunii și al Cultelor 1916: 8).

¹⁵About them, see: Dragut et al. 1971: 129-131, 140-153.

¹⁶Art Gallery of Bucharest, Art Gallery of Jassy, Museum of Saint Georges, Museum Calinderu, Museum A. Simu, Ministry of Public Education, Central Society of Agriculture, Chamber of Commerce (Museul A. Simu. 1910: 42. Pascali 1912. Museul Național de Artă al României 1988: 20-22).

Acknowledgments

The author expresses her acknowledgments for their assistance to Dr. Cristina Băcanu, journalist-writer, Ms. Oana Barbălată, historian-archivist, Professor Gheorghe Macarie—University of Jassy, and Ms. Maria Rafaila, researcher—Library of the Romanian Academy.

Honoring Patrick Leigh Fermor: Review Essay¹

by WILLARD MANUS

Reading Patrick Leigh Fermor today is both an exhilarating and depressing experience, exhilarating because of the depth and brilliance of his prose, depressing because the Greece he portrays so memorably has been hammered to dust by the march of time. Fermor, who was knighted in 2003, is best known in Greece and in his native Britain, where he was born nine decades ago to Sir Lewis Leigh Fermor, director of the Geological Society in India, and Eileen Ambler, who was partly raised there. His first book, *The Traveller's Tree*, published in 1950, dealt with the journey he made through the Caribbean islands in 1947-48. The book won the Heinemann Foundation Prize for Literature, and established him as a writer of note.

His next two books, 1952's *A Time to Keep Silence*, which described his stay in various European monasteries (where he discovered in himself "a capacity for solitude"), and 1956's *The Violins of Saint-Jacque*, a novel, are interesting but minor works. His literary and political importance is linked to the two books on Greece he published a decade later—*Mani: Travels in the Southern Peloponnese* and *Roumeli: Travels in Northern Greece*. Established his reputation as the pre-eminent non-native writer on 20th century Greece.

Fermor's first experience of the country dated back to 1933, when as a rebellious and untamed 19-year-old, he dropped out of

WILLARD MANUS lived in Greece for many years, mostly in the village of Lindos on Rhodes. His experiences were published in *This Way to Paradise—Dancing on the Tables*. His most recent book is *A Dog Called Leka*, a tale of an eighteen-year-old American boy and his remarkable dog as they sail the Greek isles in a catamaran.

Sandhurst and set out on a walking tour of Europe with Constantinople as his ultimate destination was Constantinople. Envisioning himself as “a medieval pilgrim, an affable tramp with a knapsack and hobnailed boots,” he embarked, in mid-winter, on a journey that eventually spanned three years and took him through the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Rumania and, eventually, Greece.²

Remarkably, Fermor did not write about his picaresque adventures in pre-war Europe until many years later. “So when *A Time of Gifts* appeared in 1977 and *Beneath the Winds and the Water* in 1986, the life of the mid-thirties that he described had been utterly destroyed,” his biographer Artemis Cooper has noted, “and much of the land he had walked over was in the grip of communism for years. Yet his memory recreated this world with an astonishing freshness and immediacy, and recaptured the young man he was then: full of curiosity, optimism and joy in the vibrant diversity of the world.”³ The concluding volume of Fermor’s trilogy is scheduled for publication (by John Murray Ltd.) in early 2007.

Fermor made it to Constantinople on New Year’s Day, 1935, and then crossed south into Greece. He spent time in a monastery on Mt. Athos, got caught up later in a Royalist vs. Republican battle in Macedonia, arriving finally in Athens, where he met the great love of his life, the Romanian Balasha Cantacuzene. They went to Poros and lived together in an old water mill, where he wrote and she painted. When the money ran out they retreated to her decaying family home in Baldeni, Moldavia.

Fermor described the house in an essay published in *Words of Mercury*, “Most of a large estate had been lopped away in the agrarian reform. There was little cash about, people were paid in kind by a sort of sharing system, so, in a way, were the owners; and, on the spot, there was enough to go around. Elderly pensioners hovered in the middle distance and an ancient staff would come into being at moments of need. . . .

“There was one crone there who knew how to cast spells and break them by incantations; another, by magic, could deliver whole villages from rats. After sheep-shearing, a *claca*, fifty girls and crones, bristling with distaffs would gather in a barn to spin; hilarious days with a lot of food, drink, singing and story-telling.

“Snow reached the windowsills and lasted till spring. There were cloudy rides under a sky full of rooks; otherwise, it was an

indoors life of painting, writing, reading, talk and lamp-lit evenings with Mallarme, Apollinaire, Proust and Gide handy; there was *Les Enfants Terribles* and *Le Grand Meaulnes* and *L'Aiglon* read aloud; all these were early debarbarizing steps in beguiling and unknown territory."

Fermor was not quite the barbarian he fancied himself. Despite having rejected higher education, he was already something of a polymath, an autodidact. Not only was he conversant in five European languages (only Hungarian stumped him), he was knowledgeable about art, history, architecture, geography, sociology, religion, fashion, etymology, cartography, heraldry and many other subjects, all of which he had absorbed through voracious reading.

The importance of books in his life was discussed in a piece he wrote for *The Pleasure of Reading* (ed. Antonia Fraser, Bloomsbury, 1992). "When the miracle of literacy happened at last, it turned an unlettered brute into a book-ridden lunatic," he confessed. "Till it was light enough to read, furious dawn-watches ushered in days flat on hearth-rugs or grass, in ricks or up trees, which ended in stifling torch lit hours under bedclothes."⁴

Among his favorite writers were Dickens, Thackeray (*Vanity Fair*, anyway), the Sitwells, Norman Douglas, Aldous Huxley and Evelyn Waugh, not to speak of Kipling and Houseman; Baudelaire and Ronsard in French; Horace and Virgil in Latin; Holderlin, Rilke and Stefan George in German.

"The young learn as quick as mynahs, at an age, luckily, when everything sticks," he continued. What also stuck were "reams of Shakespeare, border ballads, passages of Donne, Raleigh, Wyatt and Marvel . . . two Latin hymns, remnants of spasmodic religious mania . . . swatches from Homer, two or three epitaphs of Simonides, and two four-line moon-poems of Sappho."

Fermor's list also includes "the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* . . . a battery of atlases, concordances, dictionaries, Loeb classics, Pleiades editions, Oxford companions, Cambridge histories, anthologies and books on birds, beasts, plants and stars."

When Britain declared war in 1939, Fermor immediately went home to join up, leaving Balasha behind in Romania. He first enlisted in the Irish Guards, but because of his fluent command of Greek he was commissioned into the Intelligence Corps, serving at first as liaison officer to the Greek army fighting the Italians in

Albania. After Greece fell, Fermor was sent to Crete where he took part in the battle against the German airborne invasion. He remained on the island after the German triumph; disguised now as a Cretan shepherd, with a big handlebar moustache and a dagger in his belt, the tall, slim, Fermor cut a swashbuckling figure as he roamed the mountains to help organize the resistance movement.

It was there, in Crete's high, wild country, that he recalled in *Words of Mercury* that "devotion to the Greek mountains and their population took root. . . . We lived in goat-folds and abandoned conical cheese-makers' huts and above all, in the myriad caverns that mercilessly riddle the island's stiff spine. Some were too shallow to keep out the snow, others could house a Cyclops and all his flocks. Here, at ibex- and eagle-height, we settled with our small retinues. Enemy searches kept us on the move and it was in a hundred of these eyries that we got to know an older Crete and an older Greece than anyone dreams of in the plains. Under the dripping stalactites we sprawled and sat cross-legged, our eyes red with smoke, on the branches that padded the cave's floor and spooned our suppers out of a communal tin plate: beans, lentils, cooked snails and herbs, accompanied by that twice-baked herdsman's bread that must be soaked in water or goat's milk before it is eaten. Toasting goat's cheese sizzled on the points of long daggers and oil dewed our whiskers. These sessions were often cheered by flasks of *raki*, occasionally distilled from mulberries, sent by the guardian village below. On lucky nights, calabashes of powerful amber-colored wine loosened all our tongues. Over the shoulders of each figure was a bristly white cloak stiff as bark, with the sleeves hanging loose like penguins' wings; the hoods raised against the wind gave the bearded and mustachioed faces a look of Cistercians turned bandit. Someone would be smashing shells with his pistol-butt and offering peeled walnuts in a horny palm; another sliced tobacco on the stock of a rifle; for hours we forgot the war with talk and singing and stories; laughter echoed along the minotaurish warrens."

In 1944 Fermor took part in a bold and perilous mission that later became the subject of a best-selling book, *Ill Met by Moonlight* by W. Stanley Moss, a fellow intelligence officer.⁵ The British plan was to kidnap the German army's chief of staff, General Muller, who had become notorious and hated for his brutal treatment of

both Cretan partisans and civilians. When Muller was called away, the new target was his replacement: General Heinrich Kreipe, a professional soldier arriving straight from service on the Russian front.

Fermor and his team, which included Moss, Sandy Rendel (former political correspondent for the *Sunday Times*), the Cretan partisan Niki Akoumianakis and a dozen other *andartes*, had to radically alter their original plan. Fermor and Moss agreed to disguise themselves as German military policemen. That meant Fermor had to part with his Cretan moustache. Without it, he looked so much the stiff-necked Teuton that Moss kidded him about being on the wrong side. They decided to promote themselves to corporal's rank and decorate themselves with a few (stolen) ribbons.

Taking up positions outside the isolated Villa Ariadne—the headquarters for the German army had been built above Heraklion before the war by the archaeologist Sir Arthur Evans—Fermor and Moss flagged the general's car down at 9.30 pm.

"*Is dies das general's wagon?*" he asked.

"*Ja, ja,*" came the muffled answer from inside.

With that assurance, key members of the band attacked from all sides, tearing at the doors of the car. The beam of a flashlight showed the startled face of the general and the chauffeur reaching for his automatic. There was the thud of a bludgeon; the chauffeur keeled over and was dragged out of sight.

The general, who offered no resistance, was brought to Anogia, the largest village on Crete, located on the northern slopes of Mt. Ida. "Famous for its independent spirit, its idiosyncrasy of dress and accent, it had always been a great hideout of ours," said Fermor in an account written in 1969 for the Imperial War Museum.

Fermor related that a note had been left in the general's car stating that he was safe and "would be treated with the respect due to his rank," and that the kidnap had been carried out by British officers and Greek nationals serving as soldiers in the forces of His Hellenic Majesty. "The point was to give the Germans no excuse for carnage and reprisals in the Knossos area."

The next day, however, a single-winged Feiseler-Storck reconnaissance plane circled above Anovia and dropped a steady snowfall of leaflets. "To all Cretans," the message read, "last night the German General Kreipe was abducted by bandits. He is being concealed in the Cretan mountains and his whereabouts cannot be

unknown to the inhabitants. If the General isn't returned within three days, all rebel villages in the Heraklion district will be razed to the ground and the severest reprisals exacted on the civilian population."

The general was not, of course, returned to the Germans; he was smuggled off the island and delivered by submarine to British army headquarters in Egypt, and the Germans exacted their promised revenge. Fermor deals with this in circumspect fashion in his official report, asserting that "most untrue to form, there had been little violence, few arrests, no shooting on the part of the Germans."

Fermor's statement is disputed by Dr. Michael E. Paradise, a Midwest-based Greek-American whose father and two brothers were members of the British intelligence group on Crete. Though in his teens, Michael himself was often used as a courier. "Attacking in the darkness of one night," he wrote in the April 10, 1997 edition of *The Greek American* (a now-defunct, New York-based newspaper), "the Germans proceeded to destroy several villages with the utmost brutality and ferocity. I was witness of the destruction of one of the villages, Ano Meros, on Mt. Kendros in Amari."

The kidnapping of Gen. Kreipe, Paradise asserted, "contributed to the unnecessary death of hundreds of men, who were hunted down like wild animals in the streets of their villages, then, while some were injured and still alive, they were burnt in the houses of the villages, and buried in them when the dynamiting of the houses followed."

Most Cretans, though, have not held a grudge against Fermor and his gung-ho confederates. As one veteran Cretan commando said at the time of Kreipe's abduction, "So they'll burn down all the houses one day. And what then? My house was burnt down four times by the Turks. Let the Germans burn it down for a fifth time! And they killed scores of my family, scores of them, my child, yet here I am! We're at war and war has all of these things. You can't make a wedding feast without meat."

After the war—and his brief Caribbean sojourn—Fermor realized that his love of Greece had tied himself forever to the country's fortunes. He lived for a time on Evia, then Ithaca and Hydra (in the house of the painter, Niko Ghika). Soon after he began his travels in the far corners of the Greek mainland which led to the

publication of his two masterpieces, *Mani* and *Roumeli*. Accompanied by the photographer (and his wife-to-be) Joan Rayner (daughter of the Conservative politician and First Lord of the Admiralty in Ramsay MacDonald's coalition government, Belton Eyres Monsell), whom he had met in wartime Cairo, Fermor set off with this goal in mind: "To situate and describe present-day Greece of the mountains and islands in relationship to their habitat and history."

Mani is the southernmost part of Greece, an isolated, mountainous and forbidding peninsula known for its stark, sun-blistered landscape and warlike, feuding inhabitants. Despite having been warned not to attempt to penetrate into The Deep Mani—"the *Maniatis* are dangerous"—"they are Jews"—"they fear and hate foreigners"—"they live on salted starfish"—Fermor and Rayner defiantly set out on foot and mule, bus and caique, in search of an authentic Greek world.

What they found and reported on was a revelation to one and all. The Mani was a strange, combative place, to be sure—most people lived in *pyrgi*, stone towers that were more fortress than domicile—but it was fantastical at the same time, rich in history and bravery (no part of Greece played a more conspicuous and valuable part in the War of Independence). With its code of honor and hospitality, its love of freedom, the Mani was also pulsing with life, colorful in speech, custom, ritual and superstition.

The book that came out of this expedition into the heart and soul of the Mani became an instant classic. Fermor's prose and Rayner's photographs (sadly dropped from subsequent editions) won plaudits from critics and readers alike. The British artist (and longtime Greek resident) Polly Hope has said, "*Mani* was one of the books that brought me to Greece. When my husband and I first read it we knew instantly that this was the world we wanted to go to. It told of magic and fury and history and people and landscape. Completely breathtaking. We read it and reread it and read it again until our heads were full of towers and feuds, cucumbers like slices of ancient pillars, and ouzo. Donkeys and heat. And the dark sea that because of the extraordinary Greek light stands up vertically as far as the horizon. We had to go. And immediately.

"We did, and remained, though not in Mani. Still all these years later it is the book that tells about Greece as it is. It is still right and as clear and informative as that first reading. Although

tourism has spread its ugly veil over most of Greece the people are still there, the feuds and cucumbers, the vertical sea and broiling sun."⁶

Similar praise was bestowed on *Roumeli* when it was published eight years later. Fermor and Rayner's portrait of the northeast corner of Greece, including Messolonghi, where Lord Byron (one of Fermor's heroes) fought and died for Greece, is as vivid and compelling as anything in *Mani*. Whether writing about the *sarakatsans*, the nomadic shepherds—"self-appointed Ishmaels"—who inhabited the mountaintops, speaking in a secret tongue; or the origins of the local *Karayiozi* puppet shows; or the Meteora monasteries; or the "stone-age banquet" (celebrating an arranged marriage) to which they were invited, Fermor's prose shines and shimmers like beaten gold.

Historian John J. Norwich believes that Fermor "writes English as well as anyone alive."⁷ He also praised "the preternatural copiousness" of Fermor's two books. Jan Morris seconded the statement, adding that Fermor was "beyond cavil, the greatest living travel writer."⁸ In November, 2004 the British Guild of Travel Writers concurred, bestowing on Fermor its Lifetime Achievement Award.

Fermor won another important prize in 2004: the second Genadius Trustees' Award for his support of things Greek. At the ceremony in Athens, the previous recipient of the award, writer/translator Edmund Keeley, said, "I look upon Mr. Fermor as one of my first mentors, a man of letters who taught me, perhaps more than any other Philhellene, the best way to write about the second country we have both come to love and to celebrate in our work."⁹

After lauding Fermor for his "imaginative projection of Greece," Keeley offered a specific example of the kind of "special insight" that Fermor brings to his writing about Greece. "A scene in his superb book on the Mani . . . not only captures the essence of Greek hedonism . . . but demonstrates his easy and subtle understanding of the Greek sensibility."

The scene took place in "the glaring white town" of Kalamata where the Feast of St. John the Baptist was being celebrated. Fermor, his wife Joan, and their friend the writer Xan Fielding sat down to eat their dinner set out at the water's edge on flagstones "that flung back the heat like a casserole with the lid off."

Suddenly they decided to pick up their iron table, neatly laid out, and set it down a few yards out to sea, followed by their three chairs, then by the three of them sitting down with the cool water up to their waists. Quite sensible, the only slightly odd thing about this was that all three were fully dressed. Yet the really significant moment, the epiphany, came when the waiter arrived on the quay, gazed in surprise at the space they'd left empty on the burning flagstones, and then (quoting Fermor) "observing us with a quickly masked flicker of pleasure," stepped without further hesitation into the sea and "advanced with a butler's gravity" to put down their meal before them, three broiled fish, "piping hot, and with their golden brown scales sparkling."

As Keeley pointed out, "It is Fermor's seeing both that flicker of pleasure and the quick masking of it that says so much, more even than his report that others on the quay sent their seaborne fellow diners can after measuring can of retsina, and a dozen boats gathered around to help them consume the complimentary wine, and a mandolin arrived . . . to accompany *rebetika* songs in praise of the liberated life. Only those who have often taken apart and savored a broiled tsipoura or *fangri* . . . fresh from the sea and amply bathed in an olive-oil-and-lemon sauce would recognize why no representative Greek citizen given to pleasure would think of disturbing, except in a celebratory way, any table holding such a succulent, earthy gift from the Gods. And only a writer with Fermor's precise vision and brilliant skill in expression would choose to show our hedonistic waiter appropriately masking his pleasure and assuming the gravity of a butler as he entered the sea on his mission to deliver the gods' gift."

It is, alas, harder and harder to find such raffish scenes in 21st-century, tourist-choked, EU-regimented Greece. Even Fermor, in a recent essay, had to admit that much of what he first encountered and experienced in Greece has disappeared. "Progress has altered the face and character of the country," he commented. And as for tourism, "it destroys the object of its love."¹⁰

That said, Fermor still continues to write about Greece. In his 90s, living alone in the pyrgos he built in the Outer Mani—Joan died in 2000, of injuries suffered in a fall—he toils away on the final book of his Hook of Holland to Constantinople trilogy, the one that deals with his first years in Greece, working from notebooks, maps and memory. In a way Fermor is a chronicler of a

bygone age, a rememberer of things past. The Greece he reveres may have died, but he battles with the last strength in him to keep its spirit alive.

Notes

¹Only two of Fermor's books are in print in the United States: *A Time of Gifts* and *Between the Woods and the Water*. They are New York Review of Books Classics. In the UK, most of Fermor's books are published in hardbound and paperback by John Murray Ltd., but Penguin has published a few of his titles as paper reprints. The following are his major publications. *Mani: Travels in the Southern Peloponnese*. Photos by Joan Eyres (London: Murray, 1958); Translation of George Pyschounadkis, *The Cretan Runner: His story of the Germany Occupation*. (London: J. Murray, 1978, c1955); *Roumeli: Travels in Northern Greece* (London & NY; Penguin, 1983, c1966); Introduction to Kostas Chatzepateras, *Greece 1940-41 Eyewitnessed* (Anixi Attikis [Greece]: Efstathiadis Group, 1995); Text with Stephen Spender of *Ghika: Paintings, Drawings, Sculpture* (London: Lund Humphries, 1964); *A Time of Gifts; On Foot to Constantinople, from the Hook of Holland to the Middle Danube* (NY: New York Review of Books, 2005).

²Quotations is from a review from "Scholar in the Woods," a review by James Campbell in *The Guardian*, April 8, 2005.

³James Campbell, *Words of Mercury*.

⁴All quotes regarding Fermor's reading tastes are taken from his essay in the anthology *The Pleasures of Reading* edited by Antonia Fraser, Bloomsbury, 1992.

⁵The details of the kidnapping are taken from *Ill Met by Moonlight* (London: Harrap, 1950). In the movie of the same name released in 1958, Fermor is played by Dirk Bogarde.

⁶Letter to the author sent in 2004.

⁷Copy written for the dusk jacket of the paperback edition of *Between the Woods and the Water*.

⁸Ibid.

⁹This and subsequent Keeley citations are from a 2004 letter to the author. Date?

¹⁰See Fermor's essay in *A Time of Gifts*.

Book Reviews

- Vaka Brown, Demetra. *Haremlik: Some Pages from the Life of Turkish Women*. 1909. Intro. Yiorgos Kalogeras. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004. ISBN: 1-59333-203-3. 275 pp.
- Vaka Brown, Demetra. *The Unveiled Ladies of Istanbul (Stamboul)*. 1923. Intro. Yiorgos Kalogeras. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2005. ISBN: 1-59333-216-5. 261 pp.

Cultures in Dialogue, the latest publishing project of Gorgias Press (Piscataway, NJ) returns to active circulation out of print sources by women writers that were published in the period between 1880 and 1940. Series One of *Cultures in Dialogue* includes a wide range of genres—memoir, travelogue, ethnography, political commentary—all of which illustrate the “exchanges” between and amongst Ottoman, British, and American women authors whose work addresses such issues as imperialism, colonialism, nationalism, race relations, the East/West dichotomy, Islam facing modernity, and female emancipation. As the series’ title suggests, the thirteen reprinted volumes—collected under the subtitle “Orientalism, Occidentalism, and Women’s Writing”—focus on dialogue instead of divide. Furthermore, these diverse contributions by women authors to the tradition of Orientalist/Occidentalism writings reframe the historical tensions between Eastern and Western cultures, ultimately offering a nuanced understanding of their current manifestations.

Series One of *Cultures in Dialogue* includes two titles by Demetra Vaka Brown: *Haremlik: Some Pages from the Life of Turkish Women*, initially published in 1909 by Houghton and Mifflin, and *The Unveiled Ladies of Stamboul*, first published in 1923 by the same press. The inclusion of two works by Vaka Brown in the particular series—we must note that Vaka Brown is the only writer in the series who is anthologized twice—testifies to the author’s prominence with respect to a culture of “women’s orients” that undermines the binary of the Western colonizer and the Eastern colonized. Indeed, Vaka’s work, bearing witness to the *female* experience of the Orient, operates against a hegemonic and homogeneously constructed patriarchal tradition of Orientalism and revises conventional conceptualizations of Ottoman and modern Turkey as a unified and monolithic “Oriental topos.”

ELEFTHERIA ARAPOGLOU is a lecturer at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. She was a Fulbright Grantee (1998) at the University of Texas-San Antonio and recipient of a Quarry Farm Fellowship (2003) from the Center for Mark Twain Studies at Elmira College (NY).

Demetra Vaka Brown is “the first Greek immigrant woman to the U.S.A. whose name, date of birth, date of immigration and life story can be established with relative accuracy” (Kalogeras, “Contested, Familiar and Exotic Spaces” v). She was born in 1877 on the island of Prinkipo (Bouyouk Ada), off the coast of Constantinople in the Sea of Marmara. She was the daughter of a Greek official who was working for the Sultanate, thus her family was one of the upper middle-class Greek families living in Constantinople under Ottoman rule. The family’s socio-economic status allowed Vaka to pursue studies in Paris—possibly at convent schools—which she had to interrupt due to the financial difficulties her family faced following the sudden death of her father. She immigrated to the United States in 1894, at the age of 17, as the governess of the children of the Ottoman government’s appointed consul to the U.S., who was a man of Greek descent. When in the U.S., significant historic events altered the course of Vaka’s life. The Armenian massacres by the Ottomans in 1894 and 1895 put the Christian consul in a compromising position: since he could not successfully “justify” the killing of Christians by Muslims to the American public, he was refused his salary by the Sultan, thus forced to abandon his position and return to Constantinople. Vaka did not follow the consul when he was recalled, but decided to stay in the U.S. with the purpose of studying—a goal she ultimately had to abandon due to financial hardships. Before becoming fluent in English, she worked as a copy editor, writing in Greek for the national daily Greek newspaper *Atlantis*, but her ultimate professional transition was made when she became a correspondent and regular contributor to major popular publications such as *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Asia*, *The Century*, *Delineator*, *Colliers Magazine*, and *The Outlook*. By the time of her death in 1946, Vaka Brown had written over a dozen romances and personal narratives—two of which appeared posthumously following her husband’s initiative—almost all exclusively published by the established, mainstream publishing house Houghton and Mifflin.

As Yiorgos Kalogeras accurately notes in his thorough and historically informed Introduction to the 2004 edition of *Haremlik*, in the 1910s and 1920s Vaka Brown was lionized as an authority not only on Oriental politics and culture, but also on domestic and social life in the Orient (“Contested, Familiar and Exotic Spaces” vii). Furthermore, she was regarded “a valuable source on the international politics surrounding the prospective division of the moribund Ottoman Empire among the European Powers” (Kalogeras, “Contested, Familiar and Exotic Spaces” vii). *Haremlik* is Vaka Brown’s first book in which the autobiographical narrator recounts the author’s return to Constantinople in 1901, following a six year stay in the U.S. The ten chapters in *Haremlik*—each devoted to a friend or an acquaintance of Vaka: Mihirmah, Djimlah, Validé Hanoum, Houlmé Hanoum, Nor-Sembah etc.—are based on the writer’s impressions of the life of Turkish women at a time when the harem was gradually becoming a thing of the past. In this respect, the historic background to the narrative is extremely important: the book was published when the cosmopolitan Islamic Ottoman Empire began shifting from a concept of citizenship based on belief to one based on place of birth, culminating in an independent Turkey and radically altering the relationship of women to the nation. Thus, set against the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of modern Turkey, the female portraits in *Haremlik* illustrate the move of Oriental women

from veiling and seclusion to personal and political liberty.

Vaka Brown's descriptions of the life of Turkish women in *Haremlik* are fashioned in such a way as to cater to the reading market's fascination with the Orient. At the same time, however, these descriptions defy Orientalism as a tradition of representation. For example, Vaka's autobiographical narrator depicts the *hammam* as a luxurious and exotic space—a women's public sphere within which slaves enable their mistresses' desultory enjoyment of quasi-erotic pleasures. In this way, the autobiographical narrator follows a long tradition in travel literature of depicting the East as fantastical and hedonistic. Nonetheless, whereas specific accounts—such as the scenes in the *hammam*, for example—seem to be catering to the U.S. market for Orientalism at the time, Vaka's narrator eventually undercuts her exotic rendering of life in the Orient, suggesting a reflexive use of the conventions of Oriental literature. A case in point is Vaka's representation of the *harem* as a female sanctuary, identified with virtue, morality, female agency and camaraderie.

In *Haremlik*, Vaka Brown's reflections on life in the harem reveal the ambiguity of the author's response to the changing world of Oriental women. More specifically, on the one hand, Vaka's autobiographical narrator regrets that modernization transforms Ottoman life, while on the other hand the book's author upholds Western values and attitudes. As a result, and though it may seem paradoxical, even if some of the passages in *Haremlik* render the Oriental woman as "Other," the narrative as a whole reinforces the similarities between women of the harem and Western women. This is because Vaka's narrator employs the Turkish woman as a cautionary figure to articulate her critique of Western women's economic precariousness and lack of liberty. Thus, even though we cannot overlook the fact that Vaka's autobiographical speaker often seems to emphasize the desire to see the Orient as exotic, writing a sensationalist account that will sell, *Haremlik* ultimately challenges that desire, exposing it as fantasy.

The second book by Vaka Brown that is included in the series, *The Unveiled Ladies of Stamboul*, "unveils" the diversity of images that have been used to textually represent the "Oriental female subject" and exposes the way in which these images have been culturally constructed by "the West." The book was initially published in 1923, fourteen years following the publication of *Haremlik*, and records Vaka's return to her native Constantinople (Istanbul, Turkey, after 1923) in 1921, after a twenty-year absence since her last visit to the city in 1901. The year of publication is significant for two reasons: on the one hand, it marks a turning point in the author's career, since *Unveiled* is the last personal/travel narrative Vaka would publish in book form. As Yiorgos Kalogeras insightfully remarks in his Introduction to the 2005 edition, "one has the feeling [Vaka] is summing up her career in journalism and Orientalism in this book" ("The Decline of her Oriental Tale" vi). On the other hand, the book appeared at a crucial moment in the history of both Turkey and Greece. 1923 was the year of the exchange of populations between the two countries. 1923 was also the year when the Republic of Turkey was proclaimed under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal (1881-1938). Following the abolishment of the Sultanate and the Caliphate in 1922, Ottoman dynastic rule and the multicultural Ottoman Empire gave their place to the monocultural, modern Republic of Turkey.

The Unveiled Ladies of Stamboul collects the articles that were commissioned by *Asia: The American Magazine on the Orient* from February to August 1922. *Asia* commissioned Vaka's correspondence because of the U.S. interest in the geographical region of Turkey and the Balkans as a potential area of colonial, political, and economic influence (Kalogeras, "The Decline of her Oriental Tale" xi). Interestingly, the women's voices that are heard in *Unveiled* all respond to the Kemalist principles of secularism, statism, and Turkish nationalism against Western colonial, cultural, political, and economic intervention in Turkey, but they do so in disparate ways.

The seven, extremely diverse, portraits of "unveiled ladies of Istanbul" that Vaka's narrator paints offer a polyphonic response to the forces of modernity and modernization operating on Turkey at the time. More explicitly, whereas some of the ladies the autobiographical narrator describes embrace modernity as a liberating force, some others strongly oppose modernization. As a result of these women's conflicted responses to Turkey's socioeconomic and cultural modernization, Vaka's autobiographical speaker figures as a chameleon who assumes diverse voices and different masks to convey to her audience different points of view in accordance with the person or character she addresses.

Vaka's ambiguous narrative identification acquires significance if interpreted in the context of the profoundly heterogeneous tradition of Orientalism which her autobiographical narrator represents. In *Unveiled*, Vaka's departure from a unified Western discourse on "the Eastern woman" does not signify her complete rejection of Orientalist tropes. It is true that Vaka's narrator, by "unveiling" the ladies of Istanbul, challenges monolithic Orientalist stereotypes of female subjectivity by highlighting the cultural, social, and political agency of individual, vibrant, Ottoman/Muslim women. However, the autobiographical narrator's aesthetic strategy of subverting the homogeneous and unified representation of the Oriental female, much as it verges on modern feminism, "veils" a highly political Orientalist discourse.

The heterogeneity of Vaka's "Oriental object," as this is illustrated both in the diversity of the portraits which the autobiographical narrator paints and in the varied narrative stances she assumes, marks precisely the instability of Vaka's Orientalist discourse which involves contradictions and lack of fixity. Each woman Vaka's narrator encounters represents a distinct Orientalist situation, thus denoting a plurality of referents for the Oriental female, which are not unified or necessarily related.

Ultimately, Vaka's Orientalist examples—the literary figures embedded in the narratives of *Haremlik* and *The Unveiled Ladies of Stamboul*—much as they feature as an incongruous variety, illustrate Orientalism as a nexus of various modes of representation. In both books, the series of observations that Vaka's autobiographical narrator makes about women in Turkey resist and challenge the notion of a closed Orientalist discourse that has the potential to manage and colonize the "otherness" of the "Eastern lady." Subsequently, *Haremlik* and *The Unveiled Ladies of Stamboul*, as hereby discussed, undermine the notion of an oversimplified, consistent, univocal Orientalist discourse that effectively produces "cultural difference."

—Eleftheria Arapoglou