

The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 19, No 1 (2022)

The Historical Review / La Revue Historique


The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME XIX (2022)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF



The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME XIX (2022)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique

VOLUME XIX (2022)

Section of Neohellenic Research /
Institute of Historical Research
National Hellenic Research Foundation
Vas. Constantinou 48, Athens 116 35
Greece
tel. (+30) 210 72 73 554
e-mail: iie@eie.gr
historical_review@eie.gr

Subscription information:
bookstore@eie.gr

Institute of Historical Research Publications
<https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques /
Institut de Recherches Historiques
Fondation Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique
48, av. Vas. Constantinou, Athènes 116 35
Grèce
tél. (+30) 210 72 73 554
e-mail: iie@eie.gr
historical_review@eie.gr

Abonnements:
bookstore@eie.gr

Publications de l' Institut de Recherches Historiques
<https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>

ISSN 1790-3572

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique

VOLUME XIX (2022)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

The Historical Review is an annual refereed journal of historical research in the human sciences published by the Section of Neohellenic Research, IHR / NHRF

La Revue Historique est une revue annuelle de recherche historique en sciences humaines publiée par la Section de Recherches Néohelléniques, IRH / FNRS

Editorial Committee / Comité de rédaction

Maria Christina Chatziioannou, Eleni Kyramargiou, George Koutzakiotis, Alexandra Sfoini, Niketas Siniossoglou, Kostas Tampakis, George Tolias

Contact: Niketas Siniossoglou, nsinios@eie.gr

Editor of issue XIX (2022) / éditeur pour le n° XIX (2022):
George Tolias

Advisory Board / Conseil scientifique

Dimitris Apostolopoulos, Section of Neohellenic Research, IHR / NHRF

Richard Clogg, St Antony's College, Oxford

Georges Dertilis†, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris

Paschalis M. Kitromilides (founding editor), University of Athens

Mark Mazower, Columbia University

Anthony Molho, European University Institute, Florence

Vassilis Panayotopoulos, Section of Neohellenic Research, IHR / NHRF

Andrei Pippidi, Université de Bucarest

Alexis Politis, University of Crete

Fred Rosen, University College London

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique

VOLUME XIX (2022)

Contents / Table des matières

SPECIAL SECTION I / SECTION SPÉCIALE I

CONFLICT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

A Concise Introduction to Greek Environmental History: Research Hubs, Threads, Themes and Projections into the Future 9

George L. Vlachos

“At the mercy of a miserable ditch named the Kifisos”: The Changing Perceptions of the Natural Environment and the Contest with Nature through the History of Athens’ Main River 27

Dimitris Glistras

The “War on the Goat”: Forestry, Husbandry and Politics in Early Modern Greece 47

Giorgos Kostopoulos and Iosif Botetzagias

Is There Oil in Greece? Oil Exploration and Scientific Conflict during the First Years of the Greek Geological Survey (1917–1925) 77

Christos Karampatsos, Spyros Tzokas, Giorgos Velegrakis and Gelina Harlaftis

SPECIAL SECTION II / SECTION SPÉCIALE II

- Atlas1821.com. A DIGITAL ATLAS OF THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE CREATION OF THE GREEK STATE, 1821–1852 113
 Presentation
George Tolias
- Reconstructing the Map: ‘Deep Mapping’ Greece, 1821–1852 115
George Tolias, Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis El Gedi
- Military Mapping, Philhellenic Geography, and the Making of Greece, 1811–1827 143
George Tolias
- Alternative Narratives of the Greek Revolution: An Intellectual Map of Messolonghi (1821–1880) 167
Panagiotis El Gedi

ARTICLES

- From the Greek Medical Manuscripts of the Ottoman Empire to the Pharmacopoeia I of the Greek State: Pharmacy and Political Change in Southeastern Europe 187
Athanasios Barlagiannis, Penelope Seriatou and Vaso Seirinidou
- The University as a Punisher: Control Mechanisms and Disciplinary Practices. The Disciplinary Board of the University of Athens (1911–1940) 229
Angeliki Christodoulou, Vassilis Gkonis and Vangelis Karamanolakis

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES / APPROCHES CRITIQUES

- Onur İnal and Yavuz Köse (eds.), *Seeds of Power: Explorations in Ottoman Environmental History* 259
George L. Vlachos
- Mark Mazower, *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση* 263
Christos Loukos

Eugenia Drakopoulou, <i>Εικόνες του Αγώνα στην ιστορική ζωγραφική της Ευρώπης</i> [Images of the Greek War of Independence in European history painting] <i>Aphrodite Kouria</i>	268
Anastassios Anastassiadis, <i>La réforme Orthodoxe: Église, État et société en Grèce à l'époque de la confessionnalisation post-ottomane (1833–1940)</i> <i>Paraskevas Matalas</i>	275
Paraskevas Matalas, <i>Κοσμοπολίτες εθνικιστές: Ο Μωρίς Μπαρές και οι ανά τον κόσμο “μαθητές” του</i> [Cosmopolitan nationalists: Maurice Barres and his “disciples” around the world] <i>Vicky Karafoulidou</i>	282
Kostis Gkotsinas, <i>Επί της ουσίας: Ιστορία των ναρκωτικών στην Ελλάδα, 1875–1950</i> [In substance: A history of drugs in Greece, 1875–1950] <i>Effi Gazi</i>	288
Maximilien Giraud et Claire Béchu (éds.), <i>La France et la Grèce au XXe siècle: Des archives à l'histoire</i> <i>Ellie Droulia</i>	295
C. TH. DIMARAS ANNUAL LECTURE, 2022	
“Do the People Benefit from Being Deceived?” A Debate on the Politics of the Enlightenment <i>Elisabeth Décultot</i>	299

Special Section I / Section Spéciale I

CONFLICT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

A Concise Introduction to Greek Environmental History: Research Hubs, Threads, Themes and Projections into the Future

ABSTRACT: This article aims to provide a brief overview of the institutional emergence and development of environmental history in Greece, starting from its humble beginnings during the latter part of the 2000s to the rapid flourishing of the field in the late 2010s. After a brief discussion of the emergence of environmental history internationally, it highlights how environmental history evolved from an extracurricular research interest of a few scholars into a discipline that is being fostered by many institutions and has already appeared in several university curricula. Additionally, the article provides a coherent list of works by Greek scholars that have contributed to the development of environmental history in Greece. The last part of the article acts as a prologue to this special section, summarising the main idea behind each article and the elements that make them fit together, underlining the reason why it focuses on the concept of conflict and its environmental repercussions.

Determining the point when environmental history moved from the margins of historical scholarship to become a legitimate historical discipline with its own goals, analytical tools and intricacies can be exceptionally challenging. The task becomes even more difficult because of the asymmetry with which environmental history entered historical discourse or university curricula across the globe. Like social history earlier, environmental history grew gradually in popularity and certain academic circumstances. For social history, it was the need to build a narrative from below, free and antagonistic to the great-men-on-horses histories that had been written until then. Environmental history is also grounded in reality. More specifically, it was born in response to the intensifying environmental degradation the world has been facing since shortly after World War II, an era commonly labelled by environmental historians as the Anthropocene.¹

This article, however, will not discuss the course that has shaped environmental history and its academic milestones on an international level.

¹ While the term Anthropocene – defined as the era when the globe became shaped by human activity – is commonly accepted among environmental humanists, there have

Several authors have already engaged in the genealogy of environmental history, multiple times.² While it will not abstain from including a coherent list of the works of Greek scholars that made environmental history in Greece the discipline that it is today, as a first objective this article will give a brief synopsis of the institutional synergies that fostered it; briefly on an international level, starting from the humble beginnings and then tracing the emerging hubs of research and innovation in Greece. There are parallels to be drawn here. On an international level, these associations functioned as dissemination nodes comprised of only a few scholars each time that, over the years, became sturdier, passing on the notion of why environmental history can be relevant, even necessary. As the discipline gained momentum in Greece, similar developments can be observed. What began as an extracurricular research interest of only a handful of historians and merely a footnote in a few publications gradually became a discipline accepted by many. From there, it migrated to the curricula of universities, and today it is on the verge of being regarded as a separate, respected discipline, capable of discussing old and new subjects in an insightful light. Finally, the last part of this article acts as a prologue to this special edition. Apart from presenting the main idea behind each article and the elements that make them fit together in a special thematic edition, it also summarises the reason why it focuses on such an unpleasant concept, that of conflict, and its environmental repercussions, hinting at a precarious ecological future.

The Emergence of International Institutions

Environmental history has been recognised as a legitimate separate discipline since its emergence in the 1970s. At the time, well-known academics adopted

been a number of criticisms from several scholars who propose a shift from the collective responsibility that the term Anthropocene implies to a more targeted one. Thus, a number of different -cenes have been invented, each highlighting a different agent in the process of altering the global ecosystem. Most notable of these new approaches is the term Capitalocene, introduced by scholar and activist Jason W. Moore in *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2016). For more -cenes, see Donna Haraway, “Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin,” *Environmental Humanities* 6, no. 1 (2015): 159–65; Michael Warren Murphy and Caitlin Schroering, “Refiguring the Plantationocene,” *Journal of World-Systems Research* 26, no. 2 (2020): 400–15; and Marco Armiero, *Wasteocene: Stories from the Global Dump* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

² Two of the more recent and complete examples are J. Donald Hughes, *What is Environmental History?* (London: John Wiley & Sons, 2016); Andrew C. Isenberg, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

the term to describe a particular sector of rural history that did not abide by the same research directives as economic, agricultural or social history as it was not centred on the economy, agriculture or rural societies.³ While it was possible to include them, those categories of analysis were only supplementary to the main argument. As self-explanatory as it may sound, environmental history focuses on the environment. A common misconception must be tackled here. The environment, as described most often in the literature of environmental history, is not merely the sum of a number of lifeless or mindless parts that merely exist until the day a historian decides to put their timeline into words. It is far more than that. In environmental history, the historian elevates the environment to a decisive agent that interacts with mankind, either in a conceptual or, more frequently, material way, seeking answers that cannot be found in ordinary archives or can be found in ordinary archives but cannot be interpreted in the same way.⁴ As such, environmental historians do not attempt to tell the history of a secluded environment but rather document the interplay of the environment with humanity, an endeavour that undoubtedly ends up telling more about humankind and less about the environment.

The emergence of environmental history predates the popularisation of the term; an early precursor to that course came much earlier, in the form of the Forest History Society (FHS), founded in 1946 in the USA amid the emergence of the American conservation movement. The FHS was the first such organisation that regarded ecosystems as subjects worth researching, even though it was dedicated to forests and foresters, only a tiny fragment of what environmental history would address in the future.⁵ A few decades later, the American Society for Environmental History (ASEH) offered a much more coherent theoretical framework and opened paths towards new research possibilities for historians to further develop environmental history. Founded in 1977, the ASEH became

³ William Cronon, "The Uses of Environmental History," *Environmental History Review* 17, no. 3 (1993): 1–22; Donald Worster and Alfred W. Crosby, eds., *The Ends of the Earth: Perspectives on Modern Environmental History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); William Ashworth, *The Late, Great Lakes: An Environmental History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987); John Sheail, "Green History: The Evolving Agenda," *Rural History* 4, no. 2 (1993): 209–23.

⁴ An excellent example of the multiplicity present in primary sources about environmental history can be found in Erika Weiberg et al., "The Socio-environmental History of the Peloponnese during the Holocene: Towards an Integrated Understanding of the Past," *Quaternary Science Reviews* 136 (2016): 40–65.

⁵ "History," Forest History Society, <https://foresthistor.org/about/history/>.

the central research hub that drew a considerable number of scholars who had acquired their environmental consciousness within the rising ecological movements and the energy crisis of the 1970s.⁶ As stated on its website, the ASEH's mission is to advance "understanding of human interactions with the natural world by promoting historical research and teaching, and fostering dialogue about human use from a earth among humanists, social and environmental scientists, and the public".⁷

To that end, the ASEH organises an annual conference and has published – along with the FHS – one of the leading journals in the field, *Environmental History*, since 1976, which accepts articles from a vast international spectrum rather than just an American one.⁸

While these facts suggest that environmental history had been a discipline that flourished on American soil, this is not entirely true. Environmental history had been appearing in the works of European scholarship since the 1960s, most notably negotiated as a research theme of the Annales school of social history, without explicitly being stated as such.⁹ The official inauguration of the discipline in Europe came later, in 1999, with the foundation of European Society for Environmental History (ESEH), a counterpart of the ASEH. Structured on the same foundations as the ASEH, the ESEH's mission could be described as promoting the discipline across Europe's lecture halls and helping create a meeting hub for fellow environmental historians that could pursue common goals and even work toward the implementation of educational policies.¹⁰ More

⁶ Caleb Wellum, "The Ambivalent Aesthetics of Oil: Project Documerica and the Energy Crisis in 1970s America," *Environmental History* 22, no. 4 (2017): 723–32; Meg Jacobs, *Panic at the Pump: The Energy Crisis and the Transformation of American Politics in the 1970s* (New York: Macmillan, 2016).

⁷ "Our Mission," American Society for Environmental History, <https://aseh.org/mission>.

⁸ "Environmental History," University of Chicago Press Journals, <https://academic.oup.com/envhis>.

⁹ Although it would be easy to find authors that have adopted an environmental history perspective without doing so explicitly, there are two scholars in particulars whose books should be known to any environmental history enthusiasts: Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The Peasants of Languedoc* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), first published 1966; Le Roy Ladurie, *Histoire du climat depuis l'an mil* (Paris: Flammarion, 1967); Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols., trans. Siân Reynolds (1949; New York: Harper, 1973); Braudel, *L'identité de la France*, vol. 1, *Espace et histoire* (Paris: Flammarion, 2009); Braudel, *L'identité de la France*, vol. 2, *Les hommes et les choses* (Paris: Flammarion, 2009).

¹⁰ "About Us: Mission," European Society for Environmental History, <http://eseh.org/about-us/mission/>.

than that, and similarly to the ASEH, the ESEH holds a biennial environmental history conference, hosted by a different European city each time, and publishes the journal *Environment and History*.¹¹

The establishment of the international organisational foundation soon gave rise to many associations specialising in the environmental history of specific areas, regions and countries. Before long, and as the field thrived and scholarly works multiplied, Canada,¹² Australia and New Zealand,¹³ East Asia,¹⁴ Latin America and the Caribbean,¹⁵ Austria,¹⁶ Turkey¹⁷ and Estonia,¹⁸ to mention just a few, founded their environmental history cells.¹⁹ While this undoubtedly translates as a success for the discipline, such polyphony pointed to the need for a global environmental history umbrella confederation that could loosely coordinate the numerous national and supranational organisations and steer the discipline towards applicable and appropriate themes. Thus, the International Consortium of Environmental History Organisations (ICEHO) was founded in the 2000s in order “to provide a structured framework within which organisations and institutions worldwide interested in environmental history can meet and work in an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary manner”.²⁰ The major event organised by ICEHO is the World Congress of Environmental History, held every five years.²¹

Domestic Hubs and Research Threads

Environmental history did not land in Greece on completely uncultivated soil. Even though this article will offer a panorama of the institutional rise of the

¹¹ “Environmental History,” White Horse Press, <https://www.whpress.co.uk/EH.html>.

¹² “Niche: Network in Canadian History & Environment,” <http://niche-canada.org/>.

¹³ Australian and New Zealand Environmental History Network, <https://www.environmentalhistory-au-nz.org>.

¹⁴ Association for Environmental History, <http://www.aeah.org>.

¹⁵ Sociedad Latinoamericana de Historia Ambiental, <http://solcha.org>.

¹⁶ “Center for Environmental History,” University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU), Vienna, <https://boku.ac.at/en/zentrum-fuer-umweltgeschichte>.

¹⁷ Turkish Environmental History Network, <http://www.envhisturkey.com>.

¹⁸ “Centre for Environmental History,” Tallinn University, <https://www.tlu.ee/en/ht/researchinstitute-history-archaeology-and-art-history/centre-environmental-history>.

¹⁹ International Consortium for Environmental History Organizations, <https://www.iceho.org/membership> (accessed 18 January 2023).

²⁰ “Mission,” International Consortium for Environmental History Organizations, <https://www.iceho.org/mission>.

²¹ “Past World Conferences,” International Consortium for Environmental History Organizations, <https://www.iceho.org/past-wceh-conferences>.

discipline, there is one honourable mention that young environmental historians should be acquainted with. Panos Grispos deserves a place in this genealogy of Greek environmental history because he bore a fundamental element found in present-day environmental historical narratives: a genuine devotion to documenting the history of Greek ecosystems. Grispos was a forester and his story reads like that of the FHS but without the institutional gown. Stemming from his professional capacity, he set off to write the history of Greek forests, perhaps as a crucial step towards managing woodlands more effectively. Remarkably his publications start in the 1960s, with short treatises on certain forests around Greece.²² His perspective is not exclusively historical, as in his narratives he includes ethnographic and folklore elements. Undoubtedly, his most systematic work is the 1973 monograph *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, which constitutes a reference point for any environmental history-related venture.²³ But it was only decades later that present-day scholars would pick up on his legacy. In fact, three-and-a-half decades later.

In 2009, Vaso Seirinidou, at the time lecturer at the National Kapodistrian University of Athens (NKUA), opened an article intended to familiarise Greek historical readership and scholars with the notion of environmental history as follows:

Historians do not feel at ease in nature. As intellectual residents of humanism, of the social and the cultural, these stereotypical “bookworms” of archives and libraries do not feel at home in their “universal home”. In the realm where the notions of society, culture, nation, class and gender dominate the discourse, nature belongs to the margins, even as a rhetorical device. After all, [according to them] only natural scientists are responsible for that.²⁴

These lines were meant to criticise Greek historians’ reluctance and even indifference to become engaged with a field of historical research that had already been established internationally. Indeed, up until Seirinidou’s involvement with the discipline, environmental history had been completely ignored. The article cited above, titled “Historians at nature: An introduction to environmental history”, published in an acclaimed journal addressed to a Greek readership,

²² Panos Grispos. Το σφακιανό κυπαρισσόδασος (Athens: s.n., 1968); Grispos, *Η δασική φυσιογνωμία των κυκλάδων νήσων* (Athens: Κυπριαίου, 1968); Grispos, “Δασική λαογραφία,” *Ηπειρωτική Εστία*, no. 16–21 (1967–1972).

²³ Panos Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος: Από του ΙΕ΄ αιώνας μέχρι του 1971* (Athens: Forestry Agency, 1973).

²⁴ Vaso Seirinidou, “Οι ιστορικοί στη φύση: Μια εισαγωγή στην περιβαλλοντική ιστορία,” *Τα Ιστορικά* 26, no. 51 (2009): 275–97.

should probably be regarded as a milestone in Greece, being the first that acknowledged the term “environmental history”. In it, Seirinidou provided the unaware readers with all the necessary information and state-of-the-art reports that researchers would need at the time to begin their inquiries in the field on equal grounds as his colleagues in academic environments where environmental history had already been endorsed its potential. Seirinidou went through all the cornerstones of the discipline, covering many different shades and themes, starting from the early conservationist discourse of John Muir and Aldo Leopold to works of environmental history that defined the field, like those of David Worster and William Cronon, to the eco-feminist perspective that Carolyn Merchant introduced.

It was a slow start and, at the time, the weight of the further development of environmental history was undertaken by Seirinidou alone. The major Greek economic crisis that would unfold during the next few years would cripple any confidence in advancing an approach to history that was still considered experimental. In this light, Seirinidou’s efforts were bold as she set up a postgraduate seminar at the Department History and Archaeology of the NKUA. Titled “Common, public and private: Nature and property in Greece, 15th–19th centuries”, it explored the conceptual formation of property in several early modern and modern sociocultural frameworks vis-à-vis their detrimental interplay with the natural environment.²⁵ The same effort continued with the postgraduate course “Mediterranean mountains: Uses and perceptions of changing space (16th–19th centuries)” (a title that perhaps echoed Marco Armiero’s well-known book),²⁶ again at NKUA in 2016 and the seminar course “Environmental knowledge and its social condition” in 2018 at the Democritus University of Thrace.²⁷ Seirinidou’s courses were enhanced by journal publications from 2014 to 2017,²⁸ combined with being

²⁵ “Φύση και ιδιοκτησία στον ελληνικό χώρο, 15ος–19ος αιώνας (Κωδ.: 70/4/11107),” Department of History and Archaeology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, <http://www.arch.uoa.gr/ereyna/ereynhtika-programmata/trexonta/fysh-kai-idiokthsia-ston-ellhniko-xoro-15os-19os-aionas.html>.

²⁶ Marco Armiero, *A Rugged Nation: Mountains and the Making of Modern Italy: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: White Horse, 2011).

²⁷ “Η περιβαλλοντική γνώση και η κοινωνική της συνθήκη,” Democritus University of Thrace, http://pmsees.psed.duth.gr/102_lesson.html.

²⁸ Vaso Seirinidou, “Environmental Narratives and Sociopolitical Agendas in Greece in the 18th and 19th Centuries,” in *Environmentalism in Central and Southeastern Europe: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Hrvoje Petrić and Žebec Šilj Ivana (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2017), 91–101; Seirinidou, “Notes from the Edges: Environmental History Writing in a Mediterranean ‘Periphery,’” *Environmental History in the Making*, vol. 1, *Explaining* (Cham: Springer, 2017),

elected the ESEH's first regional representative for Greece, a position she held until 2019.

Luckily, Seirinidou, in her effort to disseminate the meaning of environmental history, found two sturdy institutional supporters, the cooperation of which created the first significant hub that fostered the discipline in Greece. The first was the Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation (PIOP), an unlikely ally as it did not have ties to traditional Greek academia. Nevertheless, Eleni Beneki, the head of the historical archive of the foundation, took the initiative to establish in 2015 what would become a reference point for every environmental history enthusiast and scholar in Greece: two-day History of the Environment Workshop. Since then, the workshop has been dedicated to exploring fundamental themes that follow the international developments in the field. Organised roughly every autumn or winter, the workshop gets much scholarly attention. It draws together environmental historians and humanists from all career stages and academic tracks, eager to discuss and negotiate the essence of Greek environmental history. The workshop's scope is broad and directed towards a transdisciplinary perspective. While historians make up a large proportion of the participants and the audience, they do not monopolise the discourse. In addition, the PIOP has also published a considerable number of works that address environmental subjects. An example of such publishing activity is the collective volume titled *Ελιά και λάδι στην ανατολική Μεσόγειο*, which expands this classic agricultural subject with environmental perspectives, or the monograph of Christos Chatziliias *Οι πετράδες της Λέσβου* that explores the interaction of a unique material – stone – with the community that utilised it both as resource and commodity.²⁹

The second institutional pillar that supported environmental history in its humble beginnings has been the Institute of Historical Research of the National Hellenic Research Foundation (IHR/NHRF), one of the oldest institutions in Greece dedicated to historical research. Environmental topics have featured in the works of several IHR/NHRF researchers since the very early days of the field. Spearheading this effort, Maria Leontsini inaugurated her engagement with environmental history in 2008 with a paper that introduced a human-animal

207–21; Seirinidou, “Δάση στον ελληνικό χώρο (15ος–18ος αι.): Αναψηλαφώντας μια ιστορία καταστροφής,” *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά* 11 (2014): 69–87.

²⁹ Pias Anagnostakis and Evangelia Balta, eds., *Ελιά και λάδι στην ανατολική Μεσόγειο: Από την αρχαιότητα στην προβιομηχανική εποχή* (Athens: Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2020); Christos N. Chatziliias, *Οι πετράδες της Λέσβου: Κοινωνικά δίκτυα, τεχνικές και τοπική ιστορία (1850–1950)* (Athens: Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2020).

perspective, titled “Οικόσιτα, ωδικά και εξωτικά πτηνά: Αισθητική πρόσληψη και χρηστικές όψεις (7ος–11ος αι.)”.³⁰ Since then, Leontsini has offered the Greek environmental readership insightful works on several subjects that few scholars are capable of discussing, such as the environmental history of the Middle Ages, and especially of the Eastern Roman Empire, zooming in on matters that range from the dietary choices of the Mediterranean rural space to the history of forest management and clearings during the Byzantine era.³¹

In a country where environmental history was still barely known, however, publications did not convey the importance of the young discipline. To nurture this, the IHR/NHRF took up initiatives on multiple occasions to disseminate environmental history through activities on its premises. From 2010 to 2013, the institute organised the Historical Workshops (Φροντιστήριο Ιστορικών Επιστημών) programme, a series of public seminars and workshops, throughout which Leontsini hosted four complete courses centred on the interaction between state, society and environment from the 5th to the 16th centuries, exploring topics such as maritime environmental history and the environmental history of resources. A considerable number of students attended all four courses.

In an effort to introduce environmental topics to a broader audience, Leontsini also participated in the well-known annual conference The Seminars of Ermoupoli in 2013, presenting her paper “Το νερό και ο πολιτισμός της καθημερινότητας στις βυζαντινές πόλεις” as part of a research panel titled “Before Ecology: Environmental Management in Pre-industrial Societies”, in which Leontsini and the rest of the panel participants traced the transformative anthropocenic mentality back to the early modern era.³² Finally, Leontsini has been the constant delegate of the IHR/NHRF in the organisation and scientific committee for many environmentally driven events, including the annual

³⁰ Maria Leontsini, *Οικόσιτα, ωδικά και εξωτικά πτηνά: Αισθητική πρόσληψη και χρηστικές όψεις (7ος–11ος αι.)* (Athens: Institute of Byzantine Research–National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2011).

³¹ Gerasimos Merianos and Maria Leontsini, “From Culinary to Alchemical Recipes: Various Uses of Milk and Cheese in Byzantium,” in *Latte e Latticini: Aspetti della produzione e del consumo nelle società mediterranee dell’Antichità e del Medioevo*, ed. Ilias Anagnostakis and Antonella Pellettieri (Lagonegro: Grafica Zaccara, 2016), 205–22; Maria Leontsini, “Butter and Lard instead of Olive Oil? Fatty Byzantine Meals,” in *Identità euromediterranea e paesaggi culturali del vino e dell’olio*, ed. Antonella Pellettieri (Foggia: Centro Grafico, 2014), 217–29; Maria Leontsini, “Wonders of Nature and Heroism in the Narratives of Herakleios’ Campaigns Against Persia,” in *Narratives Across Space and Time: Transmissions and Adaptations*, ed. Aikaterini Polymerou-Kamilaki (Athens: Academy of Athens, 2014), 2:337–56.

³² “Τα Σεμινάρια της Ερμούπολης 2013,” Ermoupoli, 5–14 July 2013, programme, https://infostrag.gr/syros/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/SEM_ERM_-20132.pdf.

workshop of the PIOP. At the same time, from 2017 to 2021, she oversaw the project “Domesticated and wild fauna in the Greek world (9th–15th centuries): Written accounts and archaeological data”, part of the overarching Anavathmis project that was run by the IHR/NHRF.

The IHR/NHRF did not rely only on Leontsini, however. Several more of the institute’s researchers engaged in topics that reflected the rising interest in the field. Most notably, Angeliki Panopoulou, a close acquaintance of Leontsini’s in many of her ventures and frequently a member of the organising and scientific committee of PIOP workshops, exhibited notable publication activity in the field, focusing on the early modern period.³³ Dimitris Dimitropoulos, on the other hand, focused on modern history. He had edited an essential collective volume on fishing in Greece³⁴ while, more recently, he and his team of early-career scholars undertook a project that investigated the abandoned settlements in the Peloponnese since the early nineteenth century, taking into consideration environmental factors, among others.³⁵

Athens hosts yet another significant hub that has taken environmental history forward in the country: the History and Philosophy of Science Department of the NKUA. Unlike the IHR/NHRF, the starting point of the department is the history of technology above anything else, which has a long-standing tradition.³⁶ The department’s specialisation – unique across research institutions in Greece – is exploring technological breakthroughs from a historical standpoint concerning their everyday impact and interaction with the public. Aristotle Tympas, arguably the foremost exponent of this effort, has maintained a circle of young scholars that demonstrates remarkable publishing activity. At the core of the department’s ventures lie topics regarding the history of infrastructure, examined critically and interpreted as a driving force that alters economy and society to an equal

³³ Angeliki Panopoulou, “Ένα παράδειγμα εκμετάλλευσης των θαλάσσιων πόρων στη βενετοκρατία: οι αλυκές της Καμενίτσας (17ος–18ος αι.),” in *Φραγκοκρατία – Βενετοκρατία – Α΄ Τουρκοκρατία*, ed. Eleni Saranti (Patras: Municipality of Dimos, 2012), 269–77.

³⁴ Dimitris Dimitropoulos and Evdokia Olympitou, eds., *Ψαρεύοντας στις ελληνικές θάλασσες: Από τις μαρτυρίες του παρελθόντος στη σύγχρονη πραγματικότητα* (Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2010).

³⁵ The research team has not produced publications on the matter, as the project is ongoing. For more, see <https://www.settlements-peloponnese1821.eu>.

³⁶ Aristotle Tympas, “Methods in the History of Technology,” in *Encyclopedia of 20th-Century Technology*, ed. Colin A. Hempstead (New York: Routledge, 2005), 485–89; Aristotle Tympas, “Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία της τεχνολογίας: Μια εισαγωγή,” in *Ιστορίες της τεχνολογίας του εικοστού αιώνα: Ηλεκτρικά αυτοκίνητα, ξύλινα αεροπλάνα, γαλλικοί αντιδραστήρες, γυναικείες υπολογιστές*, ed. Aristotle Tympas and Eirini Mergoupi-Savaidou (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2013), 1–40.

degree.³⁷ Inherent in this analysis is also the perspective that regards experts as ideological players in this process and not simply as passive employees of the state or private contractors, thus attributing them with agency.³⁸ Topics concerning energy matters have also been on the long list of the department's research interests, with issues of co-dependency and sustainability being the most prevalent.³⁹ Additionally, Tympas has been very active in the realm of international research projects. Through him, the department has participated in a considerable number of projects, out of which "HoNESt (History of Nuclear Energy and Society)"⁴⁰ and "EUROCRIT-Europe Goes Critical. The Emergence and Governance of Critical: The European Infrastructures"⁴¹ stand out thanks to the substantial contributions they have made both to the international literature on the matters they explored as well as the dissemination efforts to the public. Other members of the department have also noted similar successes. One such case is Stathis Arapostathis, an associate professor in the department, who has been the principal investigator of the "Configuring Environment and Food: Critical Techno-Scientific Networks and the Agri-food Sector in Greece, 1950-2017 (CON-EF)" project, which evaluates the complex web of interdependencies

³⁷ Irene Anastasiadou and Aristotle Tympas, "Iron Silk Roads: Comparing Interwar and Post-war Transnational Asian Railway Projects," *Linking Networks: The Formation of Common Standards and Visions for Infrastructure Development*, ed. Hans-Liudger Dienel and Martin Schiefelbusch (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 169–86; Aristotle Tympas, Stathis Arapostathis, Katerina Vlantonis and Yiannis Garyfallos, "Border-crossing Electrons: Critical Energy Flows to and from Greece," in *The Making of Europe's Critical Infrastructure: Common Connections and Shared Vulnerabilities*, ed. Per Högselius, Anique Hommels, Arne Kaijser and Erik Vleuten (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 157–83.

³⁸ Aristotle Tympas, Spyros Tzokas and Giannis Garyfallos, "Το μεγαλύτερον υδραγωγείον της Ευρώπης: αντιπαραθετικοί υπολογισμοί μηχανικών για την Αθήνα και την ύδρευση της," in *Η ελληνική πόλη σε ιστορική προοπτική*, ed. Lydia Drakaki (Athens: Dionikos, 2005), 209–19.

³⁹ Stathis Arapostathis, Aspasia Kandaraki, Yannis Garyfallos and Aristotle Tympas, "'Tobacco for Atoms': Nuclear Politics, Ambivalences and Resistances about a Reactor that was Never Built," *History of Technology* 33 (2017): 205–27; Tympas et al., "Border-crossing Electrons"; Constantinos Morfakis, Katerina Vlantonis, Dimitris Katsaros and Aristotle Tympas, "Between the Regenerative and the Renewable: Patterns in the Media Beautification of Technology and Science, from Stem Cells to Wind Farms," in *Quality, Honesty and Beauty in Science and Technology Communication PCST 2012: Book of Papers*, Massimiano Bucchi and Brian Trench (Vicenza: Observa Science in Society, 2012), 186–92.

⁴⁰ History of Nuclear Energy and Society (HONES), <http://www.honest2020.eu>.

⁴¹ Europe Goes Critical. The Emergence and Governance of Critical Transnational European Infrastructures (EUROCRIT), Tensions of Europe, <https://www.tensionsofeurope.eu/projects-and-publications/research/eurocrit>.

in the Greek food chain from a historical point of view (among others).⁴² Similarly, other long-standing affiliates of the department, like Christos Karampatsos, have been funded to explore the interwar efforts of the Greek state to find and exploit petroleum deposits.⁴³

These milestones confirmed that environmental history was a worthy new research field in Greek academia. Soon enough, environmental history rippled out from Athens to meet research demands expressed from different regional universities all over Greece. At the University of Crete (UoC) and its renowned History and Archaeology Department, Elias Kolovos and his colleagues set up a loose research node that carried out original research on environmental history. The UoC hub has an impressive list of publications spread across three separate directions. The first moves on the border between rural and environmental history, researching the transformative forces that moulded the Greek rural ecosystem, emphasising its grassroots perspective.⁴⁴ The second research thread assumes a hard-science approach. Kolovos and the UoC have been part of a project undertaken by the Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History in Vienna, which investigates how palynological research (the research of pollen indicators found in sediment cores)⁴⁵ could contribute to the field of environmental history, a task at which Georgios Liakopoulos, a Greek environmental historian affiliated with the Max Planck Institute, excels.⁴⁶ Finally, the diversity of environmental themes is completed with a more traditional

⁴² See <https://conef.gr>.

⁴³ Christos Karampatsos, “Το γενικότερο συμφέρον του κράτους: η ‘συνέχεια των ελληνικών χωρών’ και οι Έλληνες γεωλόγοι, 1908–1925,” *Τα Ιστορικά* 73 (2021): 125–54.

⁴⁴ The bulk of Kolovos’ publication record in environmental history can be found in Elias Kolovos, *Across the Aegean: Islands, Monasteries and Rural Societies in the Ottoman Greek Lands* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2018). For even more, however, see Kolovos, *Όπου ην κήπος: Η μεσογειακή νησιωτική οικονομία της Άνδρου σύμφωνα με το οθωμανικό κτηματολόγιο του 1670* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2017); Kolovos, “The Mediterranean Economies as ‘Garden Economies’,” *Meltem: İzmir Akdeniz Akademisi Dergisi* 5 (2019): 90–92; Elias Kolovos, Georgios Vidras and Christos Kyriakopoulos, “The Rural Economy of Ottoman Crete (1650–1670): A Spatial Approach,” *Études balkaniques* 55, no. 4 (2019): 801–30.

⁴⁵ Heidemarie Halbritter, Silvia Ulrich, Friðgeir Grímsson, Martina Weber, Reinhard Zetter, Michael Hesse, Ralf Buchner, Matthias Svojtka and Andrea Frosch-Radivo, “Palynology: History and Systematic Aspects,” in *Illustrated Pollen Terminology*, ed. Heidemarie Halbritter et al. (Cham: Springer, 2018), 3–21.

⁴⁶ Elias Kolovos and Phokion Kotzageorgis, “Searching for the ‘Little Ice Age’ effects in the Ottoman Greek Lands: The Cases of Salonica and Crete,” in *Seeds of Power: Explorations in Ottoman Environmental History*, ed. Onur Inal and Yavuz Köse (Winwick: White Horse Press, 2019), 17–34.

environmental perspective, which focuses on mines and extractivism in the late Ottoman era, specialising in Halkidiki in Macedonia. What made this particular research strand more pertinent was that it tapped into the events that shook the area in the 2010s, when the Halkidiki mines were leased to a Canadian company that sought to extract minerals from the subsoil using environmentally controversial methods.⁴⁷

Treading along the same lines, but for the more recent past and from a labour history perspective, Leda Papastefanaki, of the University of Ioannina (UoI), has set out to explore the extractivist history of several Aegean islands. While labour history and environmental history seem an unlikely pair, Papastefanaki succeeds in combining the two fields in a harmonious whole, where the exploitation of the natural environment also echoes that of the labourers by their employers. Her first major publication on the subject came in 2017 with the book *Η φλέβα της γης*, which explored the extractivist enterprises that flourished all over Greece after the foundation of the Greek state, engaging with unique historical fields ranging from gender to environmental history.⁴⁸ Her publishing endeavours continued in 2018 and discussed the commodification of Theran earth on the island of Santorini, an enterprise that featured and affected many agents,⁴⁹ while she is currently working on the lime kilns of the island of Astypalea. Moreover, commendable is the cooperation between the UoI and the Forestry Service of Ioannina, personified in Kalliopi Stara and Rigas Tsiakiris, that led to an intriguing list of publications exploring the custom of “sacred forests” in Greece’s modern history.⁵⁰

The centrifugal forces meant that environmental history would find fertile ground in even more regional Greek universities. Although more erratically,

⁴⁷ Elias Kolovos, “Mines and the Environment in Halkidiki: A Story from the Ottoman Past,” *Environmental History* 42 (2003): 5–43; Elias Kolovos and Phokion Kotzageorgis, “Halkidiki in the Early Modern Period: Towards an Environmental History,” in *Mines, Olives and Monasteries: Aspects of Halkidiki’s Environmental History*, ed. Basil C. Gounaris (Thessaloniki: Epikentro; Pharos, 2015), 327–54.

⁴⁸ Leda Papastefanaki, *Η φλέβα της γης: Τα μεταλλεία της Ελλάδας, 19ος–20ός αιώνας* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2017).

⁴⁹ Leda Papastefanaki, “From Santorini to Trieste and Suez: Scientific Knowledge, Discovery and Use of Theran Earth in the Mediterranean (From the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century),” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 33, no. 1 (2018): 67–88.

⁵⁰ Kalliopi Stara, Rigas Tsiakiris and Jennifer L.G. Wong, “The Trees of the Sacred Natural Sites of Zagori, NW Greece,” *Landscape Research* 40, no. 7 (2015): 884–904; Kalliopi Stara, Rigas Tsiakiris and Jennifer L.G. Wong, “Valuing Trees in a Changing Cultural Landscape: A Case Study from Northwestern Greece,” *Human Ecology* 43, no. 1 (2015): 153–67; Valentino Marini Govigli, Anthoula Efthymiou and Kalliopi Stara, “From Religion to Conservation:

several scholars in various positions brought the environmental perspective to more of their works and curricula. The most prominent examples come from the University of the Aegean (UoA), where Iosif Botetzagias and Giorgos Kostopoulos have established a lively research node that promoted the discipline, centred around the undergraduate course in environmental history, supplemented by a rich list of publications.⁵¹ Similarly, Dimitra Mylona, an environmental zooarchaeologist, has shown remarkable activity in Crete as a member of the Institute for Aegean Prehistory Study Center for East Crete (INSTPAP SCEC). Mylona specialises in the interaction of the ancient Greek world with the sea and especially as a food source. This research field has produced several important and original publications, most important of which is her book *Fish-Eating in Greece*, which has effectively highlighted an aspect of the social, environmental and economic life of classical Greece that had remained unexplored to a large extent.⁵²

The future of environmental history in Greece and of the scholars that serve the discipline seems promising. The work that has been done is undoubtedly an indicator that a solid foundation has already been built. Greek historians are beginning to see why history can be written or even rewritten through environmental lenses, from antiquity to the Middle Ages, to early, high and late modernity. The challenge we will face from now on will be to prevent those disparate hubs – both geographically and in terms of the particular topics they examine – from growing apart into scholarly seclusion. As it happened with the rest of the European examples presented, the establishment of an association for the environmental history of Greece is in order. Hopefully, such an organisation will act as a cohesive element, facilitating communication among the hubs and institutions that comprise the country's colourful mosaic of environmental history. Additionally, it will be responsible for the promotion, orientation and

Unfolding 300 Years of Collective Action in a Greek Sacred Forest,” *Forest Policy and Economics* 131 (2021): 102575.

⁵¹ Iosif Botetzagias, *Η ανθρώπινη ιστορία των σκύλων* (Athens: Alexandria, 2017); Botetzagias, “Η υπόλοιπη φύση: μια σύντομη αναδρομή στις σχέσεις Ανθρώπου και φυσικού περιβάλλοντος,” in *Πολιτική οικολογία: Οκτώ συμβολές στην ελληνική*, ed. Giorgos Velegrakis, Haris Konstantatos and Costis Hadjimichalis (Athens: Nissos, 2017); Botetzagias, *Η ιδέα της φύσης: Απόψεις για το περιβάλλον από την αρχαιότητα μέχρι τις μέρες μας* (Athens: Kritiki, 2010); Iosif Botetzagias and Giorgos Kostopoulos, “‘For the Thorough Conservation of the Forests’: A History of Forest Management and Protection in ‘Old Greece’, 1830–1880,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 39, no. 1 (2021): 93–116; Giorgos Kostopoulos, “The War Against the Goats in Interwar Greece,” *Arcadia*, no. 8 (Spring 2020), <https://doi.org/10.5282/rcc/9011>.

⁵² Dimitra Mylona, *Fish-Eating in Greece from the Fifth Century B.C. to the Seventh Century A.D.: A Story of Impoverished Fishermen or Luxurious Fish Banquets?* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2008).

coordination of the discipline. This was precisely the reasoning that led to the foundation of the Hellenic Society for Environmental History, which will join the rest of environmental history associations in the joint effort to advance the discipline.

Conflict and the Environment

In the not so distant 2014, John R. McNeill and Peter Engelke, both seasoned environmental humanists, published a book that established a different perspective in the way we viewed, thought and taught environmental history. In *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*,⁵³ the authors attempted to introduce a new turning point in global history, one that had not usually featured in the curricula of modern history. It was the era of the Great Acceleration and, according to McNeill and Engelke, it represented a dramatic escalation of transformative human activity in the world that started after World War II. Thought of as an era of progress and development, the post-1945 world changed rapidly to accommodate the increasing material needs of the – also increasing – global population. The radical improvements in living standards were readily noted by historians, who often translated this newly found bliss as the triumph of technology over poverty and misery. And while this reasoning seemed valid (especially for the “developed” Western world and the classes that reaped its rewards), it came with rapid environmental degradation, reflected in a series of graphs that triggered the birth of the Great Acceleration concept.⁵⁴

Among the many points that are tackled in the book, McNeill and Engelke emphasised in particular the agency of conflict. Present throughout its pages, conflict seems to be the major driving force that propelled the Great Acceleration

⁵³ John Roberts McNeill and Peter Engelke, *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945* (Harvard: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014). The concept of the Great Acceleration did not appear suddenly. It came into existence gradually and was being worked on since the early 2000s. The following articles contain its theoretical antecedents: Paul J. Crutzen, “Geology of Mankind,” in *Paul J. Crutzen: A Pioneer on Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Change in the Anthropocene*, ed. Paul J. Crutzen and Hans Günter Brauch (Cham: Springer, 2016), 211–15; Crutzen, “The ‘Anthropocene,’” In *Earth System Science in the Anthropocene: Emerging Issues and Problems*, ed. Eckart Ehlers and Thomas Krafft (Berlin: Springer, 2006), 13–18.

⁵⁴ Will Steffen, Wendy Broadgate, Lisa Deutsch, Owen Gaffney and Cornelia Ludwig, “The Trajectory of the Anthropocene: The Great Acceleration,” *Anthropocene Review* 2, no. 1 (2015): 81–98.

forward without any regard for possible long-term consequences. During the Cold War the world became the theatre of an undeclared race for military and infrastructural supremacy that was nurtured by the USA, USSR and People's Republic of China. The implementation of the Mutual Assured Destruction doctrine permeated all levels of governance to such a degree that slowing down was simply not an option. Even though the ideological grievances subsided to a certain degree, with the collapse of the socialist ideological flagship, the USSR, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the system of exploitation that remained was constantly in need of new resources, which at the time still seemed inexhaustible in the eyes of those who had ended history, despite the rising concerns of environmental scientists.

This special edition does not challenge McNeill's and Engelke's argument. It highlights its merits. More than scrutinising the detrimental effects of the technological and scientific leaps in recent history, it will demonstrate that the primary necessary condition that pushed us into this environmental downward spiral was not the technological advancements of the past. These were merely the inanimate tools our economic and productive systems utilised. What the following selection of articles showcases is the ravenous Hobbesian-like appetite that the modern state, or the people representing it, worked up even before World War II. The mental trajectory of manipulating our ecosystems was already there; as will be shown, our historical actors only lacked the efficient means to do so well enough. The next three glimpses into the environmental history of modern Greece demonstrate exactly that; and although the ramifications are far from serious as to affect the Earth system, our contributors succeed in showing, in qualitative terms, the true colours of humanity during modernity.

In his article Dimitris Glistras explores the annihilation of a river. The Kifisos, the largest river that once flowed through the capital of Greece, Athens, did not manage to co-exist with the city. The river was first seen as an antagonist as early as the late nineteenth century after a series of catastrophic floods. With the turn of the century, a process started that sought to tame the river into becoming a compatible element with the ever-growing and -expanding city of Athens. Throughout Greek modern history, the Kifisos was marked by large-scale projects, undertaken in 1900, 1936, between 1961 and 1964, and after 1972 that aimed at straightening, deepening and widening the riverbed, eventually turning the Kifisos into the concrete drainpipe that it is today.

The same spirit of correction can be seen in Giorgos Kostopoulos and Iosif Botetzagias' article, which traces the restriction on transhumant goat grazing in Greece since 1830. Even though it had been an activity that at times was

deemed beneficial to the national economy, goat grazing came to be regarded as the primary deforester of the Greek countryside. The path that the two scholars follow starts in 1836 and ends almost exactly a century later. The struggle for the alleged modernisation of Greece legitimised the restrictive policies to be implemented on goat grazing in Greek forests. After 1937 forest grazing, as well as transhumant pastoralism, was indeed heavily mitigated by a number of new laws which saw the numbers of goats in Greece plummet rapidly.

Finally, Christos Karamatsos, Spyros Tzokas, Giorgos Velegrakis and Gelina Harlaftis embark on an almost cinematic article that deals with the (failed) attempts of the Greek state to exploit its subsoil. Even though the environment is placed in the background, primarily as an apple of discord, the article uncovers the limitless ambition of two antagonistic geologists to find lignite and – more importantly – oil in Greece. What we see as the story unfolds is the triumph of speculative flattery and wishful thinking over caution and level-headed scientific discourse. Remarkably though, no environment was harmed in the making of the venerable geologists.

George L. Vlachos

Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

“AT THE MERCY OF A MISERABLE DITCH NAMED THE KIFISOS”:
THE CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
AND THE CONTEST WITH NATURE THROUGH THE HISTORY
OF ATHENS’ MAIN RIVER

Dimitris Glistras

ABSTRACT: The course of the Kifisos over the past two centuries seems like it has been on the ultimate path to disaster. Its natural riverbed, the bioclimate and the flora along its banks have ceased to exist, at least in the form that they were some decades after the Greek War of Independence. However, the history of the Kifisos is interesting not just because it is a space which enables us to observe the environmental damage done by man, but also because a great part of the Greek capital’s own history is written in its riverbed. Through the history of the Kifisos and the varying perceptions of the river over time, the article describes the progression from a natural environment to an urban reality.

Since Greece declared its independence two centuries ago, Athens has transformed itself from a town of 32,000 inhabitants, an estimation from 1848,¹ into a modern, European capital city. However, this achievement dramatically transformed the natural environment of the area, with the natural geomorphology of Athens being artificially altered extensively for the first time. The Kifisos, being the largest river of Athens and also the main drainage system of the region, provides a valuable field to observe and study these changes.

As cities emerged, a double transformation of the natural environment became evident worldwide. On the one hand, residents of these cities began to view the natural environment as something antagonistic while, on the other, a “new natural environment” was being developed using many urban characteristics. How can the history of the Kifisos assist us in better understanding the progression from a natural environment to an urban reality?

Bibliographical or other references to the Kifisos are only sporadic. Practically all existing references relate to the engineering interventions along its riverbed. Such evidence merely recites the story of how the physical status of the river ended and how it was replaced to satisfy the needs of a growing city. However, looking beyond the large-scale variations of the river, as well as the role played by the state

¹ Vyron Kotzamanis, “Αθήνα 1848–1995: Δημογραφική ανάλυση μιας μητρόπολης,” *Επιθεώρηση Κοινωνικών Μελετών* 92–93 (1997): 3–30.

to promote change, a series of other alterations can be observed. These alterations concern the daily practices of those inhabiting the area surrounding the Kifisos, their way of life and their ever-changing perception of the river over time.

This article will attempt to trace the changes in the riverbed and the river banks while drawing parallels to the shifts recorded in the relationship of the inhabitants of Athens with the Kifisos. To do so, it will draw on the cultural and socio-environmental information revealed throughout the history of the city and its people. It will also attempt to identify the ever-changing perceptions of the river as a natural element of the city. Within a 200-year span, the Kifisos evolved from being considered not only a valuable resource but also an essential part of the natural landscape into a ruthless enemy of urban modernisation and a source of disease, a sewer with “pipelines of dirty waters”. Upon examination of these varying perceptions of the Kifisos, the article intends to highlight the cultural and social aspect of the environmental consciousness predating its ecological connection and any corresponding initiatives from activists.




Figure 1. A map of the Kifisos along with the river's tributaries. Some of the riparian areas mentioned in the present article are also named.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the media coverage of two floods indicated the existence of additional residential areas near the Kifisos. In 1896, “crops” were reported to have suffered “severe damage” in the area between the Kolokyntou area and Pireos Street, while “all the small houses in the area were carried away by the water”.⁴ In Kolokyntou, twelve houses were reported to have collapsed. Following the flooding of the Kifisos in 1899, press reports referred to the destruction of gardens in Kolokyntou, damage to holiday cottages in Kato Patisia and the destruction of oil mills in scattered areas. Such reports provide us with the understanding that the landscape was one of low population density inhabited by land workers or residents of the centre of Athens who would vacation in these secondary cottages.⁵

Additional information concerning the Kifisos of the early nineteenth century, as well as its tributaries and streams, is derived from foreign travellers of the time. These travellers were motivated to visit the newly established Greek state following its declaration of independence. The German traveller Zachariae von Lingenthal, in his memories of a trip from Athens to Piraeus in the 1830s, described the Kifisos as a “swampy pit”.⁶ Some years later, in 1848, another traveller, the Austrian Joseph Russegger, referred to the “dryness of the Kifisos”.⁷

There have been many changes in the Kifisos’ morphology during the past two centuries. The specific form of the Kifisos estuary, which was visible throughout most of the twentieth century, was a result of human interference. Initially, following the establishment of the Greek state, the actual physical confines of the Kifisos riverbed were somewhat vague, especially along the last part of the river, before draining into the sea. According to reports from circa 1830, the perimeter of Piraeus’ port was less than 1,500 meters from the “ancient swamp”. Meanwhile the so-called “lake”, or rather marsh, in which the water of the Kifisos and, the second biggest river of Athens, the Ilisos, drained into, was situated north of Piraeus’ peninsulas.⁸ Furthermore, according to reports dated from the end of the nineteenth century, the Kifisos almost entirely lacked a riverbed upon its confluence with the Ilisos up and until it drained into the sea, due to its “irregularity”.⁹ Reading between the lines of these reports, a critical tone can be

⁴ *Πρωϊά*, 16 November 1896.

⁵ *Πρωϊά*, 7 November 1899.

⁶ Ropaitou-Tsapareli, *Ο Ελαιώννας της Αθήνας*, 52.

⁷ Andreas Kordelas, *Αι Αθήναι εξεταζόμεναι υπό υδραυλικήν έποψιν* (Athens: Τυρ. Filokalias, 1879), 101.

⁸ Nikos Belavilas, *Η ιστορία της πόλης του Πειραιά* (Athens: Alexandria, 2021), 27.

⁹ Ilias Angelopoulos, “Διάλεξη” [on floods in the Athens basin, held on 9 December], *Αρχιμήδης* 3 (1899).

easily traced, coming from both engineers and the press. The unsettled riverbed of the Kifisos was beginning to be seen as a danger, in addition to being perceived as hindering the highly expected and proper functioning of the city.

Throughout the history of the river, the indistinct riverbed was not always a result of diminished flow or the hydrographical and geographical characteristics of the Athens basin. Gardeners with riverside gardens (*περβολάρηδες*) had also been gradually levelling the mounds of the riverbanks in order to expand their properties. In a lecture given to the Attica Polytechnic Association in 1899, engineer A. Matsas referred to the “greediness of the rivers’ landowners”. A press report approximately 40 years later offers some proof that the problem was not transitory, but a common practice of exploiting the river:

Adjacent to Iera Odos we lose the river Kifisos. What happened to its riverbed? Because it was open and low along that area, gardeners occupied it, attaching it to their land and cultivating it. Along other sections of the banks, brickyards were set up. Therefore, with no restrictions, the water would cause floods.¹⁰

From the 1830s to the mid-twentieth century, the layout of the riverbed and the river banks was greatly influenced by flood protection works. Mark Cioc states that the actual floodplain of rivers, perceived as “normal” flow, is sometimes indicative of the anthropocentric way man sees rivers. This is precisely how the Kifisos was perceived throughout the initial decades following Greek independence. According to Cioc, the term *flood* originates from the principle of each river having a fixed length, but no prescribed breadth. As a result, the term is often used to point out the effects of the overflow of water on farms and settlements, as if these were not part of the riverine system.¹¹ “Actually, the water just follows the path of least resistance from elevated areas to sea level, using as much of the landscape necessary at any given time.” When humans are present to witness these high-water flows, especially when their lives and properties are affected, a *flood* is recorded.¹²

Human Intervention: Old and New Uses of the River

Technical works have made the Kifisos what it is today, even if, for the most part, is a strictly structured pipeline, or rather a drainage machine, and not a natural river. The mechanisation of the Kifisos is unquestionably a very significant part of the river’s history while simultaneously it leads to questions as to what kind

¹⁰ *Η Καθημερινή*, 21 November 1937.

¹¹ Mark Cioc, *The Rhine: An Eco-biography, 1815–2000* (Washington: University of Washington Press, 2002), 23.

¹² *Ibid.*

of history it entails (political, technical or social). Since the eighteenth century, notions about still water being dangerous for a city's population were quite widespread throughout Europe. Moreover, engineers seemed to believe that the probability of a river overflowing decreased when the river was deep and wide instead of shallow and narrow or part of a network of streams.¹³ The practice of interfering with the riverscape seems to have also influenced some important Greek engineers towards the end of the nineteenth century, many of whom had studied in European polytechnic schools or had some kind of professional relationship with relevant European companies.¹⁴

In a lecture given in 1898, the soon-to-be president of the Technical Chamber of Greece Ilias Angelopoulos argued that “the Kifisos riverbed has many and sharp curves” while its width presented “great heterogeneity”. Angelopoulos suggested broadening and straightening most of the river's curves, as well as “normalising” the riverbed for 9,400 meters, from the bridge in the Menidi area to the river's estuaries in Ilisos.¹⁵ The publicising of the concept of a morphological “imperfect” river fuelled public dissatisfaction with the river, giving rise to the growing belief that it had a detrimental effect on the expansion of the city.

While on this theoretical ground, a legendary flood event occurred. On 14 November 1896, the Saint Philip's Day flood paved the way for the regulation project, which was to commence with the dawn of the twentieth century. Angelos Ginis, a professor at the Greek Polytechnic School (EMP), carried out the plans for the regulation of the Kifisos riverbed, which was to become boxed in for about 1,000 meters, in its southern part, downstream from Pireos Street. The regulated section thus began at a point where all the big streams had already joined the Kifisos and, hence, the total volume of water was greater. Although the works were limited to the lowlands of the streams, they were reported to be the first hydronomic works in Greece.¹⁶

¹³ In 1719, in his study *Opera omnia [Opera omnia mathematica, hydraulica, medica, et physica]*, vols. 1 and 2 (Geneva: Cramer, Perachon, 1719), the Italian multi-scientist Dominici Gulielmini delivered the first practical guide to tame and control a river to the next generations. His ideas spread throughout Switzerland, Holland, the German states and, most of all, France and especially its French military schools [Cioc, *The Rhine*, 26]. Cioc argues that the important element the French added to the Italian tradition was the notion that river engineering was central to in the state-building process.

¹⁴ Ilias Angelopoulos, an engineer and senior public servant, was a commercial agent of the French concrete company Hennebique. He studied bridge building at the *École nationale des ponts et chaussées*. Angelos Ginis studied at the Polytechnic Institute in Dresden.

¹⁵ Angelopoulos, “Διάλεξη.”

¹⁶ Machi Karali, “Πρόλογος,” in *Παρεμβάσεις στα ρέματα: Εναλλακτικές προτάσεις σχεδιασμού*, ed. Machi Karali (Athens: National Technical University of Athens, 2000), 22.

Even though such interventions were still unknown in Greece, other European countries had long before implemented the ideas of hydroengineering in their national river systems. They intended to use the river to satisfy economic needs (transport) or to resolve problems occurring from water flow (floods). It seemed reasonable to redevelop rivers to achieve canalised water flow, to foresee their behaviour and to also avoid the accumulation of stagnant water. The accumulation of plants and smaller industries in the areas near the Kifisos in the last quarter of the nineteenth century led to another perception; one non-exclusive to farming or agriculture activity.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the unsanitary condition of Kifisos was considered one of its main characteristics. The area today known as Monastiraki and to the west towards Iera Odos was reportedly worst hit during the epidemic of cholera or swamp fever that struck the Greek capital in 1835. Different sources correlate the high morbidity in the area with close proximity to the stagnant waters of the Kifisos.¹⁷ Furthermore, following the declaration of Greek independence, officials began to seek the best location to build a palace for the young King Othon. The suggestion of a site in Thissio by the German architect Leo von Klenze was rejected as it was found unsanitary, due to its proximity to “the Kifisos swamps” as well as other streams of western Athens.¹⁸ For the same reasons, an earlier suggestion to locate the palace near Omonia Square was also rejected.

A few years later, another public health issue emerged that was directly associated with the exploitation of the Kifisos. In 1851, Piraeus municipal council discussed the filling in of big holes that pottery cottage industries in the riverine area of Moschato had created to extract raw material. The deep trenches gathered stagnant water, which was seen as negatively affecting the health of the local people. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, malaria was considered one of the major risks for the entire Greek population.¹⁹ Furthermore, in 1914, the professor and secretary of the Association for the Containment of Malaria Diseases, Ioannis Kardamatis, along with a health inspector (*αστίατρος*), Dimitios Psaltis, wrote to the Interior Ministry indicating the Kifisos as one of Athens’ main sources of malaria contamination.²⁰

¹⁷ Kostas Biris, *Αι Αθήναι: Από του 19ου έως τον 20ο αιώνα* (Athens: Melissa, 2005), 65, and Dimitris Gerontas, *Ιστορία του Δήμου Αθηναίων (1835–1971)* (Athens: Municipality of Athens, 1972), 211.

¹⁸ Biris, *Αι Αθήναι*, 65.

¹⁹ Adamantia Marselou, “Οι ασθένειες της ελονοσίας και της φυματίωσης στον ελλαδικό χώρο κατά τα τέλη του 19ου και τα μέσα του 20ου αιώνα” (PhD diss., Ionian University, 2013), 51. Marselou cites a lecture given in 1887 by pharmacology the professor Theodoros Afentoulis.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 184.

Although there is little official documentation attributing the poor sanitary conditions in areas near the Kifisos, in the public mind the river was very much to blame. In 1953, a civil engineer, P. Stoupathis, published an article in *Τεχνικά Χρονικά* arguing that since the 1930s the creeks of the Kifisos and Ilisos and their tributary streams were sources of “every kind of contamination”. According to Stoupathis, “the health of the general population was in great danger due to the pollution of subterranean water and the saturation of the ground with pathogens”.²¹ A decade later, similar reports could be found in the press,²² while throughout the 1970s press articles were still condemning the river for the unsanitary conditions along it, mainly in the Moschato area.²³

Around the turn of the twentieth century, the perception of the Kifisos and its usages had changed, mainly from the economic perspective. For most of the nineteenth century, the river was chiefly identified for its role in the production process. Hence, although the Kifisos was initially seen as a supplier of life-preserving water for crops, it was gradually becoming a resource for manufacturing activity to prosper, providing a useful pipeline for any industrial waste. However, press reports or testimonies from the period do not capture this change in perception. While there exists considerable information on the use of the Kifisos in irrigation from local officials, farmers and land workers, references to its industrial use are non-existent. Is this lack of reference to the river’s industrial role somehow indicative of a collective guilt? The limited quantity of waste at this time, as well as the importance attributed to industrial development, may offer an innocuous explanation for this silence. Whatever reports appeared in the press about the river reflected the writers’ expectations of a future in which the development of the city would no longer face problems caused by the Kifisos.

The riverbed of the rivers should remain open and broad ditches for watering the gardens and the vineyards should also remain open. Furthermore, to avoid confusion, some domestic landowners should be asked to indicate the best routes for prospective water ditches. In the Kaminia area or perhaps a little more upstream, exactly where the drain ditches meet the river, the riverbed of the Kifisos should be widened, to avoid any flooding in the Faliro or Kaminia areas, and

²¹ Panagiotis Stoupathis, “Το δίκτυον αποχετεύσεων του συγκροτήματος των πόλεων Αθηνών, Πειραιώς, και των πέριξ δήμων και κοινοτήτων,” *Τεχνικά Χρονικά* 30 (1953): 19–28.

²² “The still and rotten waters of the river emitted an unhealthy and bad smell and it didn’t take it long for it to turn Athens’ temperate and healthy climate into a sick one.” *Η Καθημερινή*, 29 November 1964.

²³ Lefteris Papadopoulos, “Η πόλη μας δεν είναι επαρχία,” *Τα Νέα*, 2 February 1986.

to additionally protect the Elaionas area. The olive trees of Elaionas each year produce oil and olives worth hundreds of thousands of drachmas.²⁴

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the increase of Athens' population²⁵ resulted in an increase in the capital's demand for fresh vegetables and, hence, an increase in the cultivation of land along the Kifisos.²⁶ At that time, vegetable gardens and plant nurseries occupied most of the fertile riverside, displacing arboriculture, such as olive trees. The use of the riverside entered a phase of "urbanisation", in the sense that it was closely associated to the city that was growing next to it.

In the following decades, there was an increase in manufacturing activity by large industrial plants and smaller manufacturers along the riverside. Elaionas is a prime example. The area enjoyed the advantage of being close to the port of Piraeus as well as the commercial centre of Athens. Due to plentiful subterranean water and the appropriate ground for clay quarrying, which was now greatly in demand for basic industrial activities like brickyards, much of the new capital's manufacturing activity had accumulated in the area.²⁷

An Offender to be Tamed

While the river underwent various uses due to the rapid urban growth in the early part of the twentieth century, neither the intensification of older riparian uses

²⁴ *Η Εστία*, 11 November 1900. See also *Εμπρός*, 17 November 1896, and *Παλιγγενεσία*, 20 November 1896.

²⁵ In 1896 Athens' population was 180,000 people, while in 1907 it was 250,000 and in 1920 453,000. The numbers indicate an average annual growth rate of 4.6 percent between 1896 and 1907 and an increase of 7.3 percent from 1907 to 1920. Data until 1991 show a percentage change below 3.5 percent. Kotzamanis, "Αθήνα 1848–1995."

²⁶ Such as the area between Agias Annis Street and the Kifisos, some parts of Elaionas, the area west of the river in Neo Aigaleo, which was known as Perivolia. Konstantinos Dalkos, ed., *Αιγάλεω (σελίδες τοπικής πατριδογνωσίας)* (Aigaleo: Politistikos Syllogos Aigaleo, 2017) 210.

²⁷ Eugenia Bournova, *Από τις Νέες Κυδωνίες στο Δήμο Αιγάλεω: Η συγκρότηση μιας πόλης στον 20ό αιώνα* (Athens: Plethron, 2002) 165. According to Belavilas, in the broader area from the Kifisos to Piraeus operated plants like the Neo Faliro power plant. Besides, some tanning units were still operating in Rentis. Their premises had to be close to the Kifisos to discharge their waste. Belavilas, *Η ιστορία της πόλης του Πειραιά*, 221 and 289. Further upstream, reportedly in the area of Perissos, the following industrial units used to operate: Nikolaos Kirkinis' textile factory, the Atlas building materials firm in the area now called Thymarakia, Vretos Bros pipe manufacturers, and the Painesis Mills. Both of the last two were located in Treis Gefyres. Milionis, *Η πόλη των αγίων*, 108.

nor the appearance of new ones affected the perception of the riverside as a place where one could simply enjoy nature, as a reference in an Eleftheroudakis tourist guide from 1906 shows. It recommended travelling to Elefsina “through the marvellous Elaionas of the Kifisos valley” as “a nice excursion”.²⁸ Furthermore, older Elaionas residents recall it as an “idyllic site”, where people used to erect tents and spend a few days there, especially around the summer festival to mark the feast day of Saint Paraskevi. “People went there on an excursion and many of them would stay there for vacation as it was countryside.”²⁹ The Kolokythou area, where people came because of “the rich flora and the marvellous fruit trees that no longer exist”, was regarded as “remote Athens countryside” in an nostalgic article from 1931.³⁰

In many Athens daily press reports, people were usually presented as powerless before the rage of the Kifisos. This weakness was attributed either to the indolence of the public services or the properties of nature itself, which could not be tamed. The press did not always stress the oversights of the Greek state as the cause of destruction; it often described flood damage through the eyes of everyday citizens, who were totally helpless and unprepared in the face of such an event. Many reports of flooding contained information on those stricken, including their social class, their poor financial situation and their generally low standard of living. The confrontation of these simple people with the river’s strength was perceived as a vivid parable of David versus Goliath, as one report conveyed in a melodramatic way.

Yesterday we witnessed an antihistorical [sic] tragedy, that struck both the capital and Piraeus. Innocent and unsuspecting people, family men, working daughters, poor people struggling to make a living, upon returning to their homes to rest from a hard day’s work, found tragic death due to the fury of a ditch. It is shameful, for this country, as well as the state that wishes to be viewed as civilised, that such an event can invade a paved avenue causing murder and drowning, the uprooting of trees and the flooding of houses. All this due to the fury of a silly river that has for many years been flowing unrestrained, enabling murderous caprices with no consideration by the state to widen its destructive riverbed or take measures to contain the evil, which is not only great and tragic, but also apparent.³¹

²⁸ Ropaitou, *Ο Ελαιώνας της Αθήνας*, 129.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ *Ελεύθερο Βήμα*, 30 December 1931.

³¹ *Ακρόπολις*, 24 November 1934.



Figure 3. Photograph showing residents in an area along the Kifisos left homeless after the November 1934 flood. *Ελεύθερος Άνθρωπος*, 24 November 1934.



Figure 4. Photograph of the aftermath of the November 1934 flood. The caption reads: “Another picture of the phenomenal flood ... A whole square, where children played, was transformed into a lake.” *Ακρόπολις*, 23 November 1934.

Often the Kifisos was accused of being the actual offender. Following a flood on 22 November 1934 (figs. 3 and 4), in which seven people lost their lives, some reports attempted to direct the people’s anger and despair at the river.

A miserable ditch, the ... for years untamed Kifisos, carried away with its momentum, along with the belongings of tens of thousands of our fellow citizens and ... dead bodies. In this Greek capital, we now mourn the fate of nine people that suffered the worst death, while commuting from their work to their homes.³²

In the mid-1930s a series of important technical works was approved and began to materialise. This particular activity, during the interwar period, was part of a series of civil projects implemented in many parts of the country, aiming to modernise and raise the overall standard of living. Many of these projects were focused on, but not limited to, the capital. These included the installation of electricity, which was completed in 1929, the construction of the Athens water supply system, including the gravity dam at Marathonas, which was also completed in 1929, and a broad road construction project throughout the country.³³ A 1937 press report praised the work completed on the Kifisos,

³² Ibid.

³³ Finally, approximately 2,000 km of paved national and provincial road were delivered from the mid-1930s onwards. As part of the same set of projects, we could also mention the

which was expected to definitively regulate the river. Such references indicated that public opinion in Athens was positive towards eliminating any obstacles that the natural environment supposedly placed on the city's progress towards modernisation. This report stressed that "in two more years [the Kifisos] will only be a bad memory of the people from that time, and a perfect technical achievement for generations to come".

In such cases, the projection of a negative image of the Kifisos seems to have served as leverage to accelerate the progress of technical works, which would conquer the river in the name of urban life.

That rainfall can take the scope of a natural disaster on an almost national scale denotes the level of our civilisation. We tolerate this never-ending situation with purely eastern fatalism like it was some kind of tornado or some other terrifying natural phenomenon, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen or dealt with effectively.³⁴

The reference to the "east" is pivotal in the criticism of the state's ineffectiveness. In the collective conscience, there was no chance of the "east" fighting nature and winning. Instead, an eastern state's only choice was to withstand nature's fury. The report highlights the widespread determination of the Greek state to disassociate itself from the "underdeveloped" label. At the same time, an eastern inference contrasts with the preferable "western" mentality towards nature, which mainly implies control and economic exploitation. Eastern states or the states with "an eastern mentality" are not supposed to have the means or the will to protect their citizens from what seems to be the natural forces fighting civilisation.

The narrative of what would have been the final regulation of the Kifisos in the 1930s was also linked to the glory of the pro-fascist 4 August dictatorship, which ruled from 1936 until the outbreak of World War II. The following press extract describes the planned works, in which a large-scale road project would offer the chance to glorify the regime.

The Kifisos has not silted up. On the contrary, it has deepened in several sections ... [as] its riverbed is small, which enables floods. Thus, the Kifisos will become ten meters deeper and much wider. On each side of the river, there will be an inclined wall, meanwhile from Treis Gefyres to Neo Faliro a marvellous dual carriageway will be built along its riverbed. Each side of the aforementioned avenue will be six

construction of the telephone network, the contract for which was signed in 1930. Christina Agriantoni and Georgia Panselina, "Η ελληνική οικονομία, διεθνής κρίση και εθνικός προστατευτισμός," in *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, ed. Vasilis Panagiotopoulos (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2003), 7:121–34.

³⁴ *Έθνος*, 23 November 1934.

meters wide, with a fourfold line of poplars. This will be named the “Fourth of August Avenue” of Athens.³⁵

These river works were not completed until the 1950s due to World War II and the Greek Civil War. However, as it will be shown, they attracted criticism from famous engineers who were concerned with the effectiveness of the flood protection measures. In one of these critiques, both of the two main factors that resulted in the permanent alteration of the Kifisos’ natural environment become evident: it was the state that regulated the river and private initiative that encroached on its riverbed.

Despite the fact that the plans for the Kifisos riverbed included many straight parts and open curves, the Public Works Service, to prevent the uneven expropriation of riverside properties belonging mainly to wealthy Athenian families, cancelled the proposed study and remodelling, thus resulting in both the uneven and insufficient construction of the dual project. As a consequence, neither the dual carriageway nor the drainage system worked properly, as proven during the flood in November 1961.³⁶

Urban development of Greece throughout the twentieth century was marked by the inefficiency of the state’s role and the greediness of private individuals. Both these factors are evident in many natural landscapes, the Kifisos riverbed among them. Studying how and why the river has changed, as well as the obstacles that these changes faced, allows us to observe the conscious role of human intervention in the transformation of the Athens landscape.

Apart from being an area of both modernisation and exploitation of nature, the Kifisos directly influenced the mentality and the cultural identity of its neighbouring residents. Matthew Gandy has suggested that nature “has a social and cultural history that has enriched countless dimensions of the urban experience”.³⁷ Regardless of the way in which the natural history of the Kifisos has changed, history offers multiple representations that remain closely linked to the individual perceptions one may have had on the Kifisos. The survival of the natural environment surrounding the banks of the Kifisos until the mid-twentieth century, in addition to the symbiotic relationship developed between the river and those residing along it, forged a

³⁵ *Η Καθημερινή*, 18 July 1937.

³⁶ Biris, *Αι Αθήναι*, 327. Stoupathis was also critical and his main points can be found on p. 34 of the present article.

³⁷ Quoted in Nik Heynen, Maria Kaika and Erik Swyngedouw, “Urban Political Ecology: Politicizing the Production of Urban Natures,” in *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism*, ed. Nik Heynen, Maria Kaika, and Erik Swyngedouw (London: Routledge, 2006), 5.

different perception, one that basically originated from the daily practices and habits of the riverside inhabitants. As an old resident of Moschato recalled:

When I was little, I used to make my own perfume. My grandmother had told me to use verbena, marjoram and spearmint that we found in the surrounding gardens. We would lay them in the sun for their aromas to come out and then we used the mixture to wash our hair.³⁸

Other memories relate the Kifisos and the nearby landscape with children's play and early sensory experiences. Giorgos Zambetas, a famous Greek musician and composer, recalled being interested in nature as a child. At that time, he did not see the waters of the Kifisos as being a source of possible infection but a hospitable habitat for species, in which frogs and birds used to make an enchanting soundscape:

And then there was [the area of] Votanikos as well. Still water accumulated there, and there were many, many frogs. And there were some poplars, some huge poplars. Within Votanikos was the Forestry School. The Agricultural University stands there now. So, in the gardens, besides the frogs, nightingales gathered as well. At dawn, when the sky was painted in a blue-orange light, I used to go to Votanikos – it was not far – I would sit down, and listen to the concerts of the frogs and the nightingales. I used to lose my mind there. Anyone who heard this concert in spring or autumn was thrilled. I would sit in the thick vegetation and hear all these quack-quacks, peep-peeps, tweet-tweets plus the nightingales. It was mind-blowing! I would sit there for hours. Each spring and each autumn this was the big concert with millions of voices from birds. Birds coming and birds going.³⁹

The City that Carried Away a River

Although crops could still be found along the banks of the Kifisos until the 1950s and 1960s, the years between the two world wars was a milestone for the symbiotic relationship between farming activity and industrial use near the riverside. Eventually, farming and gardening gave way to factories and to the selling of plots of land for building purposes. in the 1920s approximately 1.2

³⁸ Stelios Dantis, *Ιστορικά του Μοσχάτου* (Moschato: Historical Archive and Municipality of Moschato, 2004), 3:36. The story was narrated by Litsa Papadaki in an interview along with Evangelia Kosioni with Stelios Dantis.

³⁹ Ioanna Kleiasiou, *Γιώργος Ζαμπέτας, Βίος και πολιτεία: Και η βρόχα έπιπτε στρέιτ θρου* (Athens: Defi, 1997), 62, 64–65.

million refugees⁴⁰ arrived in Greece from Asia Minor, many of whom would finally settle in Athens, especially in areas near the Kifisos. Several areas, like Nea Philadelpheia and Aigaleo, were formed at this time with populations consisting mainly of refugees. Other areas, like Agioi Anargyroi and Peristeri, changed forever following this large-scale relocation of people.⁴¹ In the 1920s and 1930s, new industrial units sprung up in areas near the Kifisos. Examples include the ETMA silk plant in Kolokynthou, the Ariston clothing plant and Viamyl in Rentis and the Lanaras' family business in Peristeri.⁴²

As previously stated, the aforementioned transformation was nevertheless delayed because of the events in the 1940s. During the German occupation of Athens, the crops and mainly the gardens near the Kifisos saved many people from starvation. Farming production from the fertile riverside provided Athens' impoverished population with a large quantity of vegetables. People came to the gardens near the Kifisos seeking collard or other vegetables that the Wehrmacht found unpalatable for its soldiers' meals. According to some testimonies, daily visits to the garden proprietors were routine during the occupation:

[My father] used to work in the gardens owned by Manolis Bellos, which lay between the big bridge and the little bridge of Taxiarches. He used to water the gardens and plant collards and beets. During the hunger years, relatives used to come from Kokkinia and we would give them greens ... People came from all over Athens begging for a few collards. "Give me some greens to feed the children and I'll give you olive oil," they used to say.⁴³

In the postwar period, a new wave of settlers established themselves along the banks of the Kifisos, mainly to the west of the river. This time the colonists were not from abroad, as was the case in the 1920s. The first phase of this second wave consisted primarily of left-wing supporters who were defeated in the civil war. They had left their villages seeking the anonymity of the capital.⁴⁴ Also, in

⁴⁰ Elsa Kontogiorgi, "Η αποκατάσταση," in *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, ed. Vasilis Panagiotopoulos (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2003), 7:101–20.

⁴¹ It is indicative that, during the 1929 census, Aigaleo had a population of 147 inhabitants while this number, according to the 1934 census, had risen to 3,500 inhabitants in some of the Aigaleo's settlements alone. Dalkos, *Αιγάλεω*, 112.

⁴² The industrial development near the Kifisos was part of the broader development that the Greek industrial sector experienced in the 1920s. It is significant that within one decade 34,000 small and large new industries had started operating.

⁴³ Dantis, *Ιστορικά του Μοσχάτου*, 38.

⁴⁴ The following testimony of Giorgos Christofilopoulos, a Peristeri inhabitant, is significant: "My father was a member of the Greek leftwing partisan army ELAS. Where should

the 1950s and the 1960s, a great number of migrants from the Greek provinces moved to the larger cities for economic or broader social reasons, in what could be described as Greece's belated urbanisation. This significant movement of the population can be attributed, among others, to the decline of agricultural activity in the Greek countryside and to the many employment opportunities offered in the cities.

Due to these circumstances, in the 1950s there was a dramatic increase in the number of people interested in residing along the Kifisos. Between 1951 and 1961, the population of Agios Ioannis Rentis doubled. Meanwhile migration and the progression from agricultural to industrial activity prompted the formulation of a new urban environment in the surrounding area.⁴⁵ Similar growth was evident in Aigaleo between 1950 and 1960⁴⁶ as well as in Agioi Anargyroi.⁴⁷

Subsequent to this internal movement, the dwellings built on these new settlements were often constructed illegally. The plots of land upon which these poorly improvised and unapproved buildings were built had resulted from encroachment on public or communal fields, mainly through the parcelling and selling of existing gardens. The increase in demand for these parcels is explained by the comparably lower prices they fetched than those in areas closer to the centre of Athens⁴⁸ as well as the fact that the purchasing of land and a house in an urban area was considered a financial investment.⁴⁹ For a migrant hoping to purchase land, these cheaper parcels located beyond the urban planning range seemed an appropriate choice.⁵⁰ Hence, the arrival of a new population and

we stand in [our village] Kopanaki? We couldn't stay anywhere in the whole of Messinia. And then there was the upward movement of inhabitants of the Peloponnese and the downward movement of inhabitants of Central Greece, who then came here. The new city [Peristeri] was built by these hunted populations." Personal interview, 6 June 2019.

⁴⁵ Katerina Kaliampakou, "Άγιος Ιωάννης Ρέντης 1950–1960," in *Νίκαια, Άγιος Ιωάννης Ρέντη: Οδοιπορικό στη μνήμη*, ed. Dimitris Loukas and Kyriaki Papadimitropoulou (Athens: Municipality of Nikaia–Agios Ioannis Rentis 2019), 124–37.

⁴⁶ The number of the inhabitants in Aigaleo was 29,404 in the 1950 census and 57,840 in the 1961 census. Bournova, *Από τις Νέες Κυδωνίες στο Δήμο Αιγάλεω*, 44.

⁴⁷ According to data from the National Statistics Service, the sharpest increase in the population of Agioi Anargyroi was recorded in the 1950s (118 percent). Milionis stresses that every year 1,000 people were added to the existing population, and hence their number climbed from 8,400 in 1951 to 18,400 in 1961. *Η πόλη των αγίων*, 199.

⁴⁸ Bournova, *Από τις Νέες Κυδωνίες στο Δήμο Αιγάλεω*, 45–46.

⁴⁹ Dimitra Lampropoulou, *Οικοδόμοι: Οι άνθρωποι που έχτισαν την Αθήνα, 1950–1967* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2009), 88.

⁵⁰ Maria Mavridou, "Η συγκυριακή ανάπτυξη ενός περιφερειακού συνοικισμού: Ν. Λιόσια" (PhD diss., National Technical University of Athens, 1987), 88.

the spatial expansion of the Greek capital led to new usage being made of the riverside.

Small “colonies” consisting of migrants who had relocated for political or economic reasons sprung up along the west bank of the Kifisos. These people brought with them their native, social networks. These mid-century newcomers to the Athens periphery established a different perception of the capital’s natural environment. As their urbanite identity had only recently become part of their collective conscience, the rural houses and sites in the western part of the city appeared familiar to them.⁵¹ Despite the poor living conditions, these populations established a space that offered them security and relieved them of the loss of their previous way of living. It also allowed them to develop their true identity in contrast to the identity enforced on them by life in the big city.⁵²

In the following testimony, a relocated person visits the area of Agioi Anargyroi in the early 1960s and considers buying a piece of land to build a house of his own:

There was the smell of manure and sheep in the air. There were three or four sheds, dry stone walls, drainage ditches, a garden, vineyards and crops. Only a few pieces of land were fenced. The whole settlement was five or six small rooms with outhouse toilets, outdoor sinks, wood stoves with firewood piled in front of them, water tanks, washtubs, fruit trees, domestic animals and poultry. No electricity, no water supply; only tank trucks that transported water. The streets had no clear borders, while their surface was eroded by rills ... Something was pulling me to this place and only later did I understand that the landscape recalled images of my village. It was something I had missed and I found again there, in Agia Paraskevi and Agioi Anargyroi, only seven kilometres away [from the centre of Athens].⁵³

Ever since the 1960s, the fate of the Kifisos was primarily determined by the traffic needs of the capital and only secondarily by flood prevention planning or anything else. While some have argued that some sites of the capital’s landscape remained rural throughout the 1960s, an increase in the use and the number of vehicles had resulted in a series of roadworks. Among them, in 1965, the construction of a national highway along the Kifisos began. As part of the construction, the river was fully covered in the Agioi Anargyroi area, while a

⁵¹ Vika Gizeli, *Κοινωνικός μετασχηματισμός και προέλευση της κοινωνικής κατοικίας στην Ελλάδα (1920–1930)* (Athens: Epikairoitita, 1984), 115.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Milionis, *Η πόλη των αγίων*, 211. Anonymous testimony.

new regulation of its riverbed took place in Kokkinos Mylos.⁵⁴ One of the last large-scale flood prevention works affecting the Kifisos riverbed, as well as many of the streams flowing into it, took place between 1955 and 1965. Roadworks continued to change the city and its biggest river. The idea for the full conversion of the Kifisos into a highway seems to have been seriously contemplated for the first time during the 1970s. The project began in the 1980s and continued into the 1990s; however it was not completed until the early 2000s, ahead of the 2004 Athens Olympics.

Until the 1970s, there was little consideration for the environmental dimension of the Kifisos or any sign of environmental awareness in Greece in general. The following reference by the famous Greek architect Dimitris Pikionis is rare evidence of the early existence of such ideas: “What did you do to the Kifisos and the Ilisos, my holy waters? You put sewers in them, you threw the water from your plants in them ... You have nothing left but the lowest form of a relationship with nature: its exploitation.”⁵⁵

After the 1970s, public references to the Kifisos not only included the environmental dimension, but defined how the development at this point was pivotal in the public debate regarding the river’s future. Was the emergence of environmental awareness enough to prevent the river’s transformation into what Cioc called a “water machine”?⁵⁶ Probably not, but in the minds of people, the Kifisos had been added to the list of victims of urban development. In addition, it also generated a vocal minority that was worried not only about the future of the river, but also the future of a city unable to live in harmony with its pre-existing landscape.

As argued above, the Kifisos’ relationship with organised human activity dates back to antiquity and the use of its waters for irrigation purposes. Its recognition as a natural asset goes back to its importance for the ancient cultivation of fruit trees. The nineteenth century saw the expansion of industry, which used the riverbed as a wastewater pipeline. At approximately the same time, a series of great technical projects to canalise and eliminate the natural riverbed took place in the southernmost part of the river, near its estuaries. Since then, especially in the 1930s, 1960s and 1970s and finally the decade before

⁵⁴ Sokratis Dallas, “Οριστική μελέτη έργων αναδιευθέτησης του Κηφισού,” technical report, Dallas private archive.

⁵⁵ Dimitris Pikionis, “Γαίας ατίμωσις” (1954), in *Κείμενα* (Athens: MIET, 1985), 131–32, cited in Panos Dragonas, “Κηφισός: Το απωθημένο ποτάμι,” <https://www.greekarchitects.gr/gr/republish-space/%CE%BA%CE%B7%CF%86%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%8C%CF%82-id2784>.

⁵⁶ Cioc, *The Rhine*, 72.

the Olympic Games of 2004, other technical projects completely changed the river's nature and canalised the greatest part of its riverbed. The city sought to ensure that the Kifisos would not stand stagnant or overflow, thus challenging its artificial boundaries.

As pointed out earlier, along with the Kifisos' canalisation, multiple transformations of the riverine areas also occurred. They were related to the exploitation of the semi-urban and peri-urban spaces near the river and their integration into the urban reality. Hence, in addition to the factories that started operating along the Kifisos around the turn of the twentieth century, the intensification of vegetable cultivation sought to cover the increased need for garden products due to the expansion of the city along the river's east bank. After World War II, as Athens underwent new population growth, the riverine areas were useful as free space; low-cost land, where the lowest classes could build dwelling houses and start new lives. During the second half of the twentieth century, the development of residential areas next to the Kifisos continued, along with the operation of factories, which essentially functioned without any environmental guidelines or restrictions. The transformation of the Kifisos into one of Athens' main highways at the beginning of the twenty-first century seemed to have completed a cycle of vigorous human interventions on the river.

Furthermore, looking from a different standpoint, the various fluctuations in public sentiment toward the Kifisos delineate the multiple stages which eventually led to the emergence of an environmental consciousness in the Greek capital. The passage from a harmonic symbiosis between the people and the Kifisos, lasting from antiquity until the first post-revolutionary decades, to the treatment of the river as an opponent of social progress and urban development, has been important to the cultural identity of Athenians. The flooding and any health concerns regarding the Kifisos generated the demand for state interference. The initial aim was to control a form of nature that dared to ignore the course of progress. The analogy of the Kifisos as an "antagonist" appears to be related to the development of the city. How could the city cope with the reality of an untamed river? The positioning of manufacturing activity along the riverbanks, as well as the gradual increase in industrial activity, generated an image of the river as a space of secondary importance, bound only to serve the needs of the developing urban lifestyle and economy, primarily at the river's expense. Moreover, its use as a place for the displaced to settle and a place of labour for the lower classes denoted the degradation of the areas near the river. Less seminal but more vocal was the realisation of the need to protect what was left of the existing landscape of the whole river system. But that was something that would not happen until the final decades of the twentieth century, almost simultaneously with the corresponding realisation in Western countries, and

only after the increase in living standards and post-dictatorship civil liberties was secured.

The course of the Kifisos, especially over the past two centuries, seems like it has been on the ultimate path to disaster. Its natural riverbed, bioclimate and flora along its banks ceased to exist, at least in the form that they were for some decades after the Greek War of Independence. However, returning to the question stated in the introduction, the history of the Kifisos is interesting not just because it is an area which allows one to observe of the environmental damage done by man, but also because in its riverbed a great part of the Greek capital's own history is written. As argued, the story of how the river was used remains a great field to study the contemporary social history of Greece, as the varying perception of the river over time was directly related to social changes and the formation of the new cultural identities of the urban dwellers.

Each time the Kifisos was mentioned in the public sphere, whether or not these references were hostile or acrimonious, they became part of a process which familiarised the public with the role of the river in the urban environment of the city. Press reports and articles greatly influenced the way that the Kifisos was perceived over different periods, stimulating the consciousness of the river's presence and, at the same time, the consciousness of a "new nature". These attributed characteristics of the river, regardless of their accuracy, preserved the perception of the river as an inextricable physical component, and kept it part of a city that has been busy concreting over its natural environment.

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

THE “WAR ON THE GOAT”: FORESTRY, HUSBANDRY AND POLITICS
IN EARLY MODERN GREECE

Giorgos Kostopoulos and Iosif Botetzagias

ABSTRACT: This article examines the conflict over forest use in modern Greece. While the main protagonists were foresters, who prioritised the importance of forests in providing timber, and those involved in animal husbandry, who needed the forests as grazing grounds, a number of other societal and political actors also engaged in this century-long struggle, which culminated in the 1937 decision to remove goats from Greek forests. It shows how the Greek foresters succeeded in framing the goat and goat rearing as the symbol of the country’s deforestation but also underdevelopment, both in economic and in cultural terms. Also, from the 1920s onwards, the large goat herds stood in the way of the development of the Greek agricultural sector: the extensive and free-roaming animal husbandry was viewed as an opponent of the state-sponsored and -endorsed settled farmer, who would help Greece in securing the desperately sought *σιτάρκεια* (grain sufficiency). Once Ioannis Metaxas seized power and established his authoritarian 4 August regime, which placed special emphasis on the agricultural development of the country, the fate of the goat was sealed: the “horned Satan” had to die, not just for the sake of the forests but, according to Metaxas himself, for the very survival of the Greek people.

In late 1935/early 1936, Greece was in political turmoil. On 10 October 1935, a coup d’état, aiming at the restoration of the royal family, which had been deposed in 1923, overthrew the elected government. A month later, following a rigged referendum, King George II returned from exile and appointed a caretaker government, led by a former liberal MP and university law professor, Konstantinos Demertzis, whose the sole aim was to organise fresh elections. Yet the elections of 26 January 1936 proved inconclusive. Demertzis was handed a mandate to form a government but when he died unexpectedly on 13 April, the king – contrary to parliamentary custom – appointed as prime minister-designate not one of the leaders of the major parties but a royalist ex-general turned parliamentarian, and leader of a minor, quasi-fascist party, Ioannis Metaxas.¹

On 24 April, following his dramatic yet overwhelming endorsement by the parliament the day before, Metaxas made his maiden appearance before the body as Greece’s new premier. The very first question he was called to answer came from Georgios Kafantaris, leader of the Progressive Party, who took issue with

¹ Kostas Kostis, *Τα κακομαθημένα παιδιά της ιστορίας* (Athens: Patakis, 2015), 638–40.

“a measure taken in an abnormal way, through [a government decree] signed just on the eve of the last elections ... And I refer to the banning of goat grazing in fir forests.”² Indeed, on 25 January 1936, “following the recommendation of the cabinet”, the king had signed a decree concerning “certain amendments of the laws concerning forests”, with Article 2 of which stipulating that “the grazing of goats in public or private fir forests is to be banned starting 6 months after the publication of the present law”.³ According to Panos Grispos, it was the head of the state’s Forestry Agency who had proposed this law to Agriculture Minister Antonios Benakis.⁴ Kafantaris claimed that the measure “amounts to deliberate extermination ... [the relevant line is missing from the parliamentary transcripts] under the pretext of protecting the forests”. As the announcement of the measure had led the mountain populations to the brink of an uprising, he asked the prime minister to commit to abolishing the law since “it is not goat rearing that is destroying our forests ... [but] forest fires, tree-felling and the clearing of forests”.⁵ Metaxas agreed to suspend the law, so that the issue could be reconsidered and debated through the normal parliamentary process. He nevertheless insisted that almost half of the county’s fir forests were already excluded from grazing under the existing legal framework, noting:

If goat grazing continues freely in fir forests, the latter are destined for destruction and thus the country’s forest wealth will be destroyed – to the injury of the national economy. There are also more reasons for restricting goat grazing – to avoid the deforestation of the mountain regions, the rivers turning into torrents to destroy the plains, and more serious reasons. The fight between the goat and the fir is a fight to the death: one must die so the other may live.⁶

Thus the “War on the Goat” – in the words of Rigopoulos, president of the Patras’ branch of the Friends of the Forest Union (Φιλοδοασική Ένωση)⁷ – entered its final, and most dramatic phase. This war “is not something new, or novel”, maintained Rigopoulos. “The disgust and the hate for this horned animal originate in the distant past ... because the goat is a real Satan.”⁸ This was

² *Εφημερίς Συζητήσεων της Βουλής (ΕΣΒ)*, 24 April 1936, 84.

³ “Περί τροποποίησης διατάξεων τινων περί Δασών Νόμων,” *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως [ΦΕΚ]*, 59Α, 25 January 1936, 272.

⁴ Panos Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος: Από του ΙΕ΄ αιώνας μέχρι του 1971* (Athens: Forestry Agency, 1973), 295.

⁵ *ΕΣΒ*, 24 April 1936, 84.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁷ Angelos Rigopoulos, “Ο πόλεμος κατά της γίδας,” *Δασική Ζωή*, February 1936, 34.

⁸ *Ibid.*

not just the elite's view. The goat shepherds themselves, in their oral traditions, maintained that the goat was created by the Devil and cursed by none other than Jesus Christ.⁹ This article examines how the “war” against this hoofed menace had developed – and concluded – over the first hundred years of Greek statehood.

Greeks, Forests and the Goat

Upon the successful conclusion of the war of independence, the nascent Greek state found itself as the largest land proprietor in the country – acquiring by “right of conquest” all the Ottoman-held property of pre-revolutionary Greece.¹⁰ In the case of the country's forests, it is estimated that over 80 percent of their area came to belong to the state.¹¹ Yet, in the eyes of the ruling elite, this wooded national fortune was threatened by many factors, including animal grazing. In 1830, Greece's first governor, Ioannis Kapodistrias, tried – unsuccessfully – to ban all animals from the national forests but just six years later, a number of royal decrees introduced strict rules, accompanied by heavy penalties for trespassers. Thus the Royal Decree of 7 August 1836 “On animal tax”¹² allowed shepherds to graze their animals only in designated forested areas or in areas where “forest growth” was unlikely to occur, while the Royal Decree of 9 September 1836 “On the regulation of grazing in forests”¹³ prohibited grazing in regenerating forests “until the [saplings] grow to the point that they no longer fear the animal's mouth”.¹⁴

The animal that the saplings most “feared” – in the mind of contemporaries – was the goat. The goat, and its effect on vegetation, had been known to Greeks since antiquity. Grazing is a complex biological, financial and social process, as it combines many factors of a society and reflects their views on the land.¹⁵ Based

⁹ Dimitris Loukopoulos, *Ποιμενικά της Ρούμελης* (Athens: Sidiris, 1930), 217–18.

¹⁰ Iosif A. Botetzagias and Giorgos A. Kostopoulos, “For the Thorough Conservation of the Forests: A History of Forest Management and Protection in ‘Old Greece’, 1830–1880,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 39, no. 1 (2021): 93–116.

¹¹ William W. McGrew, *Land and Revolution in Modern Greece, 1800–1881: The Transition in the Tenure and Exploitation of Land from Ottoman Rule to Independence* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985), 85.

¹² “Διάταγμα περί του επί των Ζώων φόρου,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 40, 7 August 1836, 181.

¹³ “Διάταγμα περί του κανονισμού της βοσκής των δασών,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 45, 9 September 1836, 215.

¹⁴ Botetzagias and Kostopoulos, “For the Thorough Conservation of the Forests,” 100.

¹⁵ Avi Perevolotsky and No'am G. Seligman, “Role of Grazing in Mediterranean Rangeland Ecosystems: Inversion of a Paradigm,” *BioScience* 48, no. 12 (1998): 1008.

on researchers such as Boyazoglu and Morand-Fehr,¹⁶ Rook et al.,¹⁷ Clergue et al.,¹⁸ and Dover et al.,¹⁹ Hadjigeorgiou mentions that grazing provided the Greek countryside with quality food and contributed to the conservation of biodiversity²⁰ while people exploited sheep and goats for the dairy, meat, leather, and wool they produced, which was necessary for the textile industry.²¹ Animals had grazed anywhere abundant vegetation was available – including forests. And if properly supervised, grazing may prove beneficial to the forest since it preserves biodiversity, reduces the likelihood of fires, and allows the exploitation of “unusable” less nutritious plants (see Papanastasis;²² Evans et al.;²³ Carmel and Kadmon;²⁴ Papanastasis;²⁵ Davies et al.;²⁶ Lovreglio et al.;²⁷ Kapotas²⁸). Yet, if unrestricted, the effects are detrimental since goats are capable of devouring

¹⁶ J. Boyazoglu and P. Morand-Fehr, “Mediterranean Dairy Sheep and Goat Products and their Quality. A Critical Review,” *Small Ruminant Research*, 40, no. 1 (2001): 1–11.

¹⁷ A.J. Rook, M. Petit, J. Isselstein, K. Osoro, M.F. Wallis de Vries, G. Parente and J. Mills, “Effects of Livestock Breed and Stocking Rate on Sustainable Grazing Systems: 1. Project Description and Synthesis of Results,” *Grassland Science in Europe* 9 (2004): 572–74.

¹⁸ Boris Clergue, Bernard Amiaud, Frank Pervanchon, Françoise Lasserre-Joulin and Sylvain Plantureux, “Biodiversity: Function and Assessment in Agricultural Areas: A Review,” *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 25, no. 1 (2005): 1–15.

¹⁹ J.W. Dover, S. Spencer, S. Collins, I. Hadjigeorgiou and A. Rescia, “Grassland Butterflies and Low Intensity Farming in Europe,” *Journal of Insect Conservation* 15 (2011): 129–37.

²⁰ Ioannis Hadjigeorgiou, “Past, Present and Future of Pastoralism in Greece,” *Pastoralism* 1 (2011), 1.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

²² Vasilis Papanastasis, “Land Abandonment and Old Field Dynamics in Greece,” in *Old Fields: Dynamics and Restoration of Abandoned Farmland*, ed. Viki A. Cramer and R.J. Hobbs (Washington: Island Press, 2007), 225–46.

²³ Darren M. Evans, Stephen M. Redpath, David A. Elston, Sharon A. Evans, Ruth J. Mitchell and Peter Dennis, “To Graze or not to Graze? Sheep, Voles, Forestry and Nature Conservation in the British Uplands,” *Journal of Applied Ecology* 43, no. 3 (2006): 499–505.

²⁴ Yohay Carmel and Ronen Kadmon, “Effects of Grazing and Topography on Long-term Vegetation Changes in a Mediterranean Ecosystem in Israel,” *Plant Ecology* 145 (1999): 243–54.

²⁵ Vasilis Papanastasis, “Traditional vs Contemporary Management of Mediterranean Vegetation: The Case of the Island of Crete,” *Journal of Biological Research* 1 (2004): 39–46.

²⁶ Kirk W. Davies, Chad S. Boyd, Jon D. Bates and April Hulet, “Winter Grazing can Reduce Wildfire Size, Intensity and Behaviour in a Shrub-Grassland,” *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 25, no. 2 (2015): 129–36.

²⁷ Raffella Lovreglio, Ouahiba Meddour-Sahar and Vittorio Leone, “Goat Grazing as a Wildfire Prevention Tool: A Basic Review,” *iForest* 7, no. 4 (2014): 260–68.

²⁸ Panagiotis Kapotas and Efpraxia-Aithra Maria, “Livestock Grazing, Forest Protection and Law in Greece,” *Management of Environmental Quality* 28, no. 1 (2017): 57–69.

almost any growing plant or tree they can reach – while even the bark of older trees is not immune to their teeth.

The Debate about Forest Protection and Goat Grazing

The position that goats had a detrimental effect on Greece's forests was strongly supported in nineteenth-century upper-class discourse. In this perspective, the country's forests were being "destroyed" – and the main culprits were the (transhumant) shepherds who let their herds graze unrestricted inside the forests and/or set the latter on fire to create new pasturelands and spur the growth of grass.²⁹ Thus, Sir Thomas Wyse, the British minister to Greece, blames the "constantly thwarted" tree growth on the island of Euboea on "the goats [that] come down like wild armies, and destroy all before them low enough for their teeth. Should any escape, the shepherds – wild nomads, belonging to no one but their sheep – burn *ad libitum* for grass, through laziness and wickedness: thus large tracts frequently perish."³⁰ In similar vein, in 1874 Theodoros Afentoulis, a university professor of medicine, blamed the goat shepherds (*αίπολοι*) – alongside the farmers practicing "swidden [slash-and-burn] agriculture" – who "burn the forests ... in order for new sprouts to come out of the unscathed roots, and thus the next year the goats will have plentiful and tender fodder".³¹ Thus Afentoulis was suggesting that Greece should follow the example of Germany in banning goats from forests, starting with the Greek regions where most (and most often) forest fires occurred, "in Attica, Megarida, Boeotia and Euboea".³²

Not everyone was convinced a total ban should or could be implemented. Writing in 1876, Alexandros Tobazis, a forest proprietor from Euboea, exclaimed that "by truth, the goat is not to be blamed [for forest destruction] and we consider it our duty to protect her [the goat]". The goat was simply *more* destructive compared to other grazing animals, so if grazing is regulated "then even the goat, this relentless spoiler of the forests, would graze in them without causing harm". Thus, banning goats was not only unnecessary but it would run counter to Greece's natural conditions and national interest. "Before Mr Afentoulis ostracises the goats of our country," quipped Tobazis, "he must first change Greek nature. Since this and only this causes our great goat husbandry since the goat is perfectly made for the mountains." If the goats were removed, their grazing grounds would be left

²⁹ See Botetzagias and Kostopoulos, "For the Thorough Conservation of the Forests," 109–10.

³⁰ Thomas Wyse, *Impressions of Greece* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1871), 231.

³¹ Theodoros Afentoulis, "Τα δάση καίονται, τις πταίει;" *Το Μέλλον*, 13 August 1874.

³² *Ibid.*

unused (the sheep having totally different dietary requirements) and, in effect, the national wealth would receive a severe blow since “next to apiculture, no other husbandry activity is as profitable in our country as goat herding”.³³

Some also seriously doubted that the parliament would ever vote to restrict goats. An editorial in *To Μέλλον* newspaper a few weeks after Afentoulis’ drastic call to action commented that a law banning forest grazing would prove as unenforceable as the existing one forbidding swidden agriculture, thanks to the endemic corruption of the Forestry Agency and the local authorities,³⁴ while patronage and political clientelism by “members of parliament, ministers, journalists” would ensure that such a draft law would be neutralised as “barbarous and unsparing of the poor goats”.³⁵ Instead, suggested the lead, by introducing (high) taxes for grazing goats in the forest – and even renting out the collection of these taxes – these animals would be “gradually driven out of the forests, being unable to pay the high prices for grazing in these areas” while

the goat herders ... will find other grazing lands, elsewhere in the country, or they will take on sheep herding, or they [will] abandon the mountainous [*ορεινήν*] goat herding and engage in lowland goat herding, that is, in the towns and villages, the latter being less harmful and more useful both to the goat shepherds and to society.³⁶

The above extract suggests that, in the contemporary mind, the “mountainous” (mobile/transhumant/nomadic) pastoralists were as much to blame for forest destruction as the goat itself. The most populous group of these mountainous “goat herders” were the

Greek-speaking Sarakatsans and the bilingual Koutsovlachs and Arvanitovlachs, who spoke Vlach and, respectively, Greek and Albanian [despite their different mobility status] more often than not, these peoples were collectively referred to by Greek officials in the nineteenth century as *Vlachopoimenes* [Vlach-shepherds], “Vlach” in this case meaning nomadic”. [They were organised in tselingata, that is], large, patriarchal associations of [pastoralist] men and their horses, sheep and goats, [which] ascended in May to the higher slopes of the mountain and descended in November to the lowlands.³⁷

³³ Alexandros Tobazis, *Σπουδαιότης των δασών και συντήρησις αυτών εν Ελλάδι* (Athens: Typ. ton Adelfon Perri, 1876), 40–41.

³⁴ See Botetzagias and Kostopoulos, “For the Thorough Conservation of the Forests,” 105–7.

³⁵ “Αποκέντρωσις των δασών,” *Το Μέλλον*, 7 September 1874.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ John S. Koliopoulos, “Shepherds, Brigands, and Irregulars in Nineteenth Century Greece,” *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 8, no. 4 (1981): 41.

For most commentators, these mountainous, transhumant herders were a rough and lawless group of people. As Afentoulis lamented in his analysis of forest destruction:

The goat shepherds are wild men and mountain people. You may vote and pass and set as many laws as you wish [for protecting forests]. They will never respect these laws since it is much more difficult to catch them in the act. Why should you expect the goat shepherds to respect your public (αδέσποτα) forests when they show no respect for your life and your fortune, being the very people who commit robberies and harbour bandits?³⁸

As Koliopoulos states, it is a fact that in nineteenth-century Greece “the brigand band and the nomadic group of shepherds and animals, the *tselingato*,³⁹ were in many ways complementary associations: the latter provided shelter, food, dress, and intelligence in exchange for protection” and the vast majority of brigands were (recruited from the) shepherds.⁴⁰ This close relation, he explains, “resulted mainly from the transhumant shepherd’s need for protection against the sedentary peasant” but it was further reinforced by the Greek state’s open hostility which considered their nomadic lifestyle “a disgrace to civilised Greece” and a thing to be done away with.⁴¹ Thus, turning transhumant (mountainous) animal husbandry into the “less harmful and more useful, both to the goat shepherds and to the society” lowland one (to use *To Μέλλον*’s evaluation) had been a common *topos* for Greek elite discourse and official state policy.⁴² Already by 1836, a royal decree⁴³ ordered that transhumant shepherds had to register with one of the kingdom’s communes, or establish their own [permanent] ones, in order to have access to pasturelands, otherwise “they will not be tolerated within the kingdom save for this coming winter”. Similar provisions were reiterated in 1857.⁴⁴ Harshes of all, Law ΤΟΔ’ (304) of 1871⁴⁵ “For the suppression of brigandage” had a special section on “the responsibility of Vlach-shepherds”. Clearly demarcating them from the shepherds who “settle in a village and reside therein with their family, permanently and perpetually”, the law provisioned that nomadic shepherds were to be put under police surveillance from six months

³⁸ Theodoros Afentoulis, “Τα δάση καίονται, τις πταίει;,” *Το Μέλλον*, 13 August 1874.

³⁹ Koliopoulos, “Shepherds, Brigands, and Irregulars,” 47.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 46–47.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 48–49.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ “Διάταγμα περί του επί των Ζώων φόρου,” 181.

⁴⁴ “Νόμος ΤΖΘ’ [399] περί φόρου επί των ζώων διά το 1857,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 4, 6 March 1857, 17.

⁴⁵ “Νόμος ΤΟΔ’ [304] περί καταδιώξεως της ληστείας,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 5, 1 March 1871, 33.

up to one year if there existed “strong suspicions” that they were harbouring brigands. In the cases of brigandage, if those who assisted the perpetrators could not be identified then *all* transhumant shepherds present in the area at the time of the crime were liable to pay an indemnity (up to 3,000 drachmas, proportional to their flock’s size) to the victims: and if the shepherds were unable or unwilling to do so, they would be prevented from migrating between their winter/summer grazing grounds. It is quite telling of the official Greek establishment opinion on these shepherds “that the harsh stipulations of this law concerning the nomads, unlike the rest of the provisions, caused not a single dissenting voice or vote”.⁴⁶

While the Greek state was quite successful in restricting the nomadic (goat) herders, dealing with the goats themselves was a far more difficult political challenge. In 1882, the parliament debated a bill regarding the increase in the domestic animal head tax. Yet this was more than a fiscal issue as far as goats were concerned. While up to that point sheep and goats were similarly taxed at 25 drachmas per head, the bill proposed doubling the tax on goats compared to a 20-percent increase on that of the sheep. One MP denounced Finance Minister Pavlos Kalligas, who had tabled the bill, claiming that “the Minister asks us to double the tax on goats in order to destroy them, because they are misdoing animals”,⁴⁷ a charge Kalligas did not refute:

Animal husbandry in Greece is [today] in the deplorable condition of the times of Abraham and Isaac ... Until it becomes sedentary it will be detrimental to agriculture ... It even wears down the national property through the destruction of the forests ... Between the two species, sheep and goats, which is the most devastating [for the forest]? I tell you it is the goat ... A certain Englishman brilliantly mentioned some years ago that Greek forests were being destroyed by the Greeks and by goats. And we may deal with the Greeks through the law on forest [protection]. [Yet] for the goats, what else may the legislator do if he wishes to offer useful direction and advice, other than making the possession of goats less profitable? Then sheep will increase, and they are beneficial not only to the shepherd but also to society ... since sheep are susceptible to improvement – thus [they help in] increasing revenue, while goats are unsusceptible [to improvement].⁴⁸

A storm of objections developed while the bill was under debate. One MP argued that goats grazed on poor lands where no other animal could be sustained, and another that eliminating goats would be a major blow to the rural economy of the

⁴⁶ Koliopoulos, “Shepherds, Brigands, and Irregulars,” 49–50.

⁴⁷ *ΕΣΒ*, 15 April 1882, 417.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 422–23.

mountainous communities while the amount of meat for sale in urban centres would sharply decrease. Another MP claimed that such a tax increase would be the ruin of shepherds, who would be forced to become bandits in order to secure their livelihoods. Some MPs mentioned that goats are not the only (or even the major) perpetrator of the damage to forests while a certain one went as far as to claim that goats caused no harm whatsoever to forests.⁴⁹ More sober objectors suggested that tougher penalties for illegal grazing was the way to protect forests from the goats – following the French example – and not “exterminating” the hapless beasts. The MPs’ reactions were coupled by petitions against the bill from most of the country’s goat-rearing provinces, as reflected in this exchange involving Prime Minister Harilaos Trikoupis himself:

[Prime Minister]: Mr Kalligas wished to provoke a discussion on this issue [of restricting goat grazing]. He is aware that banning goats from certain areas of the country – because indeed this provision [the tax increase] will amount to a ban in some instances – is not something which may be easily achieved...

[Opposition MP]: And it should not [be achieved]!

[Prime Minister]: It must be achieved when the country is ready to accept it. In all the countries where agriculture and forestry are advanced, there exist bans on goats ... The other tax increases proposed in this bill are simply fiscal measures. And the government cannot but insist on these. Regarding the goats, the [tax] increase is a fiscal measure, yet it is also a restricting measure. Thus the government does not wish to insist on fully implementing this measure as long as the country is not ready to accept it.⁵⁰

Thus, after much debate, it was agreed that the tax on goats would be increased equally with the one on sheep, that is, by 20 percent. The opposition MPs were highly critical of the government’s idea that enhancing Greek animal husbandry (and protecting forests) could come about through penalising, fiscal measures. Rather, a more structural change was needed. As one opposition MP noted in the concluding discussion,

animal husbandry is the way it is in Greece, and it will inevitably continue to exist [in this condition] as long as there are uncultivated lands, excess lands. Look at our provinces where the lands are cultivated and planted. There [free-roaming/transhumant] animal

⁴⁹ *EΣB*, 15, 17, 27 and 28 April 1882.

⁵⁰ *EΣB*, 17 April 1882, 453.

husbandry was restricted and it will end up as sedentary animal husbandry when the surrounding fields, the uncultivated, the excess and the ones used for feeding the animals, cease to exist. This is the reason for the state of Greek animal husbandry, and it cannot be fixed by destroying the goats.⁵¹

The opponents of goats also agreed that open-air/nomadic (goat) herding was a relic of the past which would fade away as the country developed; yet they also stressed the importance of interim measures. “The condition of our forests is deplorable due to goat grazing,” lamented Giorgos Kofinas, a middle-ranking bureaucrat in the Finance Ministry who would rise to the position of minister 20 years later: “Thus is the animal husbandry in our country: rowdy, wild, destructive.”⁵² Nevertheless, he was convinced that banning forest grazing would prove unenforceable – especially when “a great number of the country’s municipalities” was financially sustained by the goats.⁵³ Yet, “where civilisation more and more has penetrated, there the goat has gradually disappeared,” noted Kofinas, who suggested taking a middle ground regarding the goat: establishing no-grazing zones around forests and increasing the tax on the particular beast.⁵⁴ Epameinondas Empeirikos, a scion of a powerful shipowner family just beginning his political career, was of a similar mind, hoping that the increased taxes would prompt shepherds to “replace, gradually and incrementally, their goat flocks and thus the Greek soil – and above all the forests – will be redeemed by one of their greatest destroyers”.⁵⁵

Greek Foresters and the Goat

The need for targeted interventions to speed the goats’ exodus from the country’s forests was also the view of the first generation of Greek foresters, who were all trained in Germany.⁵⁶ Writing in 1900 about his impressions of Greece’s forests, Konstantinos Samios, head of the state Forestry Agency and professor of forestry courses in the Technical University of Athens, dedicated a whole chapter to “The goat and our forests”. According to Samios, “the mild Greek climate, the mountainous terrain and the underdevelopment of farming brought about the

⁵¹ ΕΣΒ, 27 April 1882, 563.

⁵² Giorgos Kofinas, *Μελέται περί δασών* (Athens: Typ. Anesti Konstantinidou, 1895), 77.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Epameinondas Empeirikos, *Περί διασώσεως και εκμεταλλεύσεως του δασικού ημών πλούτου* (Athens: Typ. Leoni, 1891), 31.

⁵⁶ See Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 223, 228, 237, 256

formidable proliferation of goats, destroying our forests and maintaining our peasants in their blessed idleness – which follows from the small requirements of this type [goat] of husbandry”.⁵⁷ Samios acknowledged the many benefits the frugal goat bestowed on the peasantry – especially in the mountainous regions – thus he considered it implausible (and impractical) to totally ban the animal from the country’s forests. In another book, after listing the damage to forests from both sedentary (yet free-roaming) as well as transhumant animal husbandry,⁵⁸ he concluded:

Least one thinks, based on what I wrote, that I recommend the total annihilation of the goat in order to achieve the amelioration of forest vegetation. That would be indeed absurd if one considers our prevailing conditions and habits, the morphology of the terrain and the climate of the country, as well as the economic importance the goat has for the peasant population.⁵⁹

Instead, he advocated limiting the grazing of goats in selected forested areas and for the animals to be supervised.⁶⁰ In similar vein, Petros Kontos, the young chief forester for the Attica region – fresh from his state-sponsored studies in Germany – was also against the total ban on grazing in forests, even by goats, not least because it could benefit forests if properly conducted but also because it was of significant economic value to rural communities.⁶¹ Thus he also advocated a middle ground: allowing goats to graze in those areas where forestry could not develop (for example, rocky areas) or in mature forests, replacing goats with sheep or cows, cultivating fodder plants in order to supply indoor animal husbandry, as well as limiting grazing rights and the number of animals allowed to graze.⁶²

It is important to note that the Greek foresters constantly emphasised that the destruction brought upon the land’s forests was not caused *only* by the “unruly” and nomadic shepherds but *also* by settled peasants, and both were manifestations of the same structural root cause, the “primitive” condition of the Greek (rural) economy. As Samios wrote in 1906, “since the main breadwinning activities of our peasants are the cultivation of cereals and

⁵⁷ Konstantinos Samios, *Εικόνες εκ των ελληνικών δασών* (Athens: Typ. I. Angelopoulou, 1900), 158.

⁵⁸ Konstantinos Samios, *Το μέλλον των ελληνικών δασών* (Athens: Typ. S. Kousoulinou, 1906), 30–34.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁶⁰ Samios, *Εικόνες εκ των ελληνικών δασών*, 161–62.

⁶¹ Petros Kontos, *Δάση και πολιτισμός ιδία εν Ελλάδι* (Athens: Typ. Leoni, 1906).

⁶² Samios, *Εικόνες εκ των ελληνικών δασών*, 160–69.

nomadic animal husbandry ... they are ignorant of the usefulness of the forests' products"⁶³ and

since the majority of the peasants, especially in mountainous areas, engage in animal husbandry without any relation to agriculture, that is, without any production of fodder, there is no other way to conduct animal husbandry but through the constant free-roaming grazing on all grounds ... since animal husbandry is practiced in a way unconnected to agriculture, and to the latter's injury, it is exercised *a fortiori* in a way unconnected to forestry, and to the latter's even greater injury.⁶⁴

Similarly Kontos maintained that Greece was currently

in the first stages of agricultural life, whereas part of the forests is cleared and turned into fields, the cultivated lands are loosely exploited and often left fallow ... while herds of domesticated animals roam and graze in the extended forest expanses, while the little wood needed for fuel and construction is harvested easily and wastefully.⁶⁵

But as the population grows, the economy expands and the needs multiply, "[a] country's agriculture and animal husbandry become more intensive, [and] then forestry production is facilitated and may become also more intensive".⁶⁶ Yet,

in contrast to the observed progress in our agricultural production since 1830, our animal husbandry – although the number of animals has increased considerably – retains overall its nomadic character, to the injury of agriculture ... since the nomadic herds destroy every agricultural amelioration, and also to the injury of forestry.⁶⁷

Similar to the opinion of the nineteenth-century parliamentarians – who argued that one could not enforce the protection of the forests through prohibitions but a more profound and structural change had to occur beforehand – Kontos also stressed that a ban on grazing might be a useful measure for protecting the forests on occasions, but in order for it to bear fruit, "beforehand, the necessary preconditions, capable of bringing about a more intensive arrangement of the country's economic and land production, must arise on their own – through the development of the country's economic production and culture".⁶⁸

⁶³ Samios, *Το μέλλον των ελληνικών δασών*, 27.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 30–31.

⁶⁵ Kontos, *Δάση και πολιτισμός ιδία εν Ελλάδι*, 122.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 132–33.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 169.

In the first decades of the twentieth century there was evidence that the country was indeed changing, both culturally and economically, in a way conducive to forest protection. Concerning the former, a number of books appeared with the expressed aim to “educate” or “elucidate” the general public concerning the condition of the Greek forests and the threats they were facing, and they were not just written by the Greek foresters mentioned above. For example, Adolf Stengel, head of the Austrian Forestry Mission to Greece, considering that “changing the common perception [about forests] is as important as the direct protection of forests through relevant laws and institutions”, published a booklet (1914) aiming to “instruct and elucidate, even by little, the general public” about the importance of Greece’s forests.⁶⁹ And in his book, Stengel did not fail to stress the detrimental effects of goats – and nomadic grazing – on forests.⁷⁰ Similarly, the Greek Friends of the Forest Union – established in 1899 by Samios and presided over by Crown Princess Sophia of Greece – alongside its public lectures and reforestation events had also been publishing informative booklets, therein presenting the necessary measures to reach a

compromise between grazing and the existence and wellbeing of the forest ... this compromise would be easier when our animal husbandry is systematically improved. Then the goats, this formidable enemy of the forests, will be limited mainly to shrubland ... and goat grazing in the forests will also be substantially restricted.⁷¹

Yet the most important change was the one occurring in the “arrangement of the country’s economic and land production”, which Kontos was seeking in 1906. Between 1912 and 1922, following a series of military triumphs and disasters, Greece had changed completely. In 1907 the country’s surface was 63,211 square kilometres, with a population of 2,631,952 people; by 1928 these figures were 129,281 and 6,204,684, respectively.⁷² This was due to the annexation of the regions of Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, the Aegean islands and Crete to the Greek Kingdom as well as to the influx of over 1.2 million refugees following the ill-fated Asia Minor Campaign.⁷³ The Greek state responded to this population challenge with a radical land reform programme and by protecting and intensifying/modernising agricultural production. Thus, the large estates

⁶⁹ Adolf Stengel, *Η σημασία του δάσους: Ιδία εν Ελλάδι*, trans. Iraklis Diamantopoulos (Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1914), 6–7.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 28–31.

⁷¹ Fillodasiki Enosis, *Δια τα δάση μας* (Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1914), 8.

⁷² Kostis, *Τα κακομαθημένα παιδιά της ιστορίας*, 604.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 610.

(chifliks) were dissolved and their land distributed to small owners, refugees included, while a number of state interventions (such as irrigation and drainage projects, the creation of agricultural cooperatives and the establishment of the Agriculture Ministry (1917) and Agricultural Bank (1929), the introduction of cash crops, fertilisers, new machinery as well as the state-protectionism of agricultural production – with the aim of achieving “grain-sufficiency”⁷⁴ – gave a major boost to Greek agriculture, which had been suffering from the effects of the global agricultural crisis of the interwar period.⁷⁵ Between 1923 and 1938 the cultivated area increased by 90 percent, representing 18 percent of the country’s total area in 1939, tree plantations not included; the number of farmers increased (from 38.7 percent of the economically active population in 1907 to 52 percent in 1928); while in over just 5 years (1923–1928) the country’s agricultural production increased by 67 percent – with agriculture representing 34.8 percent of the Greek national income in 1929.⁷⁶

The gains of Greece’s agriculture had occurred at the injury of the open-air animal husbandry. As shown in Figure 1, the number of sheep and goats stagnated, as the area under cultivation expanded.⁷⁷ Dimitris Syrakis, an agronomist and general inspector for agriculture, having toured “the animal-grazing regions of the country (Thessaly, Macedonia, Epirus, Central Greece)” in 1923, reported a bleak picture of the condition of transhumant shepherds. He noted that the wars and the establishment of national borders effectively ended the Greek nomadic herds’ freedom of movement to pasturelands in the neighbouring countries, intensifying even further the pressure transhumant husbandry was facing due to the lack of summer (that is, mountain) grazing grounds in Greek Macedonia and Thrace.⁷⁸ The nomadic herds has thus become even more dependent on the lowland areas for grazing at the very time that these areas were fast reducing. The old chiflik lands in Thessaly and Macedonia were distributed to hundreds and thousands of individual farmers, while the previously fallow/uncultivated lands – traditionally used as grazing grounds –

⁷⁴ Cf. Vasilis Patronis, *Ελληνική οικονομική ιστορία* (Athens: Kallipos, Open Academic Publications, 2015), available through: <https://hdl.handle.net/11419/1700>.

⁷⁵ See Spyridon Ploumidis, “Η ελληνική αγροτική κρίση του Μεσοπολέμου (Δεκ. 1920): Κοινωνικές διαστάσεις της οικονομολογικής σκέψης επί της κρίσης,” *Δωδώνη* 38–42 (2008–2013): 303–39.

⁷⁶ Patronis, *Ελληνική οικονομική ιστορία*, 172–73.

⁷⁷ Konstantinos Kinnas and Nikolaos Mousmoutis, *Το κτηνοτροφικόν πρόβλημα της Ελλάδος* (Athens: Stampa, 1940), 42.

⁷⁸ Dimitris Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” *Δελτίον γεωργικών της Ελληνικής Γεωργικής Εταιρείας* 12, no. 169 (1925): 743–53.

were employed for settling refugees from Asia Minor.⁷⁹ Furthermore, the revenue earned from cultivating the lowlands was fast catching up with that created through grazing: in 1914 chiflik owners could anticipate a revenue of around 2 golden drachmas per stremma a year for renting their lands for grazing, compared to 1-1.5 drachmas through shared-farming (*επίμορτος γεωργία*);⁸⁰ by 1923 the two were almost at par, and Syrakis projected that, with agriculture becoming “more intensive, cultivating not only cereals but also other plants as well as industrial plants such as tobacco etc.”, the income through farming would soon surpass the earnings from letting fields for grazing.⁸¹




Figure 1. Number of sheep and goats and cultivated area in Greece, in stremmata (1 stremma equals 0.1 hectare). The data on animals for 1923–1928 is from General Statistics Service of Greece, *Στατιστική Επετηρίς της Ελλάδος* (1930) and for 1929–1938 from General Statistics Service of Greece, *Ετήσια Γεωργική Στατιστική της Ελλάδος* (1929; 1930) and *Ετήσια Γεωργική και Κτηνοτροφική Στατιστική της Ελλάδος* (1931–1938). The date on the cultivated area is from Konstantinos Kinnas and Nikolaos Mousmoutis, *Το κτηνοτροφικόν πρόβλημα της Ελλάδος* (Athens: Stampa, 1940), 42.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 754–55.

⁸⁰ Petros Kontos, *Δάση και κτηνοτροφία εις τήν Ελλάδα: Από οικονομικής και πολιτικής απόψεως* (Thessaloniki: Typ. M. Triantafyllou, 1932), 29; Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” 746.

⁸¹ Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” 745–46.

As available, and necessary, pastureland was becoming scarcer, the age-old confrontation between farmers and herders intensified. Clashes, even deadly ones, between farmers and herders – when the latter’s animals drifted into the former’s plantations – as well as between herders themselves, for contested pastures, had always occurred,⁸² but the cataclysmic developments of the 1920s made things worse. “The goat is not animal husbandry,” one newspaper wrote in 1919, “but a curse on the vegetation ... now that the expanse of [the country’s] plantations has reached 13,548 hectares, the goats must be further removed from the cultivated fields.”⁸³ A year later, the same newspaper complained that no measures had ever been taken for protecting fields from the free-roaming goats, which, quipped the writer, “have introduced bolshevism [to Greece] by abolishing all property rights! Or at least agricultural rights!”⁸⁴ Furthermore, in 1925 Syrakis reported that the newly established farmers were strategically trying to push the transhumant shepherds out of the contested lands, either by not letting for grazing their excess/fallow fields – although they could thus secure extra revenue⁸⁵ – or by cultivating areas close and around the nomadic shepherds’ temporary camps in order to block the latter’s movement.⁸⁶

While agriculture was pushing the goats out of lowland pastures, the foresters were trying to fend them off the mountainous forested ones – with mixed results. “Regarding the goats,” remarked Anastasios Stefanou, chief forester for Thrace, in 1928, “an issue which is a disgrace for today’s civilisation and still remains unresolved ... particularly in our country, I shamefully admit – since I am also a forester – that our [state] Forestry Agency has failed to remove the goats even from the good, so-called, fir forests.”⁸⁷ Yet this did not mean that the goats were grazing unrestricted in all the country’s forests. In 1932, Kontos, who had twice served as the head of the Forestry Agency and was now a professor at the newly established School of Forestry at the University of Thessaloniki, wrote that grazing was prohibited in 23 percent of all forested areas (or 38 percent of the precious fir as well as beech and oak deciduous forests) of Greece – excluding the island of Euboea – for a variety of reasons (for example, natural regrowth, reforestation, following forest fires, etc.).⁸⁸ More particularly, in 31 percent of the

⁸² *Εμπρός*, 18 March 1901 and 18 July 1913.

⁸³ *Εμπρός*, 17 December 1919.

⁸⁴ *Εμπρός*, 5 September 1920.

⁸⁵ Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” 757–58.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 759.

⁸⁷ Anastasios Stefanou, *Το δάσος που λαχτάριζες* (Athens: self-pub, 1928 [1974]), 135.

⁸⁸ Kontos, *Δάση και κτηνοτροφία εις τήν Ελλάδα*, 10–11.

total prohibited area, the ban applied *only* to goats.⁸⁹ As Kontos explicitly states, around half of the grazing restrictions were imposed for the forests' "natural regrowth – that is for directly economic reasons".⁹⁰ He then offered a long and detailed comparison of what a forested hectare may contribute to national income if used as pasture compared to being exploited for its forest products, reaching the conclusion that, in certain circumstances, the latter could be more profitable even for individual, profit-minded, forest proprietors.⁹¹ Thus, according to Kontos, the "natural" development, based on hard economic figures, would be for the nomadic goat grazing in forests to be drastically curtailed:

Neither fires nor rapacious tree felling harms the Greek forests as much as goat grazing since natural reforestation would fix this damage if this was not prevented by the grazing goatherds.

This should not imply that it is necessary to immediately remove all goats from all Greek forests ... there exist great areas with evergreen broadleaf [trees] ... which may chiefly be exploited only through goat grazing ...

The goat is the cow of the poor farmer of the [era of the] natural economy. At an advanced stage of the cash economy, when the issue is about [producing] high volumes of milk, the rearing of cows in stables is recommended. At this stage the goat is expelled from the more fertile lands of the meadows – which are cultivated through plantations of olives, chestnuts, locust trees – as well as from the most fertile forests of fir, black pine and deciduous oak, chestnut and beech.

Thus with the progress of the national economy the goat is restricted to the status of either a domestic, milk-producing animal, the cow of the poor farmer, fed by the plants of its master's fields and gardens or grazing in the communal meadows, or to a herder's animal [living] in the barren and rocky tree-covered meadows or in poor forests with little wood production, [that is] in places where goat herding is necessary for exploiting the productive potential of the forest.⁹²

As for the nomadic shepherds, at least the smaller ones, they "should settle down in villages and acquire a house and land to plant crops and trees, and ... graze their animals in the nearby communal or public lands, by paying a reasonable rent".⁹³

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 9.

⁹¹ Ibid., 17–34.

⁹² Ibid., 36–37.

⁹³ Ibid., 75.

Accordingly, for the Greek foresters of the first half of the twentieth century, the problem of goat grazing in the forests was an indication of Greece's developmental lag vis-à-vis other "civilised countries". The Greek forested area was far smaller than in other European countries, amounting to just 14 percent of its total area, when "due to [Greece's] mountainous and rocky terrain, this percentage should have been at least 50 percent", as lamented Stefanou, now reforestation inspector at the Agriculture Ministry, in 1933.⁹⁴ This was one of the reasons why domestic production could not meet the country's needs in wood, resulting in millions of drachmas spent on imports.⁹⁵ The other reason was that the Greek forests were not "high forests", thus their production was less than half that of the European ones or much worse.⁹⁶ This economically suboptimal situation was due to the fact that Greek agriculture and animal husbandry, because of their primitive character, had used the forests as an easy target. As one observer noted, "the forest expanses are squatted to be cultivated or grazed".⁹⁷ Of all the threats facing forests, the most formidable one was the goat – since it would devour almost every piece of greenery it could reach. Another alarming fact was that the number of goats was steadily rising (fig. 2) and Greece had the highest density in Europe: in 1865, the country had 1.2 goats per person and 0.48 goats per hectare;⁹⁸ in 1936 it was still top of the list, with 0.79 goats per person and 0.42 goats per hectare (next in line were Turkey and Bulgaria, with 0.59 and 0.13 goats per hectare, respectively).⁹⁹ Thus "it is impossible for the goat and the precious forests – such as the wood-producing forests of fir, [black] pine, oak and beech – to co-exist".¹⁰⁰ Accordingly, the goat had to be removed from these (highly profitable) forests, either through increased taxation, which would make other animals more appealing, or through further restrictions. The state had to take the necessary measures

⁹⁴ Anastasios Stefanou, *Αι δρυάδες των αρχαίων ελλήνων και τα δάση των νεοτέρων* (Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1933), 12.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 12–13; Ioannis Kokkinis, *Η σημερινή κατάσταση των δασών και η δασική πολιτική του μέλλοντος* (Athens, Ethniko Typografeio, 1934), 5–6, 80.

⁹⁶ Panagiotis Zervas, *Τα ελληνικά δάση: Η σύστασις των, η σημασία των, η διοίκησις των, τα προϊόντα των, η θήρα, η ιχθυοκομία μας* (Athens: Typ. N. Apatsidi, 1932), 29.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹⁸ Alexandros Mansolas, *Πολιτειακαί πληροφορίαί περί Ελλάδος* (Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1867), 89.

⁹⁹ Panagiotis Dekazos, *Το κτηνοτροφικόν ζήτημα της Ελλάδος* (Athens: Typ. N. Apatsidi, 1940), 185.

¹⁰⁰ Stefanou, *Αι δρυάδες των αρχαίων ελλήνων*, 22.

to assist the two social groups mostly affected, the shepherds of the large transhumant herds and the peasants, to deal with the new situation. The former, who “as God’s creatures have a right to live and as Greek citizens have the same claims and rights, the same way the state requires of them the same obligations as the rest of Greeks”. Instead, they were “daily reduced to misery” by “the agricultural law and the settlement of the refugees”, according to the sympathetic Syrakis.¹⁰¹ They should be helped in their transition to a settled agro-pastoralist life – for the Greek-speaking Sarakatsans, in the newly established northern frontier of Macedonia for obvious national security reasons, according to one general inspector of forests,¹⁰² otherwise “the worst and most likely scenario, since they are mostly a crude mass [of people] not knowing and incapable of something else, is that they will turn to robbery and banditry at the expense of the rest of society”.¹⁰³ Concerning the peasants, whose flocks most foresters viewed as the real danger to forests,¹⁰⁴ Kontos in 1932 proposed compensating them, for a period of up to 10 years, for losing the privilege to freely graze their animals in the “precious, state forests of Greece”.¹⁰⁵ It is worth keeping in mind that Greece did not lack a legal framework regulating grazing in forests. Indeed, as Kontos demonstrated by listing the existing legal provisions, grazing was restricted/banned, for a number of reasons, in a substantial percentage of Greek forests.¹⁰⁶ Yet what was new was the idea that the state should completely ban a specific animal

¹⁰¹ Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” 765.

¹⁰² Antonis Andrianopoulos, *Πως θα αναδασωθεί η Ελλάς* (Athens: Typ. Deli kai Tsipi, 1929), 10–11.

¹⁰³ Syrakis, “Η νομαδική κτηνοτροφία εν Ελλάδι,” 762.

¹⁰⁴ Kontos rightly notes the number of nomadic animals is much smaller than that of sedentary ones, and they may more easily be driven away from the forests which would come under protection (*Δάση και κτηνοτροφία εις τήν Ελλάδα*, 73). To that extent see, for example, the telegram sent to the crown prince by the inhabitants of one village in Achaia: “Your Highness’ stewards’ decision to destroy 100,000-tree forest [in the prince’s estates] ... has driven the peasants to despair, since felling this forest will result to the banning of grazing for their 20,000 animals. We beg your highness to order accordingly so that the peasants may be saved, since they have no other place where to graze their animals” (*Σκριπ*, 17 September 1898). Needless to add that the settled peasants had also the political networks to block any protective measures: “Only God can imagine, the complaints that the Forestry Agency and the Agriculture Ministry had received from shepherds, other magnates, various party cadres and politicians, when they issued a ban on grazing the barren Ymittos mountain in Athens,” Stefanou recounted, in *Το δάσος που λαχτάριζες*, 137.

¹⁰⁵ Kontos, *Δάση και κτηνοτροφία εις τήν Ελλάδα*, 91.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 85–90.

from the country's forests. "We should enforce this on [the goat shepherds]," noted Kokkinis, a former head of the Forestry Agency.

By law we should require the removal or replacement of goats from all the regions and villages where the aforementioned precious forests are found ... within five years. The goat should go and be permanently settled on the bushy pastures of the lowlands. There, and only there, is its place.



Figure 2. Goats and sheep in Greece. Data sources: 1852–1865 (Alexandros Mansolas, *Πολιτειακαί πληροφοριαί περί Ελλάδος* [Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1867]); 1875 (Alexandros Mansolas, *La Grèce à l'exposition universelle de Paris en 1878: Notions statistiques, catalogue des exposants* [Athens: Philocalie, 1878], 89); 1880 (*Εφημερίς Συζητήσεων της Βουλής*, 15 April 1882, 423); 1891 (Ioannis Vlassis, *Στατιστική της εν Ελλάδι κτηνοτροφίας* [Athens: Typ. S. Vlastou, 1905], 34); 1911–1928 (General Statistics Service of Greece, *Ετήσια Γεωργική Στατιστική της Ελλάδος* [1930]); 1929–1938 (General Statistics Service of Greece, *Ετήσια Γεωργική Στατιστική της Ελλάδος* [1929; 1930] and *Ετήσια Γεωργική και Κτηνοτροφική Στατιστική της Ελλάδος* [annual reports for 1931–1938]).

Goats and the Metaxas Regime

As mentioned in the introduction, the law the foresters had sought – instituting a total ban on goat grazing – came into force in early 1936, through a decree. And while the new prime minister, Metaxas, gave an assurance that the law would be reconsidered and debated through the normal parliamentary process, this was not going to happen as parliament was suspended a week later until the autumn.

It would never reconvene. On 4 August 1936, Metaxas – in collaboration with the king – staged his own coup d'état, establishing an authoritarian, semi-fascist regime.

Yet Metaxas did not forget about the goats. In late 1936, the new agriculture minister, Georgios Kyriakos, an agronomist and member of the Academy of Athens, invited Kontos to take over – for the third time – at the helm of the Forestry Agency.¹⁰⁷ Almost immediately, Kontos issued instructions to the country's Forestry Offices (*Δασαρχεία*) to implement the decree – which Metaxas had said would be reconsidered – on prohibiting goat grazing in forests – and with a vengeance. Now goats were to be gradually banned from any forest comprising at least 50 percent fir. The application of the ban would come into effect on 23 April 1937 and was to be fully implemented by 23 April 1941, the pace depending both on the region as well as on the ratio of fir forests to total grazing grounds in each area.¹⁰⁸ In September 1937, these instructions and other provisions were enshrined in Obligatory Law 875/1937.¹⁰⁹ Thus, the Agriculture Ministry was to authorise special grazing areas for the domestic animals of local communities while the cutting of branches from forest trees to be used as fodder (*κλάρισμα*) was banned. Local government, police and forestry authorities were allowed to issue a number of restrictions or bans concerning the grazing of any animal in “state and private forests, partially forested meadows, and mountainous grass meadows” for a variety of reasons, while goat herders owing 80 to 200 animals and wealth of less than 50,000 drachmas, were to be given – if they slaughtered their animals – up to 1.5 hectares of public lands for cultivation (or 3 hectares for planting fruit-bearing trees).¹¹⁰ As Grispos rightly notes, the result was that virtually all forested areas in the country were no longer available for free grazing.¹¹¹

Although they were the inspiration of Kontos, these measures were of course fully endorsed by his political supervisors. Metaxas publicly defended the restrictions on goat grazing in a number of public speeches. Speaking in December 1936 at the inauguration of an irrigation project in the Thessalian plain, he noted that “every family must ... produce the necessary fodder for the development of indoor (*οικόσιτος*) animal husbandry ... since you well realise

¹⁰⁷ Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 296, 330.

¹⁰⁸ *Ελεύθερον Βήμα*, 29 March 1937.

¹⁰⁹ “Αναγκαστικός Νόμος 875 περί βοσκής εντός δασών, μερικών δασοσκεπών εκτάσεων και μη πεδικών χορτολιβαδίων,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 379A, 28 September 1937, 2465.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 297.

that the time of nomadic animal husbandry is little by little passing away”.¹¹² In Arta in June 1937, commenting on plans to regulate the flow of the local river, he asked peasants “to conserve the forests around the rivers. Obey the measures we will take for preserving the forests, since without forested mountainous areas ... the rivers will bring down ... rocks and pebbles”.¹¹³ And more forcefully, little over a month after Obligatory Law 875/1937 came into force, Metaxas – speaking on the occasion of yet another river project and stressing the importance of forests in preserving the works – declared in October 1937 that this may only happen by controlling “the rearing of goats, which bring about a terrible disaster”:

I know that by thus saying I may not be pleasing to the majority, since the goat is an animal which costs nothing to its owner and gives him so much – milk, cheese, skin, hair and so on. Yet the disaster [the goat causes] is also great. Goat rearing and forests cannot possibly coexist. We must decide which one of the two we prefer. The forest or the goat? We must choose. I do not mean that the inhabitant of the mountainous areas should lose a mean of his sustenance. Share [your goats] among yourselves, swap or sell [them], keep a number which may be fed at your home, your hut, your village dwelling, not in the forests ... The forests, now that I’m speaking to you, I do consider the forests only in terms of the common good. I do not consider them as the natural decoration of our land, [I’m not] looking forward to the nice sight they offer, but I consider them in terms of their usefulness in meeting so many human needs ... [Once the forests return, among others] the rivers will stop destroying the plain, that most beautiful of places, which mainly provides the means of life.¹¹⁴

This strong position against goats was received with mixed feelings by the various stakeholders. *Δασική Ζωή* – a magazine published by the younger generation of foresters and pitched to the wider public interested in forests¹¹⁵ – republished an extract of Metaxas’ speech on its front page, noting that

the understanding, by the whole of the society, of that paramount truth [that is, that “goat rearing and forests cannot coexist”] is an important achievement of the Forestry Agency. They who have fought for this achievement, who know what sacrifices this victory entailed, they have every right to be merry and proud of this felicitous result.¹¹⁶

¹¹² Ioannis Metaxas, *Λόγοι και Σκέψεις 1936–1941*, vol. 1, 1936–1938 (Athens: Govosti, 1969), 142. First published 1937.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 210.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 256–57.

¹¹⁵ Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 321–22.

¹¹⁶ *Δασική Ζωή*, July–September 1937, 124.

For others, forest destruction had been blamed on the wrong culprit. In a humorous article written by “a prominent veterinarian”, the goat defended itself by claiming that

I am not the enemy of your forests. Someone else is – and you know him too well ... It is you, the people: the peasants, the charcoal burners, the lumberjacks, the [pine] resin collectors and so many other uneducated [people] and exploiters of your forest wealth.¹¹⁷

The author added the time-long argument that a great part of the barren Greek terrain could only be exploited through goats; abolishing them would reduce the national income. Kontos himself replied to these criticisms, pointing out that goats would continue to graze in those areas that could not be otherwise exploited, but not in the forests. Forested areas, reforested and scientifically managed, would provide an income “ten to twenty times higher than the one achieved from goat grazing”.¹¹⁸ In similar vein, Kyriakos, the agriculture minister, in his 1940 account of the country’s forest policy under the Metaxas regime, wrote:

Many protested against this law ... claiming that the well-thought reduction [of goats] amounts to their total extermination and the ruin of a great national revenue ... In the Land of Pan, the goats will not be exterminated. They enjoy, and will continue to enjoy, vast areas of bushes and shrubs, one third of the country’s total area ... in the provinces [goats] are already being profitably replaced, especially by sheep, cows and even pigs [grazing] in the oak forests. Freed from the goats, the forests are returning an equal, if not higher, revenue compared to goat grazing, even in their current condition; surely, as they improve over time, they will return five times greater, while the most precious among them, such as the sylvan reserves (*δρυμοί*), [will return] even ten times greater.¹¹⁹

Yet the reality on the ground seemed to have been quite gloomy for goats and their owners. The magazine for the Greek Society for the Protection of Animals reported in December 1937 that “we are informed that following the decision to totally exterminate the goats by 1941, pregnant and ready-to-give-birth goats are being slaughtered daily, having little kids – which in most cases are about to be born – removed from their wombs.”¹²⁰ In 1939, an agronomist, Christos Vasmatzidis, quoting reports from some regional prefects in support

¹¹⁷ *Ελεύθερον Βήμα*, 25 December 1937.

¹¹⁸ *Δασική Ζωή*, January 1938, 7.

¹¹⁹ Georgios Kyriakos, *Δασική πολιτική άλλωτε και τώρα* (Athens: Agriculture Ministry, 1940), 24.

¹²⁰ *Ο φίλος των ζώων*, no. 31, December 1937, 82. The name of the organisation was Εταιρεία Προστασίας των Ζώων.

of his claims,¹²¹ concluded that locally specific transition plans had not been developed – and thus the breaking up of the nomadic herds created

total anarchy [in the countryside], with every dissolved little local economic unit – being deprived of the framework necessary for its survival and development and feeling that it is choking [to death] – crying in despair and asking to be saved by the continuous assistance and protection of the Agricultural Bank or any other authority.¹²²

Thus the number of goats dropped drastically (fig. 2). Official statistics show a 20-percent reduction in the number of goats between 1936 and 1938 (compared to just a 3.5-percent drop in the number of sheep), and their numbers surely fell even further over the following years. Though some authors claim that goats were eventually completely eliminated (for example, Grispos claims that all of Greece’s “approximately 5 million goats were slaughtered between 1939 and 1940, with no benefit to the national economy”),¹²³ no official data supporting this extreme statement has come to light.

Conclusion

The proscription of goats in interwar Greece was the end result of the wish to “modernise” the Greek countryside, advocated by a professional body, the foresters, and espoused by an ideological camp, the authoritarian Metaxas regime. Greek foresters, desperate to save the country’s forests from decline, had for years campaigned against this particular animal. Surely, and the foresters never ceased to stress this, the forests were suffering from a number of other causes, including arson, slash-and-burn agriculture and unauthorized logging. Yet, all these were punishable under law, while (goat) grazing in forests was a *legitimate* activity and one which, due to the sheer number of the animals and the structure of the Greek peasant economy, had – in the foresters’ view – the most negative effect on the forest. In 1906, Samios, the head of the Forestry Agency, calculated that fires, clearing and encroachment resulted in the loss of approximately 9,000 hectares of state forests per year; grazing alone, which “totally deforests or degrades the forest vegetation”, was responsible for a loss of at least 10,000 hectares.¹²⁴

¹²¹ Christos Vasmatazidis, *Η τεχνική και οικονομική της αιγοτροφίας εν Ελλάδι* (Athens: Flamma, 1939), 6–8.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 51. See also Georgoulas Beikos, *Η λαϊκή εξουσία στην ελεύθερη Ελλάδα*, vol. 1 (Athens: Themelio, 1979) for a personal account on the impact of the goat ban.

¹²³ Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 297.

¹²⁴ Samios, *Το μέλλον των ελληνικών δασών*, 230–31.

While acknowledging that the damage caused to forests was due to the primitive and underdeveloped character of Greek agriculture and animal husbandry, and that it would fade away as the country developed, the Greek foresters of the early twentieth century could not simply wait for the tide of time to change everything. Not least because this structural change could come too late for the Greek forests. Thus, Samios gloomily forecast in 1906 that, if nothing changed, within 25 years half of Greece's forests would be lost, resulting in disastrous river flooding and with detrimental effects on the country's forest revenue, cultivation, climate and public health.¹²⁵ Therefore, foresters embarked on a campaign to persuade the ruling elites to take the necessary measures to speed up the "modernisation" of the country, a development which would set Greece on higher cultural level and would also provide higher revenues. Regulating grazing in the forests – and, in effect, the animal husbandry of the country – was a pivotal aspect of this campaign. It is important to note that the foresters were very keen to demarcate forest grazing as *their* scientific turf, in a conscious attempt to legitimise their role in dealing with it. For example, the February 1936 editorial of *Δασική Ζωή*, titled "Animal husbandry and forestry", which appeared in the midst of the reactions following the recent ban on goat grazing in fir forests, argued that regulating "nomadic animal husbandry" was part of foresters' "mandate and specialisation" and was not to be left to agronomists and veterinarians.¹²⁶

Greek foresters were also aware that the political establishment was not receptive to their calls. Listing the reasons "why, to date, the state has not given the proper attention to the forests", Samios in 1906 included parliamentarism, which was operating in a society not yet "perfected" enough to produce voters and MPs capable of "comprehending and appreciating [and] putting [the common good] above their own interest".¹²⁷ Over 20 years later, Samios' successor as head of the Forestry Agency, Kontos, in the second edition of his 1929 book on forest policy, retained his original 1910 prologue that asked rhetorically: "Who would be that national political man and which would be that parliament ... that would seek to ... implement the policy necessary ... for forest production [to] be cleansed and rejuvenated?"¹²⁸ And the answer, obvious yet unuttered, was: no one. The electoral power of the country's agro-pastoralist communities was so great that no elected MP would dare to limit the herds'

¹²⁵ Ibid., 232–34.

¹²⁶ *Δασική Ζωή*, February 1936, 21. Emphasis in the original.

¹²⁷ Samios, *Το μέλλον των ελληνικών δασών*, 64.

¹²⁸ Petros Kontos, *Δασική πολιτική ιδία εν Ελλάδι, μετά στοιχείων αγροτικής πολιτικής*, 2nd expanded ed. (Athens: Typ. P.D. Sakellariou, 1929)

sylvan domains. It is quite telling that on the day after the 1936 elections, the *Έθνος* newspaper, still unaware of the fact that such a legal measure had *indeed* been taken by the caretaker government two days earlier and on the eve of the elections, commented: “We are saddened that [the Agriculture Ministry] has left to pass so many opportunities for [enabling] obligatory laws, without taking any measure to get rid of the goats, these bad demons of our forests.”¹²⁹ A couple of weeks later, the minister responsible for introducing the aforementioned obligatory law, Benakis, stated in an interview that this extra-parliamentary move was necessary since MPs, who were under pressure from their constituents, would not dare to vote such a measure.¹³⁰

In Metaxas the foresters’ quest found not only someone who had no parliamentary or electoral worries but also a man who ardently wished to “modernise” Greece – or, to be more precise, to develop it. In the Metaxas regime’s discourse, outdoor and transhumant grazing (of goats) was a relic of the past that had to be swept away, both for economic as well as cultural reasons. Babis Alivizatos, secretary general of the Agriculture Ministry, opined in 1937 that “at the level of economic and industrial civilisation that [our] country has now reached, it is no longer possible to continue exploiting the forest in the current way [through grazing]”; the revenue from grazing was much lower than what could be earned “even through the smallest forest exploitation”, that of taking firewood, thus “change is necessary, both from a national and an economic perspective”.¹³¹ While Kyriakos, the agriculture minister, complained in 1940 that

the great increase of the number of goats especially over the last 30 years has not only been a public danger to the forests and to the tree plantations of the country, but it has also discredited Greece, since foreigners could see that [our country] held the record for goat grazing among all other European countries, etc., and thus found herself at the lowest level of civilisation.¹³²

Metaxas himself shared these views concerning the suboptimal economic returns from transhumant animal husbandry, but his interest in forest preservation was quite different from the foresters’ emphasis on the economic value of

¹²⁹ *Έθνος*, 27 January 1936.

¹³⁰ *ΕΣΒ*, 28 April 1936, 84. See also n. 104.

¹³¹ Babis Alivizatos, *Κράτος και γεωργική πολιτική* (Athens: Agriculture Ministry, 1937), 432–33. According to the Agriculture Ministry, the revenue from goat grazing amounted to 2 drachmas per hectare compared to 100 drachmas/hectare and 30 drachmas/hectare for oak and fir forests, respectively. Figures from *Αγροτική Ηχώ*, 1 January 1938.

¹³² Kyriakos, *Δασική πολιτική*, 23.

forests. In his public speeches, Metaxas explicitly related the protection of the forests to what he considered the basis of Greece's national wealth and survival: agriculture. Frequently mentioning that his parents and grandparents were farmers – and of being proud of that – Metaxas, who was declared the country's "First Farmer" in July 1937,¹³³ never failed to stress the importance of agriculture for the nation's wellbeing. At one speech in 1937 he argued that the nation could double its population in the years to come "and still live happily within its current frontiers as long as we cultivate the land in a scientific, and systematic, and intensive, persistent way".¹³⁴ In May 1938 he claimed that "there is no way of creating wealth in Greece other than agriculture".¹³⁵ Thus, in his public addresses he very often drew a causal line between banning goats, conserving forests, avoiding torrents and landslides, and, consequently, protecting cultivated lands.¹³⁶ Addressing a farmers conference in December 1937, he noted that "it is impossible for large-scale animal husbandry [that is, nomadic large herds] to continue forever while agriculture develops in the way it will develop in Greece". He went on to proclaim that "it is impossible for the goat to coexist with modern civilisation".¹³⁷ And for Metaxas, this "modern civilisation" encompassed both the modernising hydraulic/irrigation projects his government was planning but also the newly cultivated lowlands, the asset which would safeguard Greece's survival and future: both of them risked being destroyed by the torrents coming down from the goat-deforested mountains.¹³⁸ It is in this light that Metaxas' most famous saying regarding goats, from a speech he gave while turning the first sod for yet another dam-reservoir in August 1939, should be interpreted:

For the goat we have been doing what we can and we will restrict it. I am very sorry and saddened for the herders who have such animals, which have such a frugal diet, need so little and return so much. Yet [by doing thus] the destruction ceased. If we had let the goat free, there would be no trees, all these would not exist, [this] area would have been covered by pebbles and sand. And there would be no Greeks in Greece – just goats. This is something that you certainly do not want; it is better to reduce [the number of goats] so that people may live.¹³⁹

¹³³ Marina Petrakis, *The Metaxas Myth: Dictatorship and Propaganda in Greece* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2006), 52.

¹³⁴ Metaxas, *Λόγοι και Σκέψεις*, 209.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 369.

¹³⁶ See his speeches on 16 June 1937 and 31 October 1937.

¹³⁷ Metaxas, *Λόγοι και Σκέψεις*, 302.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ Ioannis Metaxas, *Λόγοι και Σκέψεις 1936–1941*, vol. 2, 1939–1941 (Athens: Govosti, 1969), 129–30. First published 1939.

Once the Greek foresters' modernising agenda fitted with Metaxas' vision of the "new" Greece, the fate of goat grazing in forests was sealed. Yet the decision to drive out the millions of Greek goats within the span of just four years rests mainly with Kontos, the most prominent forester of his generation. Grispos, recalling his time under Kontos in the Forestry Agency, recounts how he told his supervisor that the phasing out of goats could have been extended over a longer period, in order to spare the waste of such a valuable animal capital: "Kontos answered: 'Yes, surely it could be done, yet we must hurry since we do not know how short-lived this government may be – and we will never again get an opportunity such as this one.'"¹⁴⁰ Grispos blames Kontos' ego for this hasty procedure: "Kontos was interested in connecting his name with such a cultural scheme. Because banning goat rearing in Greece was neither a forestry nor an agricultural issue, but a broader cultural one."¹⁴¹ But Grispos seems to underestimate the fact that, precisely because this was *indeed* a "broader cultural" issue, the ban could not come soon enough for those primarily involved: the foresters' community (and Kontos), who had been fighting for a generation to "educate" the Greeks on the importance of their forests, and the Metaxas regime, which was eager to create the "New State". Furthermore, the 1930s had been a period when "protecting the green" featured highly both in the social and political agendas. This is corroborated by the increase in the number of articles in the press and the holding of relevant conferences,¹⁴² the proliferation of branches of the Friends of the Forest Union around Greece (numbering 124 in 1930)¹⁴³ as well as by the promotion of reforestation by the Metaxas regime.¹⁴⁴ Next to them were other stakeholders for which the removal of the goats from the Greek forests was an economic priority. Thus, in May 1936, the board of the Greek Electricity Companies Union publicly defended Agriculture Minister Benakis' decree banning goat grazing, noting that:

Especially for the electrical economy of the country and the general development of the standard of living of the Greek people ... to maintain goat grazing is truly disastrous since, as long as it exists, [the development of] any hydraulic projects can be ruled out; and they are the national electrical economy's only future alternative [if] the country is to break free of its dependence on foreign [providers].¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Grispos, *Δασική ιστορία της νεωτέρας Ελλάδος*, 297.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 298.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 294–95.

¹⁴³ Stefanos Maris, *Αι αναδασώσεις* (Athens: Agriculture Ministry, 1931), 63–67.

¹⁴⁴ Petrakis, *Metaxas Myth*, 111–14.

¹⁴⁵ Quoted in *Δασική Ζωή*, August–September 1936, 154

In this context, dealing with what had been framed as the “scourge”, “destroyer”, “demon” and “Satan” of forests could not have been anything other than a matter of urgency.

Thus, starting in late 1936, the expulsion of goats from Greek forests progressed in what seemed an inexorable way. In 1939, a newspaper, commenting on the decision to ban live goat imports in Greece, wrote that “little by little the goat is convicted to extinction. One day it will exist no more, but only in our parlance, as a metaphor and a taunt against ugliness – *goats*.”¹⁴⁶ The milestone was set for 23 April 1941, by when the elimination of goats from Greek fir forests was to be completed. Yet, when the day arrived, Metaxas and Kontos were dead while Greece itself was breathing its last as a free state, following its invasion by Nazi Germany on 6 April. The goat survived them all, and by 2022 some 30 percent of the goats in the EU (about 3.1 million) could be found in Greece – but not in the country’s forests, where they had dwelt since antiquity.¹⁴⁷

University of the Aegean

¹⁴⁶ Σκριπ, 23 May 1939, emphasis in the original.

¹⁴⁷ Goats population: Annual data, Eurostat, accessed 22 February 2023, <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/bookmark/619ff223-695f-4ffa-a34e-72dbf7032c19>.

IS THERE OIL IN GREECE? OIL EXPLORATION AND SCIENTIFIC
CONFLICT DURING THE FIRST YEARS OF THE GREEK GEOLOGICAL
SURVEY (1917–1925)

*Christos Karampatsos, Spyros Tzokas,
Giorgos Velegrakis and Gelina Harlaftis*

ABSTRACT: When Konstantinos Ktenas and Georgios Georgalas, the two most prominent interwar Greek geologists, began their respective careers around 1910, they were already enmeshed in a tense occupational and scientific conflict. The following decade, fraught with war and political upheaval, acted as a powerful “context of motivation” for their research and occupational strategies. The result was a host of scientific and institutional endeavours such as the founding of a Greek Geological Survey, the first attempts to assess the Greek lignite deposits, and involvement in consecutive oil exploration attempts that took place in Epirus between 1920 and 1937. As it turns out, the confrontational relation between the two geologists was actually productive. It signalled the emergence of a Greek geological community. It institutionalised the relations between this geological community and the Greek state. Most importantly, it produced a fusion of geological knowledge, tacit political calculation and obscure rhetoric that still remains in use to define the “reality” of the “Greek oil deposits”.

This article is situated at a rather opaque historiographical crossroads. It concerns the history of geology in Greece, a matter that has rarely been treated by Greek historiography and was until recently “marginal” in the international literature of science and technology studies.¹ It also concerns the history of oil exploration,

* This research is co-financed by Greece and the European Union (European Social Fund [ESF]) through the Operational Programme “Human Resources Development, Education and Lifelong Learning 2014–2020” in the context of the project “Oil Exploration in the Greek Territory, 1920–1980” (MIS: 5050480). The authors would like to thank Professor Panagiotis Voudouris, Director of the Mineralogy and Petrology Museum of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, as well as the museum’s staff, Dr Ifigenia Megremis, Eleni Moustaka (MSc) and Efstathios Vorris (MSc), for providing access to the museum’s archive and for our enlightening conversations regarding the everyday practices of a geological laboratory. We would also like to thank Associate Professor Vangelis Karamanolakis, Director of the Historical Archive of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, as well as the Historical Archive’s research, administrative and library staff, Chaido Barkoula, Makrina Tsiotaki and Asimina Liazou. Finally, we would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their fruitful comments and Eva Masoura for the photographic processing of the pictures included.

¹ Naomi Oreskes and James R. Fleming, “Why Geophysics?,” *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 31, no. 3 (2000): 255. For a recent work on the history of geology

a matter whose Greek aspect is even more rarely treated and a notorious source of “intellectual vertigo” for any historian daring to enter.²

This crossroads derives from the particular method we follow in order to approach the history of oil exploration in Greece. Drawing inspiration from descriptions of petroleum geology as an artisanal practice that mediates “between profit expectations, national interest and the analysis of geological structures”,³ we narrate instances of interwar oil exploration in Greece through the history of two of the major geologists involved.

The main protagonists of our story, Greek geologists Konstantinos Ktenas and Georgios Georgalas, began their respective scientific careers around 1910. The following decade was one of four consecutive wars, a doubling of Greek territory, and constant political turbulence bordering an all-out civil war.⁴ It was also the decade during which oil’s strategic significance became internationally apparent.⁵

in Greece, see Christos Karampatsos, “Το γενικότερο συμφέρον του κράτους: Η ‘συνέχεια των ελληνικών χωρών’ και οι Έλληνες γεωλόγοι, 1908–1925,” *Τα Ιστορικά* 73 (2021): 125–54. For references to Greek geologists during the turn of the century, see Christina Koulouri, *Ιστορία και Γεωγραφία στα Ελληνικά Σχολεία (1834–1914): Γνωστικό αντικείμενο και ιδεολογικές προεκτάσεις* (Athens: Istoriko Archeio Ellinikis Neolaias, 1988); Eirini Mergoupi-Savaidou, “Δημόσιος λόγος περί επιστήμης στην Ελλάδα, 1870–1900: Εκλαϊκευτικά εγχειρήματα στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών, στους πολιτιστικούς συλλόγους και στα περιοδικά” (PhD diss., National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2010); Leda Papastefanaki, *Η φλέβα της γης: Τα μεταλλεία της Ελλάδας, 19ος–20ος αιώνας* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2017).

² Hannah Appel, Arthur Mason and Michael Watts, “Introduction: Oil Talk,” in *Subterranean Estates: Life Worlds of Oil and Gas*, ed. Hannah Appel, Arthur Mason and Michael Watts (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), 6. For a rare historical account of Greek oil exploration during the interwar, see Nikos Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης (1874–1950): Ένας αυθεντικός εκπρόσωπος της αστικής τάξης* (Athens: Metamesonikties Ekdoseis, 2018), 327–45.

³ Gisa Weszkalnys, “Geology, Potentiality, Speculation: On the Indeterminacy of First Oil,” *Cultural Anthropology* 30, no. 4 (2015): 625. Weszkalnys refers to the similar treatment of “metallurgy ... zoology, geology, engineering, anthropology and geography,” described in Andrew Barry, *Material Politics: Disputes along the Pipeline* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2013), 141–42.

⁴ For an early historical account of the decade, see Georgios Ventiris, *Η Ελλάδα του 1910–1920* (1931; Athens: Ikaros, 1970); a recent relevant account is George Th. Mavrogordatos, *1915: Ο Εθνικός διχασμός* (Athens: Patakis, 2015); Christos Hadziiossif and George Th. Mavrogordatos, eds., *Βενιζελισμός και αστικός εκσυγχρονισμός* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 1988) and Douglas Dakin, *Η ενοποίηση της Ελλάδας, 1770–1923*, trans. Athanasios Xanthopoulos (Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 2012), are used as works of reference.

⁵ Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money and Power* (1991; London: Simon & Schuster, 2008), 151–67; Timothy Mitchell, *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil* (London: Verso, 2011), 43–65.

Motivated by this powerful context,⁶ Ktenas and Georgalas were among the first Greek geologists to realise that a role of mediator between the state, the private sector and the nascent Greek geological community was possible and should be systematically pursued. The endeavours that form the bulk of our narrative, such as the founding of a Greek Geological Survey, the estimate of the Greek lignite deposits, the “geological continuity of the Greek lands” theorem, and the Epirus oil exploration attempts, were individual aspects of this wider strategy.

Given the magnitude of the stakes involved, it is not surprising that the two geologists were quickly involved in a long-standing occupational and scientific conflict.⁷ At the height of the conflict, from 1918 to 1925, the Greek state had come to employ two distinct geological agencies, based in two different ministries, bearing similar jurisdictions and headed by two prominent geologists enmeshed in a veritable feud. If indeed there is a Greek history of geology “written by and for geologists”,⁸ the manner in which Ktenas lost control of his Greek Geological Survey between 1918 and 1924, remains one of its most repeated topics. Time and again Ktenas has been lamented as the victim of “sterile opposition” and “internal bickering” and celebrated as the “founder of geology in Greece”.⁹ Time and again the political aspects of the dispute have been dismissed as a predictable outcome, bound to happen whenever a pioneering scientist of “direct and morally unyielding character” like Ktenas confronted the labyrinthine internal dealings of Greek ministries and academia.¹⁰

Our approach arrives at a different conclusion. We argue that the conflict between the two was actually productive. It signalled the emergence of a Greek geological community. It institutionalised the relations between this geological community and the Greek state. Most importantly, it produced a Greek version

⁶ For the interplay between the specific questions posed by scientists and the wider historical context within which scientists operate, see Naomi Oreskes, “A Context of Motivation: US Navy Oceanographic Research and the Discovery of Sea-Floor Hydrothermal Vents,” *Social Studies of Science* 33, no. 5 (2003): 726, 730.

⁷ For the historiographical significance of technical controversies in the early Greek scientific-engineering communities, see Spyros Tzokas, “Για την κοινωνική διαμόρφωση της αναγκαιότητας της τεχνικής: Παραδείγματα από την ιστορία των Ελλήνων μηχανικών (τέλος 19ου–αρχές 20ου αιώνα)” (PhD diss., National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2011).

⁸ Mott Greene, “History of Geology,” *Osiris* 1 (1985): 97.

⁹ Michail Dermitzakis, “Χαιρετιστήριο ομιλία,” in *Κωνσταντίνος Α. Κτενάς (1884–1935): Το επιστημονικόν έργον και η ζωή του*, ed. Ilias Mariolopoulos (Athens: Epitropi ton eis Mnimin tou Timitikon Ekdiloseon, 1978), 27.

¹⁰ Georges Marinou, ed., *Γεωλογία της νήσου Ικαρίας υπό Κωνστ. Α. Κτενά* (Athens: Institute for Geology and Subsurface Research, 1969), 60.

of what Gisa Weszkalnys calls “oil’s magic”.¹¹ Indeed, the fusion of geological knowledge, tacit political calculation and obscure rhetoric produced a hundred years ago still remains in use, often defining what is concerned to be the “reality” of the “Greek oil deposits”.

As for the petty feud between our protagonists, its outcome is explainable. Bruno Latour has noted that in life and even more in science, “he who is able to translate others’ interests into his own language carries the day”.¹² Indeed, between 1912 and 1924, Ktenas and Georgalas embarked on separate quests to translate private and state interests into their own geological language. But as they found out, any “translation of interests” is de facto contingent on an even more complex prerequisite: the accurate estimation of all interests involved.

This, after all, is a story of estimates, be it of the accurate or the inaccurate kind.

Two “Fledgling Geologists” in Greece during the First Decade of the Twentieth Century

In May 1908, Konstantinos Mitsopoulos, esteemed professor of geology and mineralogy of the University of Athens, was called on to evaluate a young candidate for the position of “lecturer of petrography and mineralogy”. The candidate’s name was Konstantinos Ktenas. Born in 1884, Ktenas had recently returned to Greece after completing his doctoral dissertation in the University of Leipzig (1907) and a one-year internship in the Freiberg Mining Academy.¹³ In addition to his notable academic credentials, Ktenas was the scion of an old financially affluent Athenian family,¹⁴ and enjoyed the support of well-respected elder geologists such as Andreas Kordellas and Phokion Negris.¹⁵ After

¹¹ Gisa Weszkalnys, “Oil’s Magic: Contestation and Materiality,” in *Cultures of Energy: Power, Practices, Technologies*, ed. Sarah Strauss, Stephanie Rupp and Thomas Love (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2013), 267.

¹² Bruno Latour, “Give me a Laboratory and I will Raise the World,” in *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*, ed. Karin Knorr-Cetina and Michael Mulkay (New York: Sage, 1983), 144.

¹³ Michail Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν Πανεπιστήμιον Αθηνών: Εκατονταετηρίς, 1837–1937*, vol. 5, no. 2 (Athens: Ethniko Typografeio, 1948): 28–31.

¹⁴ The family descended from “Panagis Ktenas who led the siege of Acropolis and conquered it as leader of the Athenians” in June 1822; see Ioannis Kandilis, “Κωνσταντίνος Α. Κτενάς, Η ζωή του, η δράσι του και η εποχή του,” in *Κωνσταντίνος Α. Κτενάς (1884–1935): Το επιστημονικόν έργον και η ζωή του*, ed. Ilias Mariolopoulos (Athens: Epitropi ton eis Mnimin tou Timitikon Ekdiloseon, 1978), 46.

¹⁵ For common publications with Kordellas and Negris just before Ktenas’ appointment, see Andreas Kordellas, “Αι επωθήσεις εις την Πελοπόννησον,” *Αρχιμήδης* 9, no. 8 (1908): 90–

extensively commenting on the candidate's dissertation, Mitsopoulos came to a somewhat positive conclusion:

I therefore propose that the candidate should be appointed as a lecturer, not of petrography and mineralogy, but of mineralogy and geology or more specifically geognosy which also includes petrography, as is the chair of his Leipzig teacher, the famous professor and writer Mr. Zirkel.¹⁶ This is because, as demonstrated by his dissertation, the young man is a fledgling geologist and because petrography should not be deemed to be a luxury in our university.¹⁷

This complicated paragraph can serve as a dense summary of the problems faced by Greek “fledgling geologists” at the time. The problems started with the status of their discipline. Indeed, what is nowadays called earth sciences did not yet exist as a well-defined field of scientific inquiry.¹⁸ Mitsopoulos confidently recited relevant subfields, but the use of such terms actually indicated more a “desire to designate new fields” than “success in doing so”,¹⁹ and earth sciences did not acquire a unifying theory until the development of plate tectonics in the 1960s.²⁰ In addition, earth sciences, however meticulously defined, were constantly suspected

93; Ph. Negrís and Const. Ktenas, “Sur le Néocrétacé de l’Argolide,” *Les Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences de Paris* 145 (1907): 1235. Negrís “who respected and loved [Ktenas] very much” was one of the few who “visited [Ktenas] regularly ... and were accepted inside his private office”; Kandilis, “Κωνσταντίνος Κτενάς,” 56.

¹⁶ In later writings, Ktenas also mentions Hermann Credner as his teacher; see Konstantinos Ktenas, *Η γεωλογική υπηρεσία της Ελλάδος: Προμελέτη δια την ίδρυσιν και οργάνωσιν της* (Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1917): 26.

¹⁷ “Συνεδρίαση 12 Μαΐου 1908,” in *Πρακτικά Συνεδριάσεων της Φυσικομαθηματικής Σχολής 1904–1911*, vol. 2, accessed 31 July 2020, <https://pergamos.lib.uoa.gr/uoal/object/52255>. Emphasis in original.

¹⁸ Ronald Doel, “The Earth Sciences and Geophysics,” in *Science in the Twentieth Century*, ed. John Krige and Dominique Pestre (Amsterdam: Harwood, 1997): 391.

¹⁹ Gregory Good, “The Assembly of Geophysics: Scientific Disciplines as Frameworks of Consensus,” *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 31, no. 3 (2000): 280. For example, usage of the term “geognosy” had been declining since 1820, although it “took a long time to die out”; Richard Howarth, “Etymology in the Earth Sciences: From ‘Geologia’ to ‘Geoscience,’” *Earth Sciences History* 39, no. 1 (2020): 9. The rector’s office was very well able to confuse “geology” (γεωλογία) with “agriculture” (γεωργία) in its official correspondence, much to Mitsopoulos’ frustration; see Archives of the Museum of Mineralogy and Petrology of the University of Athens (APOP), folder 1905–1906, “Πρυτανεία προς Μητσόπουλο,” 17 May 1906, with Mitsopoulos’ handwritten notes.

²⁰ Naomi Oreskes, “From Continental Drift to Plate Tectonics,” in *Plate Tectonics: An Insider’s History of the Modern Theory of the Earth*, ed. Naomi Oreskes and Homer Le Grand (London: CRC, 2018), xi, 27.

of lacking a “practical application”, a reputation that was rather well-deserved, given the dominant mentality among prominent geologists of the time.²¹

The second kind of problem was of a more obscure nature, related as it was to the occupational environment and its byzantine politics. In 1906, the university’s Mineralogical Museum, directed by Mitsopoulos since 1895, was split into two. The new separated half of the institution was named the Geological and Paleontological Museum and its direction was passed on to Theodoros Skoufos, who until then had served under Mitsopoulos as the museum’s prefect, but was now promoted to tenured professor of “Geology and Palaeontology”.²² The division led to constant bickering concerning the ownership and management of the museum’s library, scientific instruments, halls and budget.²³ In other words, Mitsopoulos already had ample reasons to suspect that his position within the university was in jeopardy. The demeaning word “fledgling” was underlined in the proceedings, a permanent reminder that he weighed the young man’s academic credentials and social connections, and found the result to be particularly unsettling.

Georgios Georgalas, one of Mitsopoulos’ most promising doctoral students, had even more reasons to be unsettled. Born in 1887 (thus three years younger than Ktenas), Georgalas conducted his dissertation entirely in the University of Athens. The lack of studies abroad leads us to suspect that he was less affluent than Ktenas, and so does the fact that initially he had to be unofficially supported by the mineralogical museum’s contract work.²⁴ Since 1906 however, his

²¹ Paul Lucier, “A Plea for Applied Geology,” *History of Science* 32 (1999): 284.

²² Kostas Gavroglu, Vangelis Karamanolakis and Chaido Barkoula, *Το Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών και η ιστορία του* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2014), 293.

²³ Mitsopoulos laments the loss of “more than half of the budget” in APOP, folder 1906–1907, “Επιστολή από Μητσόπουλο προς Γερμανό,” n.d.; for the library see Mitsopoulos’ underlines in APOP, folder 1907–1908, “Πρακτικόν,” 19 June 1908; for the instruments, see APOP, folder 1907–1908, “Επιστολή από Μητσόπουλο προς Σκούφο,” 17 June 1908; for complaints on the students who “entered and exited Mr. Skoufos’ classes” by trespassing through Mitsopoulos’ territory, see APOP, folder 1907–1908, “Προς τον αρχιτέκτονα του Εθν. Πανεπιστημίου,” 24 June 1908.

²⁴ In December 1904, Georgalas presented in the paperwork as an independent “naturalist”, was paid 500 drachmas for the delivery of “six geological and mineralogical tables” to the museum; this was a substantial sum amounting to more than six monthly salaries of a museum assistant; see APOP, “Κατάστασις Εξόδων του Φυσιογραφικού Μουσείου,” folder 1904–1905, 14 December 1904. There were other transactions of this kind in the next two years; see APOP, “Κατάστασις Εξόδων του Φυσιογραφικού Μουσείου,” folder 1904–1906, 24 February 1905; also APOP, “Απόδειξις δρχ. 108,” folder 1906–1907, 1 November 1906. During the same period, Georgalas conducted “over 300 experiments” of quantitative analysis of asphalt under the guidance of his “lamented teacher K. Mitsopoulos”; Georgios

dissertation was funded by a periodically renewed yearly scholarship, as well as the salary of “assistant prefect of Mineralogy, Geology and Physics” in the School of Industrial Arts, of which Mitsopoulos was director.²⁵ Georgalas completed his dissertation in 1909; under different circumstances he could have reasonably hoped that he would be the one to succeed Mitsopoulos.²⁶

Things did not work out as expected. Ktenas used the four years following his appointment as lecturer to successfully compete with all the typical problems faced by geologists of the time. His success as a teacher was probably reflected in the plummeting attendance at Mitsopoulos’ classes, observed since 1908.²⁷ His 1910 treatise on the nomenclature of Greek minerals managed an admirable balance between the “state of confusion” characteristic of international petrographical nomenclature²⁸ and the Greek tendency to validate mineral names only when they derived from “the ancient Greeks”.²⁹ His connections with venerable earth science pioneers Kordellas and Negris were put to good use and he was readily accepted as one of the 170 members

Georgalas, “Αι εν Ελλάδι εμφανίσεις ορυκτών υδρογονανθράκων,” in *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων: Πορίσματα, εκθέσεις και υπομνήματα του μεταλλευτικού τμήματος αυτής*, ed. Georgios Georgalas (Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1920), 89.

²⁵ Georgalas’ scholarship expired in December 1906 and was renewed in October 1907; see “Συνεδρίαση 8 Οκτωβρίου 1907,” in *Πρακτικά Συνεδριάσεων της Φυσικομαθηματικής Σχολής 1904–1911*, vol. 2, accessed 31 July 2020, <https://pergamos.lib.uoa.gr/uoa/dl/object/52255>. Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν*, 67–68.

²⁶ Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν*, 67, states that Georgalas completed his dissertation in 1907. Georgalas himself states that his dissertation was completed in 1909; see Georgios Georgalas, “Η του Ακροκορίνθου Περιοχή Γεωλογικώς Εξεταζομένη,” *Αρχιμήδης* 12, no. 2 (1912): 116. The most probable date is 1909 since even then Georgalas was only 22 years old.

²⁷ In September 1908 Mitsopoulos suspected that the rector’s office was somehow related to the plummeting attendance of his classes (“eight students instead of the usual 100”) and was compiling letters of protest to the rector; APOP, folder 1908–1909, “Μητσόπουλος προς Πρυτανεία,” 30 September 1908.

²⁸ Davis Young, “Origin of the American Quantitative Igneous Rock Classification: Part 2,” *Earth Sciences History* 28, no. 2 (2009): 180.

²⁹ Ktenas justified his adherence to international nomenclature with a short self-contradictory phrase: “even when the name was erroneous (not deriving from the “ancients”) it was transferred as is”; Konstantinos Ktenas, *Ορυκτογνωστικοί πίνακες μετά καταλόγου των εν Ελλάδι ορυκτών και των παραγενετικών των συνθηκών* (Athens: Τυρ. Sakellariou, 1910), 4. The book replaced the one by Mitsopoulos and remained in use for more than a decade. From the late nineteenth century, Greek engineers often justified their modern engineering projects by emphasizing a supposed continuity with Greece’s ancient engineering past; see Spyros Tzokas, “Greek Engineers, Institutions, Periodicals and Ideology: Late 19th and Early 20th Century,” *History and Technology* (2017): 157–78.

of the Greek Polytechnic Association.³⁰ Even geology's ill-reputed "lack of practical applications" soon proved to be irrelevant for someone educated at the Freiberg Mining Academy.³¹ Ktenas soon began participating in state-funded mine studies and acquainting himself with other fledgling members of the Greek geological community.³²

Georgalas did not fare as well. His 1909 dissertation treated the stratigraphy of his native Akrokorinthos area in the Peloponnese, but somehow Ktenas and Negris began exploring the exact same area and published their research before him in the prestigious bulletin of the French Geological Society.³³ In 1912, when the 25-year-old Georgalas tried to publish a summary of his dissertation in the *Αρχιμήδης* journal, his piece immediately elicited a response from none other than the 66-year-old Negris.³⁴ Phrases like "as demonstrated by G. Georgalas and K.A. Lacroix before him (*Compte Rendu de l'Académie*, 26 Décembre 1898)" walked a fine line between accusing him of incompetence and of plagiarism.³⁵

³⁰ Ελληνικός Πολυτεχνικός Σύλλογος, "Τακτικά μέλη," *Αρχιμήδης* 10, February appendix (1909): 12.

³¹ For the Freiberg Mining Academy and the efforts therein to develop systematic knowledge out of the miners' tacit knowledge, see Warren Dym, "Scholars and Miners: Dowsing and the Freiberg Mining Academy," *Technology and Culture* 49, no. 4 (2008). For Freiberg as a breeding ground of Greek mining engineers, see Papastefanaki, *Η φλέβα*, 309–14. For Ktenas' teachers, Ferdinand Zirkel and Hermann Credner, as pioneering "practical geologists," see Lucier, "A Plea," 298–300, and Young, "Igneous Rock Classification," 175–203.

³² In 1909, Ktenas participated in a study of the Halara mine of Serifos island. The resulting study is cited in many of Ktenas' works as Konstantinos Ktenas, Ilias Gounaris and Alexandros Papamarkou, *Το μεταλλείον "Ακρωτήριον Χάλαρα" και η προς αυτό συνεχομένη παραχώρητος έκτασις της νήσου Σεριφου (Μελέτη Γενομένη Εντολή της Ελληνικής Κυβερνήσεως)* (Athens: 1910). We were unable to locate this study; Negris, however, ended up holding 5 percent of the Halara mine's stock "as a right of discovery"; see APOP, "Φωκίωνα Νέγρης, Η διαθήκη μου," folder 1925, 7 February 1928. Ktenas' co-writers, Gounaris and Papamarkou were of roughly the same age as Ktenas; at the time they were also beginning their respective careers in the Mining Department of the Ministry of National Economy; see Papastefanaki, *Η φλέβα*, 154–55, 312.

³³ Phokion Negris and Konstantinos Ktenas, "Sur l'âge triasique du calcaire de l'Acrocorinthe," *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France* 10 (1910): 311.

³⁴ At the time Negris had served as the mayor of the mining city of Lavrion, a Member of Parliament and twice minister of finance; Giorgos Peppas, *Φωκίων Νέγρης, 1846–1928* (Athens: Tsoukatou, 2011): 125–64. For the significance of the *Αρχιμήδης* journal, see Tzokas, "Greek Engineers," 164–65.

³⁵ Georgios Georgalas, "Η του Ακροκορίνθου"; Phokion Negris, "Η Ακροκόρινθος και τα περίξ αυτής μέρη γεωλογικώς εξεταζόμενα," *Αρχιμήδης* 13, no. 5 (1912): 55.

The stakes were not exclusively scientific. The “Goudi Coup”, a 1909 radical restructuring of the political system fuelled by popular protest, had already led to the dismissal of several university professors. Undoubtedly owing to the “intrauniversity conflicts” we have already described, Mitsopoulos had already been dismissed from the university in July 1910, and was temporarily replaced by his former subordinate Skoufos.³⁶ In February 1912, a “special university committee” that included Skoufos promoted Ktenas to a tenured professor of mineralogy and petrography of the University of Athens and director of the university’s Mineralogical Museum.³⁷ As far as we know, Georgalas did not bother to apply for the chair; his 1912 appointment to the position of prefect of the university’s Geological and Paleontological Museum, under his “respected teacher Theodoros Skoufos”,³⁸ can be interpreted as a reward for his tacit acceptance of his position within the academic hierarchy.

In 1912, Ktenas and Georgalas, neither of whom had yet reached the age of 30, could rightfully be counted among the most promising young geologists in Greece. They had tested their ability to navigate between scientific problems, practical applications and occupational disputes. And they had begun establishing their position within the academic hierarchy, basing themselves in two spatially adjacent museums of the same university. Meanwhile the country was heading towards the Balkan Wars. The settlement proved to be temporary.

A Geologist Matures During a “Civilising Mission”: Ktenas and the Idea of a Greek Geological Survey

One of the major strategic tasks undertaken since the initial founding of the Greek nation-state was the “unification of the territory and homogenisation

³⁶ Gavroglu, Karamanolakis and Barkoula, *Το Πανεπιστήμιο*, 198. For a recent account of the “Goudi Coup,” see Nikos Potamianos, “Populism in Greece? Right, Left, and Laclau’s ‘Jacobinism’ in the Years of the Goudi Coup, 1908–1910,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 14, no. 2 (2020): 127–55.

³⁷ For Ktenas’ appointment, see “Συνεδρίαση 1 Φεβρουαρίου 1912,” in *Πρακτικά Συνεδριάσεων Φυσικομαθηματικής Σχολής 1911–1917*, vol. 3, 15, accessed 5 August 2020, <https://pergamon.lib.uoa.gr/uoa/dl/object/53483>. For the involvement of Theodoros Skoufos, see Ioannis Kandilis, *Οι Θεμελιωτάι των Φυσικών Επιστημών στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα και η Εποχή τους* (Athens: s.n., 1976), 105.

³⁸ Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν*, 67. In his later writings, Georgalas always remembered to express his gratitude towards Skoufos; see Georgios Georgalas, ed., *Ίδρυσις και πεπραγμένα του γεωλογικού γραφείου μέχρι τέλους του 1920* (Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1921), 8.

of the population”,³⁹ or, to put it in Maria Synarelli’s words, “the conquest of the national space”.⁴⁰ The Balkan Wars conducted against the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria between 1912 and 1913 can be regarded as a relevant milestone. The “New Lands” acquired in 1913 had to be “conquered” anew in Synarelli’s sense of the word; this was a “conquest” of a technopolitical nature involving “a purposeful state intervention of unprecedented scale, the cornerstone of which was the regulation of space”.⁴¹ Dimitrios Diamantidis, an engineer and a founding member of the Greek Polytechnic Association who became the first minister of transport in 1914,⁴² summarised this task as a “civilising mission” that would involve “all those serving the physical sciences”.⁴³

Diamantidis’ tempting message resonated among “those serving the physical sciences” long before he gave his speech. To take a familiar example, Ktenas was synchronising himself with the “civilising mission” since 1912. Immediately after his appointment he began staffing the museum with people of his choice,⁴⁴ purchasing the scientific instruments required in order to transform it into a proper scientific laboratory⁴⁵ and cataloguing its vast mineral collections.⁴⁶ The research conducted from this increasingly sophisticated base was immediately

³⁹ Christos Hadziiosif, “Εισαγωγή,” in *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας στον 20ο Αιώνα*, vol. A1, ed. Christos Hadziiosif (Athens: Vivliorama, 2002): 11.

⁴⁰ Maria Synarelli, *Δρόμοι και λιμάνια στην Ελλάδα* (Athens: Politistiko kai Tehnologiko Idryma ETVA, 1989):52.

⁴¹ Nikos Kalogirou, “Η Γεωγραφία του εκσυγχρονισμού: Μετασχηματισμοί του ελλαδικού χώρου στον μεσοπόλεμο,” in Hadziiosif and Manrogorlatos, *Βενιζελισμός και αστικός εκσυγχρονισμός*, 91.

⁴² Tzokas, “Greek Engineers,” 166.

⁴³ “Ο υπουργός της συγκοινωνίας και ο πολυτεχνικός σύλλογος,” *Αρχιμήδης* 15, no. 6 (1914): 61–63.

⁴⁴ Such was the case of “trusted artisan Vasilios Bravakos”, who replaced the museum’s previous clerk and remained “the only one with the right to backtalk to Ktenas” until Ktenas’ death in 1935. See APOP, “Κτενάς προς Πρυτανεία,” folder 1911–1912, 12 June 1912. On the relation of the two men, see Kandilis, *Οι Θεμελιωταί*, 104–105.

⁴⁵ Purchases included a petrographic microscope, as well as photographic equipment; the equipment was used to examine “microscopic samples” constructed by the dozens by “Voigt and Hochgesang of Göttingen, Germany”. The upgrade of the museum’s equipment is evident in the spectacularly modern illustration that begun accompanying the scientific articles produced; for the microscope see APOP, “Petrographisches Mikroskop,” folder 1912–1914, n.d.; for the photographic equipment see APOP, “Κτενάς προς πρυτανεία,” folder 1912–1914, 5 September 1913; for the “microscopic samples” see APOP, “Κτενάς προς πρυτανεία,” 9 November 1913.

⁴⁶ Cataloguing the museum’s collection required the construction of more than 10,000 boxes, hundreds of wood pedestals, dozens of showcases and provided a constant occupation for the museum’s staff for more than 10 years; see for example APOP, “Κτενάς

oriented towards the “New Lands”. The first scientific expedition organised by the laboratory was conducted in Crete, even before it was officially annexed.⁴⁷ Ktenas somehow managed to transform his October 1912 military draft into a one-person geological trip in the “New Lands”. By January 1913, with the war still ongoing, he was contributing to the daily press under the general heading “The Exploitation of New Greece”, taking care to denote that his submissions originated from areas such as “Kastoria” and “Strevini”, unknown corners of “New Greece” that were “never before submitted to scientific exploitation”.⁴⁸ The first maps to arrive in the museum from abroad as soon as circumstances allowed it, depicted more of these areas: “Saloniki, Vodina, Monastiri, Janina, Halkidiki, Athos, Kavala”.⁴⁹

This fervent activity immediately began providing for two intertwined scientific projects, both of which were carefully aligned with Diamantidis’ “civilising mission”. The first project concerned a theorem that would briefly be known as “the geological continuity of the Greek Lands”. This involved the use of stratigraphic methods in order to prove that the lands between the island of Corfu and Western Asia Minor were in fact part of a single “geological unit”.⁵⁰ The second project concerned the founding of a Greek Geological Survey, an endeavour of even larger scale and ambition. First proposed by Greek geologists in 1893,⁵¹ the survey would conduct government-subsidised subsoil exploration and produce a “comprehensive geological map” of the whole of the territory. As in foreign examples, the geological survey would serve to align the interests of

προς Πρωταναία,” folder 1912–1914, 7 February 1912; APOP, “Κτενάς προς Πρωταναία,” folder 1912–1914, 27 June 1914.

⁴⁷ APOP, “Κτενάς προς Πρωταναία,” folder 1912–1914, 8 September 1912.

⁴⁸ Konstantinos Ktenas, “Η εκμετάλλευσις της Νέας Ελλάδος,” *Εστία*, 30 January 1913; Ktenas, “Η εκμετάλλευσις της Νέας Ελλάδος,” *Εστία*, 16 February 1913. Strevini is probably the town of Strevina in Arta, renamed Kampi in 1927.

⁴⁹ APOP, “Πληρωμή Ελευθερουδάκη και Μπαρτ,” folder 1914–1915, 3 October 1914. Vodina has been renamed Edessa.

⁵⁰ Ktenas partook of relevant ideas expressed by German geologists, such as Leopold von Buch and Alfred Philippson; see Leopold von Buch, “Φυσικοϊστορική περιγραφή νήσων του Αρχιπελάγους εν Ελλάδι,” *Αρχιμήδης* 15, no. 7 (1914): 78; also Alfred Philippson, “La Tectonique de l’Égée (Grèce, Mer Egée, Asie Mineure Occidentale),” *Annales de Géographie* 7, no. 32 (1898): 112. This complex story has been narrated elsewhere; see Karampatsos, “Το γενικότερο συμφέρον του κράτους,” 138–42, 149.

⁵¹ “Let us hope that the government will found a geological institution (Geologische Anstalt) through which young Greek geologists will explore the qualities of the Greek soil inch by inch”; Konstantinos Mitsopoulos, *Στοιχεία γεωλογίας* (Athens: Typ. Anesti Konstantinidou, 1893), 591–92.

“capitalists, geologists and the state alike”,⁵² a function obviously suited to the demands posed by any significant territorial expansion.⁵³

Ktenas spent the period from 1914 and 1917 engrossed in his two projects. Beginning on 13 December 1913,⁵⁴ he initiated extensive correspondence with the directors of various European geological surveys, such as esteemed professor Ludovic Mrazek of the Romanian Survey.⁵⁵ In 1914, he used his museum’s budget to organise a geological expedition at the newly annexed island of Chios and immediately began processing the minerals recovered using his new state-of-the-art equipment. In 1915 he used the newly organised collections of his museum in order to begin suggesting the existence of a “geological link between Greece and Asia Minor” via the islands of Limnos and Imvros and the Gallipoli Peninsula.⁵⁶ In 1916, his first doctoral student, Maximos Maravelakis, completed

⁵² Lucier, “A Plea,” 287.

⁵³ The founding of a national geological survey often coincides with the rise and consolidation of a corresponding modern nation state. For example, the Prussian Geological Survey was founded in 1873; see Martin Guntau, “The History of the Origins of the Prussian Geological Survey in Berlin, 1873,” *History and Technology* 5, no. 1 (1988): 51–58. The Portuguese Geological Survey was founded in 1857; see Teresa Salomé Mota, “Spending Some Time in the Field: Fieldwork in the Portuguese Geological Survey during the Twentieth Century,” *Earth Sciences History* 33, no. 2 (2014): 201. The Italian Geological Survey was founded between 1861 and 1867; see Pietro Corsi, “Much Ado about Nothing: The Italian Geological Survey, 1861–2006,” *Earth Sciences History* 26, no. 1 (2007): 102–4. In the US, state-funded geological surveys began emerging as early as 1830; see Walter Hendrickson, “Nineteenth-Century State Geological Surveys: Early Government Support of Science,” *Isis* 52, no. 3 (1961): 359.

⁵⁴ See APOP, “Der director der Konigl. Geologischen Landesanstalt an Herrn Professor Dr. A. Ktenas,” folder προμελέτη, 23 January 1914. Regrettably, a large part of the relevant correspondence has been lost, as demonstrated by an index contained in the relevant folder. However the folder remains a testament to Ktenas’ methodical approach and the particular significance he attributed to the matter.

⁵⁵ Other correspondents included Franz Beyschlag of the Prussian Survey and Bernardino Lotti of the Italian Survey. A “committee for the organisation of a Geological Survey in Greece” briefly existed inside the Bavarian survey, thus director Ludwig von Ammon and his successor Otto Reis were especially helpful, extensively describing their survey’s facilities and project costs and providing extensive map samples. The committee was abandoned in the following years and is not mentioned in Ktenas’ published final study, a fact that can be attributed to the outbreak of the First World War; see APOP, “Die Commission zur Organization einer geologischen Landesuntersuchung in Griechenland a. H. des Herrn Professor Dr. Konst. A. Ktenas,” folder προμελέτη, 8 March 1914.

⁵⁶ Konstantinos Ktenas, “Ανεύρεσις ηωκαίνου στρώματος και εκρήξεως μικρογανουλίου εις την Νήσον Ίμβρον,” *Επετηρίς του Εθνικού Πανεπιστημίου* 9 (1915): 4.

his dissertation, disproving the existence of anthracite in Chios and suggesting that the “geotectonic structure of the island” extended “opposite Chios to the Erythrae Peninsula”.⁵⁷ In 1916 Ktenas managed to arrange a visit “to the facilities of the Italian geological survey”, followed by a trip to Switzerland.⁵⁸

Meanwhile, Greek history was running its turbulent course. Beginning in 1915, the issue of Greece’s participation in the First World War became heavily contested, leading to an unprecedented polarisation of the political system, bordering on all-out civil war. In June 1917 the pro-German King Constantine was deposed and Greece officially entered the war on the side of the Entente. The proponents of neutrality were submitted to severe persecution.⁵⁹ Among those persecuted was professor of geology and palaeontology Theodoros Skoufos, who was dismissed from the university in November 1917, along with several other professors.⁶⁰

Ktenas fared much better. Between 1914 and 1917 he forwarded his proposal for a Greek Geological Survey to the endless succession of ministers in the Ministry of National Economy, where his plans allegedly were met with approval.⁶¹ In the early 1917 he went on to publish two extensive articles that jointly described his ambitious institutional and scientific programme.

The first article, “The Anthracites of Greece”, was presented as a treatise on the possible existence of Greek anthracite deposits that could be used instead of the country’s lignite deposits. In fact it was a display of a general scientific methodology designed to produce subsoil knowledge via stratigraphic methods. According to Ktenas, the anthracite deposits could only be found “in the Paleozoic strata and more specifically in the formations of the Carboniferous period”. Thus, in order to adjudicate on the existence of anthracite, “one needs only seek the Paleozoic and more specifically the Carboniferous strata”. In this way “the search for anthracite [was] transformed into a matter of a purely theoretical nature”.⁶² He then combined his own stratigraphic observations in Chios and Attica with those of Friedrich Teller, Jacques Deprat, Carl Renz and Alfred Philippson in order to demonstrate

⁵⁷ Maximos Maravelakis, “Οι Εκρηξιγενείς Σχηματισμοί και η Μεταλλογένεια της Νήσου Χίου, Μέρος Β,” *Αρχιμήδης* 17, no. 2 (1916): 18.

⁵⁸ Ktenas, *Προμελέτη*, iv–v.

⁵⁹ Dakin, *Η ενοποίηση της Ελλάδας*, 303–32.

⁶⁰ Gavroglu, Karamanolakis and Barkoula, *Το Πανεπιστήμιο*, 208.

⁶¹ Ktenas, *Προμελέτη*, iv–v. The “approval” remained oral as far as we know. The “expert scientists supporting the creation of the survey” included all of Ktenas’ connections in the scientific community mentioned in the previous section, such as “Messrs. Ph. Negris, P. Protopapadakis, Th. Skoufos, S. Papavasiliou, I. Gounaris and A. Papamarkou”.

⁶² Konstantinos Ktenas, “Οι λιθανθρακες της Ελλάδας, μέρος Α’,” *Αρχιμήδης* 18, no. 1 (1917): 2–3.

the existence of “Paleozoic strata” that continuously extended from Attica to western Asia Minor. He took care to denote that this conclusion contradicted all earlier “deeply rooted ideas” concerning the Greek territory, and left the “geological continuity” lingering in the form of a map (fig. 1). From a purely “economical” viewpoint, this demonstration of methodological vigour led to a negative conclusion: “we cannot hope for the existence of significant anthracite deposits within the Greek Lands”.⁶³ From a more strategic viewpoint, however, the result was most promising. It demonstrated a new method for accumulating subsoil knowledge. The implied message resounded clearly: undervalued “geological theories” were after all of great importance and could be put to immediate practical use.

The “Preliminary Study on the founding and organisation of a Greek Geological Survey” was published a few months later, in July 1917. Ktenas proposed the initiation of a “systematic geological exploration of the Greek Lands”. This would be a project of unprecedented scale and multifaceted value, a veritable state asset. On




Figure 1. The stratigraphic synthesis achieved in “The Anthracites of Greece” was summarised in a map titled “The Paleozoic formations of the Greek Lands”. The map also tacitly implied the “geological continuity” between recently conquered and soon-to-be-conquered territories. The island of Chios, geologically examined as early as 1914, lies to the east, opposite the Erythraean Peninsula. (Konstantinos Ktenas, “Οι λιθανθρακες της Ελλάδας, μέρος Α’,” *Αρχιμήδης* 18, no. 1 [1917]: 4.)

⁶³ Konstantinos Ktenas, “Οι λιθανθρακες της Ελλάδας, μέρος Β’,” *Αρχιμήδης* 18, no. 2 (1917): 14.

the one hand it would solve “geological problems” such as “uncovering the existent relations” between “the geological strata of Greece and those of Asia Minor”.⁶⁴ On the other it would contribute to sectors of the national economy as varied as “agriculture, mining, tunnel, road and railroad construction ... which should operate inextricably connected to the Geological Survey”.⁶⁵ In summary, Ktenas’ survey was meant to become “the main node of control and scientific direction of all wealth-creating sectors of [the] country”.⁶⁶ Ktenas precisely calculated the project’s timeline: “in order to conclude the detailed geological exploration of the Greek Lands we need 456 years; therefore, a staff of 10 geologists will be able to complete the task in 45 to 50 years at a minimum”.⁶⁷

The two articles were designed to jointly emit a powerful message. A method for accumulating subsoil knowledge had been developed and implemented in “The Anthracites of Greece”. It stemmed from geological “theory”, yet it was powerful enough “to let us traverse the carboniferous strata in their entire length, depth and width”, political enough to align itself with the national interest and accurate enough to provide conclusive answers to the most urgent practical questions. This method would be organised in the form of a state agency and provide “a node of scientific direction” for all national industrial activity. In the middle of this war decade, Ktenas could imagine himself as the principal figure in a nursery for future Greek geologists, as the one to mediate between the geological community, private industry and the state, for five decades “at a minimum”.

At the same time, he was hardly indifferent to short-term gains. As he noted in the final pages of his “Preliminary Study”, “the University already possesses a mineralogical laboratory as well as a paleontological one. In order to minimise costs, those laboratories and the attached museums ... could serve to accommodate the operation of the geological survey”, of course after the resolution of all “relevant matters of an administrative nature”.⁶⁸ Ktenas was trying to exploit Skoufos’ imminent dismissal from the university in order to unify the institution’s two separate geological museums under his direction.

Ktenas was obviously in the midst of translating Diamantidis’ “civilising mission” into his own geological language. Yet, as it turned out, the prefect of the Paleontological Museum and former antagonist, Georgios Georgalas, had a strong say in the matter.

⁶⁴ Ktenas, *Προμελέτη*, 9.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

The Founding of the Greek Geological survey(s), or How to Efficiently Assess Lignite Deposits

Georgios Georgalas' career trajectory until 1917 is much harder to trace. As we have seen, he acquired the position of prefect of the university's Paleontological Museum under Skoufos in 1912, at the same time that Ktenas acquired his tenure. We know that in 1916 he was promoted to "professor of physics in the appended schools of the Technical University", where Skoufos had replaced Mitsopoulos after 1911, and that he retained the position at least until 1919.⁶⁹ There is archival evidence that Georgalas initially accepted his position within the academic hierarchy and even tried to make amends with Ktenas and Negris, probably to little avail.⁷⁰ However, the events of 1917 indicate a sharp turning point in Georgalas' attitude and career choices. This is hardly surprising; as we have seen, Skoufos was dismissed from the university and Ktenas was trying to exploit the opportunity in order to reunite the two museums under his direction. If this came to be, Georgalas would remain his subordinate for the foreseeable future.

For the time being, however, things were going as planned for Ktenas. Although he failed to officially unite the two museums, he was appointed temporary director of the Paleontological Museum after Skoufos' dismissal from the university. Skoufos never forgave this blatant display of ingratitude, but at least initially, it seemed to pay off.⁷¹ In August 1917, a "mining laboratory" was founded in the Ministry of National Economy. The relevant law specifically stated that the "mining laboratory" would be "attached to the mineralogical and petrographical laboratory of the University and directed by the tenured Professor of Mineralogy, who will receive a surplus wage of 100 drachmas per month".⁷²

⁶⁹ Maximos Maravelakis, "Οι πρωτεργάται της γεωλογίας εν Ελλάδι," *Annales Géologiques des Pays Helléniques* 1 (1947): 16; Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν*, 67–68. Notably, Georgalas' list of scientific publications composed by Stefanidis begins no sooner than 1922, indicating Georgalas' lesser stature before 1920.

⁷⁰ See Georgios Georgalas, "Συμβολαί εις την γνώσιν των απολεθωμένων πρωτόζωων της Ελλάδος," *Αρχιμήδης* 15, no. 12 (1914). Two draft copies of this article were discovered during our research in the library of the Physics School of the University of Athens, each bearing a handwritten inscription by Georgalas, addressed to Ktenas and Negris, respectively. The draft copy addressed to Ktenas also bears handwritten corrections of classification mistakes detected by Ktenas, but these corrections were omitted from Georgalas' final published article. This could be either because Ktenas purposefully did not point out the errors he detected, or because Georgalas chose to ignore Ktenas' comments.

⁷¹ For the "cold" relations between Ktenas and Skoufos, see Kandilis, *Οι Θεμελιωταί*, 105, 113.

⁷² "Νόμος 780 περί οργανισμού της κεντρικής υπηρεσίας του Υπουργείου της Εθνικής Οικονομίας," *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως [ΦΕΚ]*, no. 179, 29 August 1917. For a few months,

The “attachment” was revoked only a year later. In December 1918, a new position of “inspector geologist” was introduced in the ministry. The clause formerly assigning the direction of the ministry’s “mining laboratory” specifically to the “tenured professor of mineralogy” was purposefully complemented. Now “the direction c[ould] also be assigned to another professor of the University ... or to the inspector geologist himself”.⁷³ The first “inspector geologist” of the Ministry of National Economy, who also succeeded Ktenas as the director of the ministry’s “mining laboratory”, was none other than Georgalas.

Ktenas was obviously aware of this turn of events and was planning accordingly. Only four days earlier, two positions for geologists had been created in the Ministry of Transport. The two geologists would be employed “in geological studies and the compilation of geological maps relevant to road and railroad surveying and technical works in general”, assisted by “four temporary geologists”.⁷⁴ The first geologist hired in the Ministry of Transport was Ktenas.

From December 1918 onwards, the Greek state was equipped with two distinct geological agencies, based in two different ministries and bearing similar jurisdictions. The directors of these geological agencies were engaged in a tense professional and scientific competition, extending from the names of the two agencies to the use of the Mineralogical Museum’s microscope.⁷⁵

Actual contested matters extended far beyond such petty squabbles. In March 1919, three months after the founding of the two agencies, a “fuel

the notoriously dysfunctional telephone line of the university’s Mineralogical Museum was “mainly used in order to communicate with the administration of mines of the Ministry of National Economy whose recently founded mining laboratory has been installed inside the museum”; APOP, folder 1916–1917, “Κτενάς προς πρυτανεία,” 17 October 1917.

⁷³ “Νόμος 1577 περί τροποποιήσεως και συμπληρώσεως των περί οργανισμού του Υπουργείου της Εθνικής Οικονομίας νόμων,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 258, 28 December 1918.

⁷⁴ “Νόμος 1565 περί συμπληρώσεως τίνων του νόμου 972α ‘περί τροποποιήσεως των περί δημοσίων έργων νόμων κλπ’, του νόμου 1466 ‘περί αφομοιώσεως των εκτάκτων υπαλλήλων της υπηρεσίας των Δημοσίων έργων’ κλπ,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 257, 24 December 1918.

⁷⁵ In June 1919 Ktenas’ agency acquired the name “Geological Survey”, to which he added the word “Greek” whenever possible, much to Georgalas’ disdain; “Βασιλικό διάταγμα περί οργανώσεως και λειτουργίας ‘Υπηρεσίας Γεωλογικής’ εν τη υπηρεσία Μελετών Δημοσίων έργων,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 142, 26 June 1919. In June 1920, Georgalas managed to merge his agency and the “mining laboratory” into a single “Geological Bureau of the Ministry of National Economy”; “Νόμος 2258 περί συμπληρώσεως και τροποποιήσεως των νόμων περί οργανισμού του Υπουργείου της Εθνικής Οικονομίας,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 166, 27 July 1920. In the first account of his agency’s work, Georgalas took the opportunity to also provide a detailed catalogue of the “state research assignments” that were “impossible to complete” due to “denied assistance ...

committee” was formed in the Ministry of National Economy. The First World War had ended with Greece on the winning side and the doubling of the territory achieved in 1913 was now deemed to be certain. Besides, Greece was about to enter a new war in Asia Minor.⁷⁶ The committee was charged with assessing “the usage of the Greek lignite deposits in the postwar period”. This was a matter of the utmost strategic importance; an accurate estimate of the quantity and quality of the industrial energy sources within Greek territory was an obvious prerequisite for any future economic or military planning. The “great experts committee” formed to adjudicate the matter was accordingly manned, including no less than 46 of the most notable Greek industrialists, engineers and state officials.⁷⁷

Ktenas and Georgalas, whose agencies were probably formed in anticipation of this urgent task, were both included in the committee, although under a much different status. Georgalas was cited in every page possible as the “Inspector Geologist of the Ministry of National Economy”. He took complete charge of the “mining department” of the committee, being the main lecturer in all of its sub-committees. His actual task was to provide a thorough description of the lignite deposits and mining activities in the Greek territory. He thus compiled, edited and gave final approval to each one of the dozens of reports that were produced by mining engineers and members of the committee for each one of the known lignite mines in “Old Greece”. Last but not least, he produced reports and rough maps describing the lignite mines of “New Greece” by compiling already existing data and “personal information”. When the committee’s work was over after six months, in September 1919, Georgalas was cited as the editor of the final report of the committee’s “mining department” and had already begun travelling in person in the “New Lands” in order to personally assess lignite deposits.⁷⁸

Ktenas’ stature within the fuel committee was much less important. His contribution to the committee’s final report was no more than a republished newspaper article, carefully paginated to look completely irrelevant to the

on the part the relevant laboratory of the National University” and especially denial of access to its “polarising microscope”; Georgalas, *Ίδρυσις και πεπραγμένα*, 9–10.

⁷⁶ On 15 May 1919, the Greek army landed in Smyrna “in order to protect the Christian population”; Dakin, *Η ενοποίηση*, 337.

⁷⁷ The committee included such notables as industry magnate Nikolaos Kanellopoulos and shipowner and former minister Leonidas Empeirikos; for a full list of the members (in alphabetical order), see Georgios Georgalas, *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 5–6.

⁷⁸ The committee’s work was concluded in September 1919. Georgalas immediately embarked on his first trip to the “New Lands” and was able to include his first-hand “Notes

main body of the report. In this article, Ktenas argued that “the total quantity of the Greek lignite deposits cannot be adequately estimated” due to the “fragmentation and vertical shifting” characteristic of the Greek carboniferous strata.⁷⁹ His reserved stance was utterly dismissed in the adjacent pages that were devoted to an article titled “On the urgent need of confirmation of adequate lignite deposits”. In this article, Kleisthenis Filaretos, “Industry Inspector of the Ministry of National Economy”, argued that all measures should be taken in order to “confront imported anthracite in the future” and that an accurate quantitative estimate of the Greek lignite deposits was absolutely possible by drilling. Indeed, Filaretos proposed the purchase of five drilling machines from the United States. Labour and machinery costs had already been calculated via “correspondence with foreign firms” and amounted to “600,000 drachmas for the first year”. When operated “by the inspector geologist of the Ministry of National Economy”, the drilling machines would affirm the existence “of 30 million tonnes, and possibly up to 100 million tonnes” of lignite.⁸⁰

Clearly this was a view of the geological endeavour that was much different than the one proposed by Ktenas in his “Preliminary Study”. It could be readily applied, it could connect the “inspector geologist” with private interests, and, above all, it promised immediate results. In a rhetorical feat that would come to characterise future reports, the immediate results promised were speculated on before any actual drilling had taken place. Ktenas’ name was not mentioned again until several pages later, when the report used the same attitude to approach “other fuels in Greece”, and more specifically “the appearances of mineral hydrocarbons”.⁸¹ Apparently oil exploration was already underway in Epirus.

on the lignite area of Serres” in the final version of the committee’s report. See Georgalas, ed., *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 15, 64–68.

⁷⁹ For the original article, see Konstantinos Ktenas, “Οι Ελληνικοί λιγνίται: το ζήτημα της ποσότητος,” *Πολιτεία*, 6 March 1919. It is republished in Georgalas, ed., *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 21–22.

⁸⁰ Kleisthenis Filaretos, “Εκθεσις περί επειγουσσης ανάγκης βεβαιώσεως επαρκών αποθεμάτων λιγνίτου,” in Georgalas, *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 22–26. Filaretos’ estimate was actually a modest one, as at the same time, the “total Belgian coal reserves were given as ‘known, 2,500,000,000 tonnes; probable 8,500,000,000 tonnes’”; Alfred Brooks and Morris Lacroix, *The Iron and Associated Industries of Lorraine, the Sarre District, Luxemburg, and Belgium* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920), 89. Until 2020, 2.2 billion tonnes had been extracted and used. See “Εξασφαλίζουμε την επάρκεια της χώρας σε ηλεκτρική ενέργεια,” Public Power Corporation, accessed 9 April 2023, <https://www.dei.gr/el/dei-omilos/i-dei/tomeis-drastiriotitas/symvatiki-paragogi/>.

⁸¹ Georgalas, *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 79–112.

The Discovery of the Epirus Oil Deposits

Contrary to presently widespread narratives of “incompetence” and “dependence”, the Greek state has a history of conducting oil exploration immediately after the annexation of a new territory.⁸² The “New Lands” annexed after 1913 were no exception. Especially in the Molitsa River valley in Epirus, near the village of Dragopssa, surface appearances of hydrocarbons were well known to local villagers and “petroleum” was casually used for heating, lighting and medical purposes. In January 1910, N. Vasilakis, a Greek doctor residing in the Ottoman city of Ioannina, learnt of the nearby hydrocarbon appearances from a patient and immediately began efforts to secure a concession from the Ottoman administration. The geologist who was called upon to assess possible deposits was Ludovic Mrazek, esteemed professor of the University of Bucharest and director of the Romanian Institute of Geology. Mrazek arrived in July 1911, inspected surface hydrocarbon appearances in Epirus and left one of his students, C. Niculescu, to continue the work. Niculescu indeed continued with various intervals due to the outbreak of the Balkan Wars, and until 1914 he had acquainted himself with Epirus, well enough to produce several publications on the geology of the area.⁸³

The matter resurfaced in 1917, when Vasilakis informed the French expeditionary force based in Ioannina of the hydrocarbon appearances.⁸⁴ Before the war was actually over, between 1917 and 1918, the area was repeatedly inspected by joint French and Greek expeditions, manned by military officers and engineers. At the same time, the Greek prime minister, Eleftherios Venizelos, was introduced to the prospects of the Epirus oil deposits by Mrazek himself. The matter was concluded in January 1919 with the founding of a Franco-Greek Petroleum Syndicate that would exploit the “petroliferous strata in Epirus,

⁸² The island of Zakynthos, to take a prime example, well-known since the antiquity for its surface hydrocarbon appearances, was ceded by Britain to the Greek state in 1864, along with the rest of the Ionian Islands. Only a year later, in 1865, concessions had already been made to foreign “speculators” and exploratory drilling was well underway; see Henri Coquand, “Description géologique des gisements bituminifères et pétrolifères de Sélenitza dans l’Albanie et de Chieri dans l’île de Zante,” *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France* 25 (1868): 20–74; For a concise introductory history of oil exploration in Zakynthos, see Evangelos Bobos, *Τα πετρέλαια της Ζακύνθου και τα εξ αυτών προϊόντα* (Piraeus: Typ. Efth. Proukaki, 1938).

⁸³ C. Niculescu, “Contributions à la Géologie de l’Épire (Environ de Janina),” *Bulletin de la Section Scientifique de l’Académie Roumaine* 3, no. 1 (1914).

⁸⁴ Georgios Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπειρώ εμφανίσεις ορυκτών υδρογονανθράκων και αι επί αυτών ερευνητικάί εργασίαι* (Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1922), 13–14. Georgalas’ source is his personal oral communication with C. Niculescu.

Aitolokarnania, the Peloponnese and the Ionian Islands”, initially funded by the French.⁸⁵ The relevant law took care to note that “the petroliferous strata [would be] excluded from laws concerning mine concessions”⁸⁶ and that the Greek state retained the right to be the first purchaser of any oil found, “according to its needs”.⁸⁷ Niculescu was recalled to Epirus, this time as the director of 25 specialised Romanian drillers, and began exploratory drilling on 31 August 1920.⁸⁸

This immediate mobilisation on the part of the Greek state was to be expected. The first decades of the twentieth century had brought about a rapid change in transport technology. The emergence of the internal combustion engine, the introduction of the automobile and, most of all, the transition of the world’s navies from coal to oil and oil’s subsequent role in World War I, had a “dramatic impact on the way governments viewed the oil industry”.⁸⁹ The very notion of oil had been transformed from an efficient light source chiefly used in lamps, to an asset of increasingly strategic importance, in peace and – most importantly – war.⁹⁰ While Niculescu commenced exploratory drilling in Epirus, Greek Navy officers were familiarising themselves with “liquid fuels used in internal combustion engines”.⁹¹ As the Greek state was entering yet another war, this time in Asia Minor, the existence of indigenous oil deposits had become a matter of obvious national importance.

Needless to say, the “Greek oil deposits” aroused immediate interest on the part of the two chief Greek geologists of the time. Of course this required a rapid education course, for neither of them was even remotely acquainted with oil or petroleum geology.

⁸⁵ Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης*, 328–29.

⁸⁶ “Περί εξαιρέσεως παραχωρήσεως πετρελαιοφόρων στρωμάτων εν Ηπείρω, Αιτωλοακαρνανία, Πελοποννήσω κλπ,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 82, 17 April 1919.

⁸⁷ Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης*, 330.

⁸⁸ Geogalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω*, 21.

⁸⁹ David Painter, “International Oil and National Security,” *Daedalus* 120, no. 4 (1991): 183.

⁹⁰ For oil as “the blood of victory” during the First World War, see Daniel Yergin, *The Prize*, 151–67. On the social and technical aspects of the navy’s transition to oil, see Nuno Madureira, “Oil in the Age of Steam,” *Journal of Global History* 5, no. 1 (2010): 75–94. For early Greek perceptions of the internal combustion automobile as a means of territory homogenisation, see Christos Karampatsos, “Efrosini Crossing Syngrou Avenue: Automobile Accidents and the Introduction of the Automobile in Greece, 1900–1911,” *History and Technology* 33 (2017): 255–79.

⁹¹ Theodoros Varounis, “Καύσις και καύσιμα ύλαι,” *Ναυτική Επιθεώρησης* 5, no. 14 (1919): 226–31. Between 1915 and 1916, Varounis performed “several tests” concerning the use of Zakynthos oil in ship boilers; see Geogalas, *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 97.

How the Two Most Prominent Greek Geologists Discovered Oil

Georgalas had never treated “oil” in his scarce pre-1920 scientific publications. Ktenas, on the other hand, as we have seen, had initiated correspondence with Mrazek as early as 1914. However, their correspondence was devoid of any reference to the famous Romanian oil fields or Mrazek’s 1911 exploratory activities in Epirus. In fact, Ktenas specifically noted in his 1917 “Preliminary Study” that “the geological conditions prevailing in Romanian territory and therefore the industrial direction of its agency are different than the Greek”.⁹² In 1917, his rejection of the possibility of the “Greek oil deposits” was as strong as they come.

A year later, Ktenas returned to the matter of the “Greek oil” in a comprehensive newspaper article. He was now aware of the developments taking place in Dragopssa and referred to the matter as “interest aroused on the part of various industrial and technical circles”. He had delved into the latest advances of petroleum geology and was now aware that “petroliferous areas” were characterised by the existence of “mineral salt deposits”, of the kind found in Epirus.⁹³ He went as far as to reverse the opinions expressed a year earlier. Now, the “tectonic conditions” prevailing in Western Greece were found to be “analogous to the major petroliferous zones of the Earth”. Anyhow, even when trying hard to align his opinions with the latest state initiatives, his disbelief in the existence of oil deposits remained evident. The article concluded that “even in the most probable case, that is, if exploration does not provide us with satisfactory results, the discovery of new asphalt deposits ... should be sufficient to cover any relevant cost”.⁹⁴

His careful stance earned Ktenas another honorary mention in the 1920 final report of the fuel committee, where his two-page article was once again republished with no comments whatsoever. It was followed by a 33-page “rough memorandum”, where Georgalas exhibited his newly acquired knowledge on hydrocarbon appearances within Greek territory. This was an effort to summarise previous exploratory and exploitation attempts since 1865 via a thorough perusal of relevant literature. It contained a particularly detailed section on Zakynthos, implying personal communication with Dionysios Kollaitis, the major wildcatter active in the island since 1911, and intimate knowledge of the “tests” conducted by the Greek Navy to assess the compatibility of Zakynthos’ oil with Greek ship boilers.⁹⁵ Matters looked most promising in Epirus, where “surface hydrocarbon appearances

⁹² Κτενάς, *Η γεωλογική υπηρεσία*, 22.

⁹³ Interestingly, the idea that “salt diapirs ... provide an effective seal for hydrocarbons” was first introduced by Ludovic Mrazek; see Constantin Roman, *Continental Drift: Colliding Continents, Converging Cultures* (Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2000): 12.

⁹⁴ Konstantinos Ktenas, “Ελληνικόν πετρέλαιον: Μία σοβαρά ελπίς,” *Αθήναι*, 15 July 1918.

⁹⁵ Georgalas, *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων*, 95, 97.

[were] more numerous than anywhere else”. Always ready to recognise an “urgent need”, Filaretos had already visited the area and taken asphalt samples. Apart from that, Georgalas referred to Niculescu’s 1914 and 1917 publications, according to which the Molitsa River valley was shaped as a “diapiric anticline”, of the type “firstly recognised by Professor Mrazek in the petroliferous areas of Romania”.⁹⁶ His memorandum concluded that “in Greece – and especially in Epirus – ... all conditions that, according to Mrazek, are necessary for the shaping of hydrocarbons are met”.⁹⁷ As elsewhere in the report, Georgalas’ “results” were summarised in a folding map of “the hydrocarbon appearances in Greece” aimed at impressing the fleeting reader with its size and comprehensiveness (fig.2).



Figure 2. The “appearances of mineral hydrocarbons in Greece”, as depicted by Georgios Georgalas in the report of the fuel committee (1920). Notice the absence of borders. (Georgios Georgalas, ed., *Επιτροπή επί των καυσίμων: Πορίσματα, εκθέσεις και υπομνήματα του μεταλλευτικού τμήματος αυτής* [Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1920], appendix.)

⁹⁶ Ibid, 101.

⁹⁷ Ibid. Georgalas included a reference to Ludovic Mrazek, *L’industrie du pétrole en Roumanie: Les gisements du pétrole* (Bucharest: Independenta, 1916).

Ktenas and Georgalas spent the years between 1920 and 1922 summarising their hastily gathered knowledge on the Greek oil deposits in extended essays, published by all means at their disposal and providing ample evidence of their differing scientific demeanours and tactics.⁹⁸ Ktenas' 1920 essay was a lengthy compilation of earlier stratigraphic works and more recent observations made using the mineralogical collections of the university museum. It was obvious that Ktenas had never visited most of the areas described, or that he had visited them for reasons other than oil exploration. His scepticism on the existence of hydrocarbon deposits in Western Greece was evident, fuelled among other things by "the absence of recent volcanic activity that could have led to hydrocarbon formation".⁹⁹ In his conclusions, Ktenas did not discourage exploratory drilling, provided – as always – that it was preceded by "a detailed geological and indeed tectonic analysis".¹⁰⁰ Unsurprisingly, his "Geological Survey" was now planning to initiate such an "analysis". The "detailed geological mapping of the territory" that no one yet had asked for, would begin "from the western parts of Greece" (fig. 3).¹⁰¹

Georgalas' treatise on the Epirus hydrocarbons was an altogether different beast. It began by pointing out the strategic significance of "king oil" and predicting the imminent "practical disappearance of anthracite".¹⁰² It went on to portray Georgalas' special mediating position between the Franco-Greek Petroleum Syndicate and the Ministry of National Economy. Thanks to this relation, Georgalas not only enjoyed access to Niculescu's reports to the syndicate, but he had had the opportunity to personally visit the site of the exploratory drillings in the company of Niculescu himself.¹⁰³ During this trip, which took "6 hours to cover a distance of 16 km" from Ioannina to the Molitsa River valley, Niculescu provided a history of the previous Epirus exploits, as well

⁹⁸ Ktenas' essay was published in its full form as Konstantinos Ktenas, "Η υδρογονανθρακούχος ζώνη της Δυτικής Ελλάδος," in *Υπομνήματα της γεωλογικής υπηρεσίας*, no. 1, ed. Konstantinos Ktenas (Athens: Ministry of Transport, 1920). A summary was published as Ktenas, "Η υδρογονανθρακούχος ζώνη της Δυτικής Ελλάδος κατά τον Κ.Α. Κτενά," *Αρχιμήδης* 21, no. 6 (1920): 47–49; the same summary was presented in French in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences* 170 (1920): 737; see Ktenas, *Κατάλογος επιστημονικών δημοσιεύσεων Κωνσταντίνου Κτενά* (Athens: Estia, 1931), 5. The essay by Georgalas was published in 1922 as Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω εμφανίσεις*. It was also presented before the Greek Society of the Physical Sciences in March 1921 and published in *Δελτίον της εν Ελλάδι Εταιρείας των Φυσικών Επιστημών* 2, no. 9–10 (1921).

⁹⁹ Ktenas, *Η υδρογονανθρακούχος*, 78.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 82.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 55.

¹⁰² Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω εμφανίσεις*, 5.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 21, 29. Georgalas' visit probably took place during the autumn of 1920.




Figure 3: “The zone of mineral hydrocarbons”, as depicted by Konstantinos Ktenas in 1920. This map is clearly rougher than the one produced by Georgalas in the same year (fig. 2), indicating Ktenas’ haste to publish a report as soon as possible. Evidently, even the ample resources of the university’s mineralogical laboratory had reached their limits. (Konstantinos Ktenas, “Η υδρογονανθρακούχος ζώνη της Δυτικής Ελλάδος,” in *Υπομνήματα της γεωλογικής υπηρεσίας*, vol. 1, ed. Konstantinos Ktenas [Athens: Ministry of Transport, 1920], 87.)

as useful insights into the stratigraphy of the area.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, Georgalas was allowed to inspect in person the drillings performed and describe them in detail, complete with their “1 square meter cross-section and wooden panelling”, characteristic of the Romanian drillers’ working style, and the exact results of each drilling attempt “up to 31 December 1921”.¹⁰⁵ With such *in situ* information available, Georgalas could keep general stratigraphic observations at a minimum, apart from the ones actually related to oil. Indeed, Mrazek’s “diapiric anticline” notion was portrayed as a geological theory possessing the rare trait of immediate practical application: it could direct actual drilling attempts so that they “define the extent of the deposit under the hypothesis that the carboniferous strata meet underground, enclosed by the impermeable salt-bearing strata”.¹⁰⁶

The conclusions were a potent display of the geological rhetoric we have already witnessed in the fuel committee’s report. Georgalas calmly divided the question of the Epirus oil deposits in two distinct parts. The first part of the question concerned the existence of oil in Epirus. Here the answer was “definitively positive”. The analogies of the “carboniferous zone of Western Greece” to the Carpathian one were plenty, extending from their “genesis” and age to the existence of “diapiric anticlines” and the appearance of oil in “secondary deposits inside younger strata protected by older ones”. The argument was strengthened by extracting all of Ktenas’ reservations from previous articles and refuting them one by one, in an obvious effort to portray Ktenas as the foremost expert opposing oil exploration.¹⁰⁷ The second part of the question concerned the economic viability of the oil deposits. Regrettably this was “impossible to answer”; according to Mrazek “an estimate of this kind of deposits is difficult, if not impossible ... and when Mrazek speaks thus, I am forced to fall silent”.¹⁰⁸

Meanwhile, those charged with producing the relevant public discourse were quite vocal. Greek newspapers routinely published articles that analysed oil’s strategic significance and prospects, usually anonymously. Readers were reminded of the “Zakynthos oil deposits”.¹⁰⁹ French policy during the Greek–Turkish War was

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 16–20, 29.

¹⁰⁵ For the “skill and resourcefulness” displayed by Romanian drillers as well as some “photos of everyday work” reminiscent of Georgalas’ verbal descriptions, see Francesco Gerali and Jenny Gregory, “Understanding and Finding Oil over the Centuries: The Case of the Wallachian Petroleum Company in Romania,” *Earth Sciences History* 36, no. 1 (2017): 54–55. The results of the drillings are described in detail in Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω εμφανίσεις*, 21–24.

¹⁰⁶ Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω εμφανίσεις*, 21.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 24, 28.

¹⁰⁹ Anonymous, “Το ελληνικόν πετρέλαιον,” *Εμπρός*, 12 December 1919.

explained via reference to the “oil of Mosul”.¹¹⁰ Oil was allegedly discovered in the Trikala vicinity in Thessaly during a water-drilling attempt.¹¹¹ Proposals submitted by “English investors” to install an oil refinery in Piraeus were being “seriously considered” and soon to be followed by “the great American oil firm Standard Oil Company”; a “large Anglo–Persian company [sic] [had] already submitted an exploitation proposal for the petroleum sources of Epirus and Macedonia”.¹¹² Greek public discourse between 1919 and 1923 is an early instance of the “fusion of catastrophe and exuberance” characteristic of twentieth-century oil discourse.¹¹³

This is not surprising given the political turbulence and rapid reversals that characterise the period. The elections of November 1920 once more brought to power the anti-Venizelist alliance and reinstated pro-German King Constantine as head of state. Ominous developments on the Asia Minor front from 1921 onwards led to the country’s increasing diplomatic isolation.¹¹⁴ The impeding military disaster also spelt disaster on the oil front. The Franco–Greek Petroleum Syndicate abandoned the Epirus exploration project after February 1922, presumably under orders from “Paris”.¹¹⁵

Georgalas proved to be a skilful navigator in these tumultuous seas. Political circumstance favoured him; Skoufos was reinstated to his former university chair after the 1920 election and, in the same year, Georgalas was at long last appointed a tenured professor of geology and mineralogy in the newly formed Agricultural School of Athens.¹¹⁶ He presented his Epirus oil essay in a speech before the

¹¹⁰ Εμπροσθοφύλαξ, “Το παράδοξον αίνιγμα της γαλλικής τουρκοφιλίας,” *Εμπρός*, 25 April 1921.

¹¹¹ Anonymus, “Πηγαί πετρελαίου εις τα Τρίκαλα,” *Εμπρός*, 20 December 1921.

¹¹² Anonymus, “Αι εγκαταστάσεις πετρελαίου εν Πειραιεί: Η κυβέρνησις δέχεται τας προτάσεις,” *Εμπρός*, 6 August 1922. The confusion between the various companies that had resulted after the 1911 breaking up of the Standard Oil Co. and the mistaken reference to the “Anglo–Persian Co.” testify to the novelty of the matter among Greek journalists. Also note that the reference to “Anglo–Persian” was not completely imaginary; the D’Arcy Exploration Co. actually involved (see below, n. 120) was a subsidiary of the Anglo–Persian Oil Company that specialised in exploratory drilling; Yergin, *The Prize*, 132.

¹¹³ Frederick Buell, “A Short History of Oil Cultures; or, The Marriage of Catastrophe and Exuberance,” in *Oil Culture*, ed. Ross Barret and Daniel Worden (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 83.

¹¹⁴ Yanis Yanoulopoulos, “Εξωτερική πολιτική,” in Hadziiossif, *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας στον 20ο αιώνα*, vol. A2, 135.

¹¹⁵ Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης*, 330.

¹¹⁶ Stefanidis, *Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν*, 67. Dimitrios Panagiotoopoulos, “Γεωργική εκπαίδευση και ανάπτυξη: Η συμβολή της ανωτάτης γεωπονικής σχολής Αθηνών” (PhD diss., Ionian University, 2003), 68.




Figure 4. The Molitsa River valley, as depicted by Georgalas “on the basis of a photograph”, that was presumably taken during his trip with Niculescu. Dragopssa village appears to the upper middle and left. Some of the drillings performed by the Romanians are also indicated. (Georgios Georgalas, *Αι εν Ηπείρω εμφανίσεις ορυκτών υδρογονανθράκων και αι επί αυτών ερευνητικάί εργασίαι* [Athens: Ministry of National Economy, 1922], table 2.)

Greek Society of Natural Sciences in 1921. He republished it in 1922, under the auspices of his Geological Bureau, including, as usual, several expensive folding maps of the areas mentioned (fig.4). He learnt how to calmly intervene in the public oil discourse¹¹⁷ and would scientifically examine and eventually disprove the existence of the alleged “Trikala petroleum source”.¹¹⁸ He even found time to venture into timely practical applications of his science, such as “war geology”.¹¹⁹

In early August 1922 Georgalas was selected to travel to Belgium as the “official Greek representative” at the 13th International Geological Congress. He was on a sensitive mission of national importance. Efforts to involve the D’Arcy Exploration Company in exploration attempts in Macedonia were underway.¹²⁰ Georgalas was aiming to attract foreign oil investment to Western Greece in an effort to replace the French. He summarised his Epirus oil essay before his peers

¹¹⁷ Anonymous, “Πετρέλαιον εις Τρίκαλα;,” *Εμπρός*, 24 December 1921.

¹¹⁸ Georgios Georgalas, “Natural Gas in Thessaly,” *Economic Geology* 19, no. 1 (1924): 95.

¹¹⁹ Georgios Georgalas, “Πολεμογεωλογία,” *Το Μέλλον* 4, no. 39–40 (1922): 10; in this article Georgalas perused recent international literature and concluded that “geology should be a part of military training” and that a “geological corps should accompany the military cadre”; On the development of “military geology”, see Edward Rose, “Military Geology: An American Term with German and French Ancestry,” *Earth Sciences History* 38, no. 2 (2019): 357–70.

¹²⁰ “Νόμος 2910 περί εξερευνήσεως της Ανατολικής και Δυτικής Μακεδονίας προς ανεύρεσιν και εκμετάλλευσιν πετρελαίου,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 138, 7 August 1922.

and modestly concluded that “interesting future [oil] applications” in Epirus were after all “not impossible”.¹²¹

As far as Greek oil ambitions were concerned, the mission was a complete failure; the Greek Army in Asia Minor collapsed a few days later, making all oil conversation redundant. In 1923 Georgalas applied for funding in order to “perform exploratory drilling” in the area of Tavri, Thrace. “Regrettably,” though, his application was rejected.¹²² His personal ambitions were faring a lot better. At long last he had acquired tenure, even if it was at the Agricultural School. He had been officially recognised as the foremost oil expert in Greece. He had even forced Ktenas to participate in the congress as an independent researcher “at his own expense”.¹²³

This status proved to be impervious to the political turbulence of the next few years. Between 1924 and 1925, Georgalas took advantage of an ongoing conversation on “state economies” to propose the merging of the two geological agencies into a single entity, under his direction. Despite his initial angry response, Ktenas was eventually forced to grudgingly accept a compromise.¹²⁴ In 1925 the two agencies were officially merged. The new agency was named the Geological Survey of Greece and was thereafter based in the Ministry of National Economy under the direction of Georgalas. In exchange, Ktenas’ disciple Georgios Voreadis was moved to the new agency as Georgalas’ subordinate.¹²⁵ Ktenas had to content himself with being one of the founding members of the Academy of Athens, formed in 1926. He never again published something on “Greek oil” or “Greek lignite”.

Geology and Oil Exploration in the 1930s

Ktenas died prematurely in 1935. He was unable to complete “his life’s work”, which after the unfortunate events described here, apparently had come to be

¹²¹ G.C. Georgalas, *Les hydrocarbures naturels en Grèce: Extrait du Compte Rendu du XIIIe Congrès géologique international 1922* (Liege: Vaillant-Carmanne, 1926), 1359.

¹²² Georgios Georgalas, “Υπάρχουν πετρέλαια εν Ελλάδι; Γ,” *Χημικά Χρονικά* 2, no. 4 (1937), 82.

¹²³ Ktenas narrates these traumatic events in Konstantinos Ktenas, “Επιστολή,” *Ελεύθερον Βήμα*, 21 July 1924. In 1921, his funding application for a “thorough exploration of the Erythrae peninsula” in Asia Minor was also rejected, thus putting an end to his “geological continuity” notion; see Karampatsos, “Το γενικότερο συμφέρον,” 148.

¹²⁴ Georgios Georgalas, “Επιστολή,” *Ελεύθερον Βήμα*, 19 July 1924; Ktenas, “Επιστολή”; Georgalas, “Αι γεωλογικαί υπηρεσίαι,” *Ελεύθερον Βήμα*, 27 July 1924.

¹²⁵ Georgios Georgalas, “Το ιστορικόν της ιδρύσεως της γεωλογικής υπηρεσίας της Ελλάδος,” *Χημικά Χρονικά* 38, no. 11–12 (1973): 262.

understood as “the study of the tertiary and quaternary lavas of the Aegean”.¹²⁶ He was also unable to witness the next appearance of the “Greek oil deposits” during another period of major political turbulence and expectation of war. Indeed, in early 1936, only months before the imposition of the Metaxas dictatorship, “large oil deposits” were discovered in Western Thrace. Since the matter was of “colossal importance”,¹²⁷ in the following months Greek newspapers ventured deeper into its intricacies. The most informed series of relevant articles appeared in the *Οικονομολόγος Αθηνών* newspaper only a few days after the dictatorship was declared, and went on until January 1937. Here “ancient writers”, like Herodotus, were once more recruited to certify the existence of oil deposits. Next to them one could find “the director of the Geological Survey G. Georgalas, [who] as early as 1920 scientifically examined the Ioannina region with quite satisfactory results”. What’s more, the exploratory drillings were now taking place “in Tavri village, near Alexandroupoli”, the exact place of Georgalas’ 1923 rejected drilling proposal. The titles and argumentation of the articles were invariably formulated following a familiar rhetorical ploy that was now condensed in a deceptively simple question: “Is there oil in Greece?”¹²⁸

As we have seen, Georgalas was aware of this ploy and its merits since 1921. He could now further explore its potential from a new position, as in January 1937 he took over Ktenas’ vacant university chair. The installation ceremony, which took place in the institution’s Great Hall, was attended by “His Majesty the Crown Prince, the dean, the professors and a host of other notaries from the scientific and literary world”. They all witnessed Georgalas’ inaugural address, titled “Is there oil in Greece?” The answer to this familiar question was formulated in the usual manner. Greece “certainly possessed oil deposits,

¹²⁶ In 1969, Georgios Marinos collected, edited and published Ktenas’ previous work concerning the island of Ikaria. Marinos deemed it “unnecessary” to publish Ktenas’ views on the “tectonic connections” between the Aegean and Asia Minor included therein; see Marinos, ed., *Γεωλογία της νήσου Ικαρίας*, 62, 67.

¹²⁷ E. Tzamouranis, “Έχει και η Ελλάς πηγές πετρελαίου – Το πολύτιμον υγρόν – τι ευρέθη εις Θράκην,” *Αθηναϊκά Νέα*, 6 February 1936.

¹²⁸ Anonymous, “Υπάρχει Πετρέλαιον εν Ελλάδι;,” *Οικονομολόγος Αθηνών*, 15 August 1936; an article with the exact same title had appeared in the same newspaper in 1933, when the Greek state began auctioning concessions for Macedonia and Thrace; Anonymous, “Υπάρχει πετρέλαιον εν Ελλάδι;,” *Οικονομολόγος Αθηνών*, 28 January 1933; also see Ar. Avramidis, “Υπάρχει πετρέλαιον εν τη Δυτική Θράκη;,” *Οικονομολόγος Αθηνών*, 5 December 1936, and Avramidis, “Διεπιστώθη η ύπαρξις πετρελαίου εν τη Δυτική Θράκη,” *Οικονομολόγος Αθηνών*, 9 January 1937. For accounts of the post-1930 Greek oil exploration attempts, see Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης*, 331–45; the newspaper articles are cited in Christos Hadziiosif, *Η γηραιά σελήνη: Η βιομηχανία στην Ελλάδα 1830–1940* (Athens: Themelio, 1993), 194–95.

although of unknown quantity and synthesis”. Exploratory drilling had to be “immediately performed” in areas where “serious scientific evidence of the possibility of oil deposits exists”. The foremost of these areas was “the vicinity of Dragopso in Epirus”. Georgalas’ solid argumentation on “the serious evidence of possibility” was met by “vigorous and extended applause”.¹²⁹ The exploration attempts conducted in the four following years remained fruitless.¹³⁰

The dispute was – at long last – settled and a certain “reality” concerning the Greek oil deposits had been produced. It persists until today.

Conclusion: On Geology, Reality and the “General Interest of the State”

Scholars working in the fields of the history of science and technology have long argued that science should be treated as a human practice deeply embedded in wider societal structures, interests and aspirations. This point is further refined in the work of historian of science Naomi Oreskes. In a case study concerning US oceanography during the Cold War, Oreskes shows that US oceanographers “actively sought opportunities for Navy sponsorship and attempted to forge a symbiotic relationship” with the US Navy. This led to a preoccupation with specific scientific questions that “came into focus through the crosshairs of national security”. In the case of US oceanography, scientific questions stemmed from a powerful “context of motivation”, much more related to the accommodation of personal interests within the wider historical context, than to the “internal logic” of science.¹³¹

The “context of motivation” active in the case of the two most prominent Greek geologists of the 1910s was equally powerful. The doubling of the Greek territory accomplished after 1913 provided “men serving the natural sciences” with a veritable “civilising mission”, meaning the implementation of Greek state power in the “New Lands” through technopolitical means. An estimate of the quantity and quality of the industrial energy sources within Greek territory was an obvious prerequisite for any future economic or military planning. Oil’s strategic significance was made apparent during the First World War, and was readily comprehended in Greece, a country readying itself to embark on a war of its own in Asia Minor.

¹²⁹ Anonymous, “Τα πετρέλαια της Ελλάδος: Τι είπεν ο κ. Γεωργαλάς,” *Αθηναϊκά Νέα*, 29 January 1937; This article summarises the conclusions of Georgios Georgalas, *Υπάρχουν πετρέλαια εν Ελλάδι; Εναρκτήριο μάθημα εν τω Πανεπιστημίω (28-1-1937)* (Athens: Chimika Chronika, 1937), 67–70.

¹³⁰ Pantelakis, *Αλέξανδρος Ν. Διομήδης*, 345.

¹³¹ Oreskes, “A Context of Motivation,” 726, 730.

Inevitably, Ktenas and Georgalas perceived this powerful “context of motivation” through the lens of their scientific discipline. They were both trained as typical early twentieth-century geologists. They were accustomed to a stratigraphic view of the subsoil, meant to “make of the nation a single geological specimen that could be understood as a legible and logical whole”.¹³² At the same time though, this view was increasingly suspect of irrelevant accounts and problematic relations with “practical application”. The “divide between ‘pure’ and ‘practical’ research” in geology was being renegotiated all around the world.¹³³ Greece was no exception, although in this case, any “practical application” of geology had to take into account an urgent military and strategic aspect.

The scientific work performed by Ktenas until 1920 was materialised under the powerful influence of this “context of motivation”. As we have seen, Ktenas invested his early scientific work in two large-scale scientific undertakings. The “geological continuity of the Greek Lands” and the founding of a Greek Geological Survey were both designed to be a “translation” of the “general interest of the state” into Ktenas’ stratigraphic language. The crowning achievement of this strategy was his article on the “anthracites of Greece”. As demonstrated in this article, a savant professor of geology could produce a depiction of the “geological continuity” of the future Greek territory and, at the same time, transform “the search for anthracite ... into a matter of a purely theoretical nature”, simply by complementing old stratigraphic descriptions with his own.¹³⁴ His vision for a Greek Geological Survey and a “comprehensive geological map of the territory”, presented in the same year, was no more than a laborious application of this methodology until it managed to accurately describe the sum of the territory in about 50 years. In the process, Ktenas would have risen to become chief geologist in Greece.

The 1920 report of the fuel committee offers a glimpse into a much different perception of the relation between geology, industry and the state. From this point of view, concisely summarised by industrial inspector Filaretos, Ktenas’ comprehensive vision must have seemed rather outlandish. The Greek state had exited three consecutive wars and was about to enter another. An immediate “confirmation of adequate lignite deposits” was “an urgent need”, indeed urgent

¹³² For a short account of the emergence of “historical (or ‘stratigraphical’) geology” in the nineteenth century, see Bruce Braun, “Producing Vertical Territory: Geology and Governmentality in Late Victorian Canada,” *Cultural Geographies* 7, no. 1 (2000): 15–24; the quote on 22.

¹³³ Lucier, “A Plea,” 286.

¹³⁴ Ktenas clearly thought that this achievement was impressive enough to be used as his opening argument; Ktenas, “Οι λιθανθρακες Α’,” 2–3.

enough to be rhetorically performed before any exploration. Filaretos' estimate of between "30 and 100 million tonnes" of lignite seemed arbitrary; in fact it drew ample legitimacy from pressing historical circumstance, as well as from its compliance with short-term interests. The purchase of expensive equipment, the hiring of skilled and unskilled workers, the power to officially assess private lignite deposits, and 600,000 drachmas of funds, could well transform the "inspector geologist" into an indispensable appendage of the mining industry and connect him to private interests in a manner that was much more convincing and feasible than Ktenas' "endless undertaking", which presented itself as novel but was in fact reminiscent of various dubious nineteenth-century attempts to connect geology and the state.¹³⁵

Strongly motivated by their occupational dispute and his inferior position, Georgalas proved to be much more compatible than Ktenas with the Ministry of National Economy's approach, much more willing to forego the prerequisite of a "complete geological study" and provide "actual results". This is most evident in the way he accommodated his stratigraphic training within the needs posed by oil exploration. The result was a view of the geological endeavour that was much different than the one proposed by Ktenas. This was an idiom constructed via the fusion of geological knowledge, personal relations, evasive rhetoric and political intuition. Granted, this meant that words such as "possibly", "probably", "most certainly" and "maybe" had to be repeated three to four times in the same paragraph of his early reports. But any ambiguity was invariably lifted in the opposite page where "results" were carefully tabulated or sketched into "rough geological maps".¹³⁶ The rhetorical ploy invented in 1921 between "is there oil" and "is this oil exploitable" served to eliminate all speculation. As is often the case with oil discourse, it focused on "what people know and what they know they do not know". At the same time it summarised "fragmented knowledge and bits of partially obscured geological matter" in an effort to transform speculation into "reality".¹³⁷

Indeed, "reality" often results as "the consequence of the settlement of a [scientific] dispute rather than its cause".¹³⁸ The dispute described here did

¹³⁵ Pietro Corsi, "Introduction to Thematic Set of Papers on Geological Surveys," *Earth Sciences History* 26, no. 1 (2007), 7. Corsi argues that European geological surveys of the kind proposed by Ktenas had to constantly deal with "repeated administrative or political threats to put an end to an endless undertaking".

¹³⁶ For an example, see Georgalas, *Επιτροπή επί των κανσίων*, 50, 54.

¹³⁷ Weszkalnys, "Geology, Potentiality, Speculation," 622.

¹³⁸ Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* (1979; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 236.

not take place exclusively in laboratories and certainly was not of the “purely scientific” kind. It was a messy thing, conducted for decades under the powerful gravitational field of a “context of motivation” made of national interest, personal ambition and historical circumstance. Yet it produced the “reality” regarding “the Greek oil deposits” in a very strong sense.

The sort of “reality” produced was not the exclusive intellectual property of Georgalas. On the contrary it characterises the international oil exploration discourse since its beginnings. Scholars that have treated similar cases of fruitless oil exploration have rightly detected a fusion of practices, such as exploratory drillings, geological reports and skilful rhetoric, carefully designed to “materialise an absent potential and promise future gain”. The result constitutes “an extended meanwhile in which [oil] potentiality is reassured”.¹³⁹

A Greek version of this “oil potentiality” was produced during the fruitless Epirus oil exploration in 1920. It was efficiently manipulated by Georgalas, and was a significant factor in the outcome of his dispute with Ktenas. It was further refined thereafter, as Greek oil exploration attempts followed the “long periods of dormancy characteristic of the industry”.¹⁴⁰

The reality thus produced is a peculiar one; it is made of “history”, “geology” and tacit political and rhetorical knowledge amassed during one-and-a-half centuries of Greek oil exploration attempts. Expectedly, it resurfaces again and again, along with every resurfacing of the “oil matter”.¹⁴¹ On 16 October 2014, new oil exploration attempts began in the Dragopsa vicinity by a “consortium of Repsol and Energean Oil”. An information meeting was organised in nearby Ioannina city. The audience gathered for the occasion heard an enlightening speech by an expert geologist “employed for many years in the Public Petroleum Corporation and now returning to the area with the Energean Oil & Gas Company”. According to him, “we know that an oil system exists but we do not know the whereabouts of the deposit”. “Yet,” an article concluded, “nowadays, science, technology and the means provided by our era present us with possibilities that did not exist a few years ago. Data gathering is already

¹³⁹ Weszkalnys, “Geology, Potentiality, Speculation,” 616, 620. The case studied by Weszkalnys is São Tomé and Príncipe, where oil exploration has been conducted since 1876 with meagre results.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 614.

¹⁴¹ For the resurfacing of the attempts to explore for Epirus oil under a different “context of motivation” in the 1950s, see indicatively G. Vanzios, “Ο Ορυκτός πλούτος της Ηπείρου,” *Ηπειρωτική Εστία* 17 (1953): 970–75; also I. Marinos, V. Andronopoulos and N. Melidonis, “Το υπέδαφος της Ηπείρου,” *Ηπειρωτική Εστία* 87–90 (1959): 572–78.

underway ... the first drill will be installed in three years.”¹⁴² Seven years later, no drilling had taken place. Repsol had reportedly decided to abandon Greece.¹⁴³

The peculiar reality of the Greek oil deposits was produced a hundred years ago; it might as well persist for a few more.

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens/University of West Attica

Institute for Mediterranean Studies – Foundation of Research and Technology Hellas

¹⁴² Anonymous, “Ένας αιώνας έρευνας για τα πετρέλαια των Ιωαννίνων σε δέκα ασπρόμαυρα ντοκουμέντα,” *Epiruspost.gr*, 16 October 2014, accessed 9 April 2023, <https://bit.ly/41J1x11>.

¹⁴³ Christos Kolonas, “Τι συμβαίνει με τα πετρέλαια στην Ελλάδα: 10 χρόνια μετά και ούτε μία γεώτρηση,” *in.gr*, 4 April 2021, accessed 5 April 2021, <https://www.in.gr/2021/04/04/economy/oikonomikes-eidiseis/ti-symvainei-ta-petrelaia-stin-ellada-10-xronia-meta-kai-oute-mia-geotrisi/>

Special Section II / Section Spéciale II

Atlas1821.com

A DIGITAL ATLAS OF THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE
AND THE CREATION OF THE GREEK STATE, 1821–1852

In memoriam Eugenia Drakopoulou

Presentation

This Special Section is dedicated to the Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State (1821–1852), a digital mapping project conducted by the Institute of Historical Research / National Hellenic Research Foundation and generously funded by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation. The atlas is based on the historical maps and their related source materials produced during the period under study, and first-hand testimonies of the Greek War of Independence extracted from memoirs of combatants. It proposes a digital reconstruction of the historical landscape of Greece during the crucial years of the emergence of the Greek state and offers a research tool for information on the Greek space and the revolutionary events.

The Special Section comprises three articles. The first one is collective and serves as an introduction. It presents the aim of the project, the empirical methodology followed for the creation of the atlas, and a survey of its content and structure. The following two contributions are dedicated to the historical material employed for the creation of the atlas, the maps produced during the period in question and the memoirs of the combatants. The first article, by George Toliás, examines the cartography of Greece produced by French army engineers between 1811 and 1827 as a laboratory for the conception and definition of the country; the last article, by Panagiotis El Gedi, examines the interaction between the memoirs of the combatants and the patriotic poetry dedicated to the sieges and the sortie of Messolonghi, from 1821 to 1880.

George Toliás

Institute of Historical Research

RECONSTRUCTING THE MAP: ‘DEEP MAPPING’ GREECE, 1821–1852

George Tolia, Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis El Gedi

ABSTRACT: The article serves as introduction to this Special Section. After a brief overview of the potential of historical maps as visual memory registers, and a presentation of some analogous recent developments in the digital humanities, such as “spatial history”, “deep mapping” and “digital storytelling”, the article presents the aim of the project and the empirical methodology followed for the development of the Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1852. The Atlas is based on the corpus of important maps produced during the period under examination, their exploitation as sources of information, and their reconstruction, achieved through the unveiling of the subsequent layers of the principal sources of information of each map, such as travellers’ accounts and scientific expeditions, topographic illustrations and reconnaissance itineraries, topographic or hydrographic surveys, statistics, etc. The atlas is further supplemented by additional information, a selection of first-hand testimonies on the Greek War of Independence, extracted from memoirs of combatants as well as illustrations related to the revolutionary events.

Maps and Memory

It was necessary to place the Hospital of Don Juan Tavera in the form of a model because, not only did it cover the Puerta de Visagra [Bisagra], but the dome or cupola rose up over the city and so once placed as a model and moved from its location it seemed to me to show the facade better than elsewhere, and as to how it fits within the city, this can be seen in the plan. Also in the story of Our Lady bringing the chasuble to Saint Ildefonso, in order to adorn him and to make the figures large, I have in a certain way taken advantage of their being celestial bodies, as in the case of lights, which when viewed from afar, however small, they may appear to be large.¹

The acknowledgment appears on El Greco’s *View and Plan of Toledo*, painted at the turn of the seventeenth century (fig. 1). It is inscribed on the right side of the plan of the city displayed to the viewer by a youth, who stands below and on the right of the altered view. Next to the plan and towards the centre, a “model” of

¹ See Harold E. Wethey, *El Greco and His School* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 2:84–85.

the Tavera Hospital is shown, floating on a cloud, and further to the left appears the allegorical figure of the river-god Tagus, painted in monochrome earthly tones. Above the view of the city and in the clouded skies, appears the Virgin Mary, escorted by angels and placing a chasuble on Saint Ildefonsus, first bishop and patron of the city.



Figure 1. Domenikos Theotokopoulos (El Greco), *View and Plan of Toledo* (1608). Oil on canvas, Museum of El Greco, Toledo.

Art historians agree that El Greco's complex and somehow unsettling view resumes the multiple layers of the city's identity, political as well as cultural, sacred as well as secular.² In order to disclose the complexity of the city's *true nature*, the artist marshalled all sorts of means of representation, such as the perspective panorama and the topographic survey, and also resorted to antiquarian and religious symbols. El Greco's wish to portray in depth his adoptive city is not an isolated case. It has to be considered against the frame of early modern visual culture, when artists, scientists, humanist scholars and practitioners explored the potential of all kinds of spatial representations – artistic, literary, empirical or scientific – in order to explore the multiple layers of meaning registered on space. It is a composite process that implores a set of

² Jonathan Brown and Richard L. Kagan, "View of Toledo," in "Figures of Thought: El Greco as Interpreter of History, Tradition, and Ideas," *Studies in the History of Art* 11 (1982): 18–30.

intellectual procedures and attitudes, a *forma mentis* that seeks to survey the manifold aspects of human adventure on Earth.

The unprecedented flow of information due to the proliferation of communication networks and the advent of printing affected mapmaking and transformed maps into a central agent of collecting, organising and communicating new and old knowledge. From the fifteenth century till the reformation of mapmaking during the Enlightenment, and the ensuing entanglement of cartography in a technological and positivistic perception, maps were conceived as visual tools that made possible the exploration of the *true nature* of places. Among the many factors that supported and sustained this stance, mention should be made of the appearance in the West of two Greek geographical works composed during the Roman imperial era: Strabo's *Geographica* and Ptolemy's *Geography*. The first was a stoic description of the inhabited world in which places are perceived as historical theatres of human action, while the latter was a guide for the construction of the mathematical map of the world and its regions, conceived as a tool for the deciphering of the mathematical coherence of the universe.³ Against the then prevailing intellectual frame of universal harmony, the mathematically constructed map was understood as a means for expressing and even exploring the workings of the World Machine.

Maps as virtual representations of natural environments were chiefly used as registers of the variety of the Creation as they displayed the natural settings of human activity. Indeed, maps responded to the desire to portray the multiple layers of accumulated meaning related to places: past and present place names, historical or religious annotations and explanatory notes, emblems and genealogies of rulers, landscapes, costumes and thematic vignettes alluding to the local customs, mythology and sacred or secular history, fictional elements such as imaginary beasts and monstrous races inherited from the *Corpus Aristotelicum* or Pliny's *Natural History*. All these composed a mass of attractive and often encrypted cartographic paraphernalia that nowadays has transformed old maps into highly decorative and collectable items.

Important maps were accompanied by analytical descriptions of the displayed places, concordance lists of ancient and modern place names and, since the first atlases, by descriptions printed on the back of each map, containing elements of geography, mythology, history, local curiosities and famous men, as well as selected textual descriptions of the charted areas. "Mirrors", "theatres" or "true portraits" of space, maps served as registers of the memory of places.

³ Patrick Gautier Dalché, *La Géographie de Ptolémée en Occident (IVe–XVI siècle)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), and Gautier Dalché, "Strabo's Reception in the West (Fifteenth–Sixteenth Centuries)," in *The Routledge Companion to Strabo*, ed. Daniela Dueck (London: Routledge, 2017), 367–84.

In the opening lines of the first modern atlas Abraham Ortelius described geography as “the eye of history”, and maps as memory theatres that enabled the understanding of history:

And when we have acquainted our selves somewhat with the use of these *Tables* or *Mappes*, or have attained thereby to some reasonable knowledge of *Geography*, whatsoever we shall read, these *Chartes* being placed, as it were certaine glasses before our eyes, will the longer be kept in memory, and make the deeper impression in us: by which meanes it commeth to passe, that now we do seeme to perceive some fruit of that which we have read. The reading of Histories doeth both seeme to be much more pleasant, and in deed so it is, when the *Mappe* being layed before our eyes, we may behold things done, or places where they were done, as if they were at this time present and in doing.⁴

The mnemonic function of maps is easy to understand. To begin with, maps can act as mnemonic *imagines agentes* (“scenes in action”), their direct visual effect and the spatial ratio of the data that they contain facilitates the recollection of events related to the region represented on the map, known to the viewer from previous readings.⁵ Then, historical events such as wars, conquests, discoveries or migrations are hard to follow outside of their geographical settings. Thanks to the enduring nature of space and the flowing complexion of history, maps were not only used in order to display the natural and still-present settings of historical events, but also to embrace the assorted historical layers of human activity by including the historical toponymy of the pictured area as well as historical vignettes, textual or visual, of important events related to the depicted areas. The constancy of space over the changeability of time echoes down to the mid-seventeenth century. In 1652 the English polymath Peter Heylyn stated that “Geography without History hath life and motion, but very unstable, and at random; but History without Geography, like a dead carkass, hath neither life, nor motion at all.”⁶

The all-embracing, encyclopaedic and mnemonic function of early maps opened the way to thematic cartographies, especially historical or “comparative”

⁴ Abraham Ortelius’ address “To the Courteous Reader,” *Theatrum orbis terrarum* (Antwerp, 1570), 1 (English translation, *The Theatre of the Whole World* [London, 1606]). The motto “historiae oculus geographia” also appears on the title page of Ortelius’s historical atlas, the *Parergon* (1592).

⁵ George Tolia, “Maps in Renaissance Libraries and Collections,” in *The History of Cartography*, vol. 3, *Cartography in the European Renaissance*, ed. David Woodward (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 637–60 (esp. 637–42: “Maps as Memory Aids”).

⁶ Peter Heylyn, *Cosmographie in Four Bookes, Containing the Chorographie and Historie of the Whole World* (London, 1652), address to the reader.

cartography, and the production of important historical atlases,⁷ and found notable applications in education during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁸ It was challenged, however, and gradually vanished with the advent of the so-called “scientific” reformation in cartography, in other words, the cartography performed not by venerable scholars but by engineers *sans littérature*,⁹ by young army officers working on the field, initially trained in military topography schools and, later on, in technical universities. They applied older and novel quantitative methodologies, such as geodesy and statistics, and their maps were immense works in series of multiple sheets and in scales going up to 1:80,000 or 1:50,000. Commonly called General Staff Maps, they proposed an unprecedented accuracy and detail of the actual state of things. The maps of the learned fell victim to an age of technology and became a thing of the past. Hence resulted the opposition between “field” and “cabinet” cartography, where the technological accuracy and objectivity of the former opposed the cultural (“symbolic”) and intuitive subjectivity of the latter.¹⁰ The opposition was hard to break. It took all the efforts of a series of scholars over the last decades, from Brian Harley and Denis Cosgrove to Patrick Gautier Dalché and Mathiew Edney, to restore the intellectual and scientific value of medieval and early modern maps and to deconstruct the positivistic notions of “scientific” or “technical” revolutions in the history of cartography.

In parallel and independent to these scholarly endeavours, other developments occurred. The digital age and the dazzling proliferation of data brought yet another transformation of cartographic practices through the

⁷ Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Walter Goffart, *Historical Atlases: The First Three Hundred Years, 1570–1870* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

⁸ Georges Tolia, “Géographie comparée et mémoire locale au XVIIe siècle Les *Parallela geographiae veteris et novae* de Philippe Briet,” *Orbis disciplinae: Hommages en l’honneur de Patrick Gautier Dalché*, ed. Nathalie Bouloux, Anca-Cristina Dan and George Tolia (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 763–77.

⁹ J.-B. Bourguignon d’Anville, *Considérations générales, sur l’étude et les connoissances que demande la composition des ouvrages de géographie* (Paris, 1777), 110.

¹⁰ See David Woodward, “The ‘Two Cultures’ of Map History – Scientific and Humanistic Traditions: A Plea for Reintegration,” in *Approaches and Challenges in a Worldwide History of Cartography*, ed. David Woodward, Catherine Delano-Smith and Cordell D.K. Yee (Barcelona: Institut Cartogràfic de Catalunya, 2001), 49–67; Matthew Edney, “Cartography’s ‘Scientific Reformation’ and the Study of Topographical Mapping in the Modern Era,” in *History of Cartography: International Symposium of the ICA Commission, 2010*, ed. Elri Liebenberg and Imre Josef Demhardt (Heidelberg: Springer for the International Cartographic Association, 2012), 287–303.

development of Geographical Information Systems (GIS). Once again mapping was among the solutions to organise the unprecedented flow of information. Among the manifold GIS applications, a peculiar trend took shape within the broader field of the digital humanities, the so-called “spatial turn” or “geospatial scholarship”, in which scholars and social scientists, geographers and internet experts met.¹¹ Sophisticated digital practices were developed, such as *spatial history*, *deep mapping* and *spatial storytelling*, while novel and impressive tools were proposed to grasp multiple sets of space-related data and to explore the cultural and social construction of space.¹²

“Deep mapping” is an experimental notion, and as such there is no consensus on its content and methodology. In a recent overview, archaeologist Tiffany Earley-Spadoni considers “deep maps” as multi-layered, digital cartographic representations that allow “map creators to annotate and illustrate geographical and social space in various ways, often using multi-media elements, commenting, and super-imposable layers.”¹³ Quoting a recent bibliography on the subject, the author attests that deep maps “can provide temporal resolution to cartographic data”, can illustrate the element of change over time and “may integrate aspirational or imaginary space”. She observes, furthermore, that the technological framework of the medium affects its functions, since the process by which a deep map is produced makes it simultaneously a platform, a product and a process. “A deep map”, she concludes, “is a complex construction composed of layers of meaning and process.”¹⁴

Geographers, social anthropologists and archaeologists were among the first to explore the potential of these novel technologies, thanks to the transdisciplinary character of their respective epistemological fields. However, the risk of adding new layers of confusion through the use of these tools is more

¹¹ Barney Warf and Santa Arias, eds., *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

¹² “Deep Mapping,” ed. Les Roberts, special issue, *Humanities* (May 2016); Martin Dodge, “Cartography I: Mapping Deeply, Mapping the Past,” *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 1 (2016): 1–10. For a recent summary, see Stuart Dunn, *A History of Place in the Digital Age* (London: Routledge, 2019). For an overview and a critical assessment, see Martin Dodge, “Cartography I: Mapping Deeply, Mapping the Past,” *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 1 (2017): 89–98.

¹³ Tiffany Earley-Spadoni, “Spatial History, Deep Mapping and Digital Storytelling: Archaeology’s Future Imagined Through an Engagement With the Digital Humanities,” in “Archaeological GIS Today: Persistent Challenges, Pushing Old Boundaries, and Exploring New Horizons,” ed. Meghan C.L. Howey, Marieka Brouwer Burg, special issue, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 84 (2017): 95–102.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 97.

than real in historiography, a discipline compelled to ground its analyses of changes and continuities on significant and coherent corpuses of documents. In contrast, the use of these tools presents advantages in the analysis of historical maps since the rationality that lies behind these innovative and often impressive digital applications is rooted in the foundations of modern mapping practices. Indeed, digital “deep mapping” processes have similar ambitions to the multi-layered complexion and the mnemonic function of early modern mapping, though in a much more analytical scale, and with the use of modern digital tools.

One could say that mapping is a form of creating virtual environments, being a compilation and editing of all sorts of space-related data, in other words, its arrangement and communication to the public by means of analogical or mathematically structured visual representations. As graphic records of space-related data, maps are the outcome of a critical processing of available information. The reconstruction of the successive layers of their documentation, wherever possible, can shed light on the key issue of how space was conceived and how its representations were fashioned. Deep-mapping methodology can be useful in the reconstruction of historical maps, the unfolding of the successive layers of cartographic processes and documentation, the practises of compilation, and disclose the perennial patterns of mapping, a process that seeks to marshal, spatially organise and visually display information.

The Digital Atlas: Aim and Resources

The Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1852, is based on the historical, cartographic and geographic documentation produced during the time period under examination. It is an open-access interactive cartographic restoration of the historical landscape of Greece during these crucial years and a search tool for first-hand testimonies on the geography and history of Greece. It is an open-ended project, conducted at the Institute for Historical Research over the last decade, a fertile collaboration between historians, digital cartographers and network engineers.¹⁵

In undertaking this exploration, our aim was to investigate some of the intellectual processes by which Greece was conceived as a political territorial entity, to investigate the means by which these processes operated, and to offer to the academic community a set of reliable historical data on the natural and inhabited landscape of the Greek state in its making, such as a portion of the always missing historical gazetteer of modern Greece.

¹⁵ See the acknowledgments at the end of this article, herein pp. @@@.

Studying the mechanisms of the creation of the Greek state in its making is a complex task which implies systematic research in political, economic, social and institutional documentation. We opted to approach the issue from the perspective of geography, and to explore the ways by which Greece was conceived as a territorial entity. During the period under examination, Greek national space remained undefined and fluid. The process of its definition was quite precarious since Greece had never existed until then as a political and territorial entity, while the transfer from the ethnocultural notion of the “Greek people”, scattered for centuries in the north-eastern Mediterranean, to the political notion of “Greece” as a national state, was on the go.

The revolutionary administrations were quite elusive on the issue of the definition of the country, its extent and its internal jurisdiction. The first official document to describe the limits and the administrative structure of the country is the so-called “Hegemonic Constitution” of 1832, approved by the representatives of the Greek nation on the eve of King Othon’s arrival to Greece, when the Treaty of Constantinople and the London Conference provided international recognition to the Greek state.¹⁶ The uncertainty of things is to be expected within the context of a national revolution in progress. The war broke out simultaneously in Moldavia and the Peloponnese, while revolutionary sparks were manifested in an area stretching from Macedonia and the coasts of Asia Minor to the islands of Crete and the remote Cyprus, while only the Peloponnese, Central Greece and the Cyclades were included in the newly created state. When the representatives of the “Protecting Powers”, as they emerged after the 1827 Battle of Navarino (Russia, Britain and France), asked in 1828 the revolutionary administration on the extent of the future state, Governor Kapodistrias referred them “to the evidence of history and the opinion of geographers”, and proposed the territories included in the map of Greece, published in Paris by the French military cartographer Pierre Lapie in 1826, the most influential map at the time.¹⁷

Greece was not yet defined in political terms, but in historical and geographical ones. Therefore, the geographic and cartographic output related to Greece during the years under examination is not an anodyne learned or technological venture. The geography and the map of Greece conceived and imposed the country as a historical and geographical entity long before it was

¹⁶ Πολιτικὸν Σύνταγμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατὰ τὴν Ε΄ Ἐθνικὴν Συνέλευσιν. Ἐκδιδόμενον νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ὑπὸ Ἀνδρέου Ζ. Μάμουκα (Athens: Τυρ. Ρ. V. Melachouri and Ph. Karambini, 1843), 1.

¹⁷ Kapodistrias’ reply from Poros is dated 9 October 1828. See Andreas Z. Mamoukas, *Τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀναγέννησιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἤτοι Συλλογὴ τῶν περὶ τὴν ἀναγεννωμένην Ἑλλάδα συνταχθέντων πολιτευμάτων, νόμων καὶ ἄλλων ἐπισήμων πράξεων ἀπὸ τοῦ 1821 μέχρι τέλους τοῦ 1832* (Athens: Vasiliki Typografia, 1852), 11:256–57.

recognised as a political one. They constitute major cultural endeavours of significant political and ideological weight, as they were part of the mechanisms that supported both the international acceptance of a Greek national territory and the consolidation of the national idea. The map of the country became the image that summarised and impressed the territorial status of an independent Greece, the central claim of the fighting Greeks.

In order to place our inquiries on a coherent corpus of historical documents and a uniform set of data, we opted to assemble the digital atlas on the basis of the authoritative maps produced during the period under examination. The main corpus of our research consists therefore of the following maps:

1. Sheets 10–15 of the *General Map of Turkey in Europe*, by Pierre Lapie, in 15 sheets and a scale of 1:800,000, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre between 1822 and 1825;¹⁸

2. A derivative, the map of Greece in four sheets and a scale 1:400,000 by Pierre Lapie, published in 1826;¹⁹

3. The map of the Peloponnese in six sheets and a scale of 1:200,000, based on the survey conducted by the French army between 1828 and 1832, published in 1832 and included in the atlas of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, 1835;²⁰

4. The geological and historical map of the Peloponnese by Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, also a member of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, in one sheet and a scale of 1:800,000, published in 1833;²¹

5. The map of the northern frontier of Greece based on a survey conducted by the International Boundary Commission in 1832 and published in Athens, in 1837, in eight sheets and a scale of 1:150,000;²²

¹⁸ Pierre Lapie, *Carte générale de la Turquie d'Europe en XV feuilles* (Paris, 1822[–1825]).

¹⁹ Pierre Lapie, *Carte physique, historique et routière de la Grèce, dressée au 400,000e* (Paris, 1826).

²⁰ Jean-Jacques-Germain Pelet, Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félicien Peytier, Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye and Aristide-Camille Servier, *Carte de la Morée rédigée et gravée au Dépôt Général de la Guerre, d'après les triangulations et les levés exécutés en 1829, 1830 et 1831 par les officiers d'état-major attachés au Corps d'occupation, par ordre de M. le Maréchal Duc de Dalmatie Ministre de la Guerre, sous la direction de M. le Lieutenant Général Pelet* (Paris, 1832).

²¹ Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, *Carte générale de la Morée et des Cyclades exposant les principaux faits de géographie ancienne et de géographie naturelle rédigée au Dépôt général de la guerre par ordre de M. le Maréchal duc de Dalmatie, Président du Conseil, Ministre de la Guerre. Sous la direction de M. le lieutenant-général Pelet* (Paris, 1833).

²² *Carte de la frontière continentale entre le Royaume de la Grèce et l'Empire Ottoman fixée sur les lieux par M.M. les Commissaires del'Alliance assistés de ceux de la Grèce et de la Turquie* (Athens, 1837).

6. The final map of Greece in 20 sheets and a scale of 1:200,000, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre in 1852 under the supervision of Jean Pierre Eugène Félicien Peytier. It contains the six sheets of the 1832 map (map no. 3) and the surveys in Central Greece conducted by Captain Peytier between 1832 and 1849.²³

These maps form the basic historical “sheets” or cartographic layers of the digital atlas, together with a modern digital map showing the communication network in the area and the distances between places in walking hours, extracted from the route guide printed in Greek in Venice in 1829.²⁴ Many other maps produced during this time span are omitted, the best of them being based on Lapie’s maps during the 1820s and the French Expedition’s map during the 1830s.

The Reconstruction of the Maps

The superimposition of the six historical maps that compose the atlas facilitates the display of the evolution of the data over time, given that the creation of the Greek state was followed by constant changes of names of settlements and of administrative jurisdictions or districts, offering a tool for the comprehension of the process of Hellenisation of the newly liberated Greek territories.²⁵ The six historical maps of the atlas are reconstructed by means of subsequent sublayers, each one dedicated to a specific source of documentation of the relevant map, quantitative or narrative, since both learned and technical mapmaking practices continued to operate at the time. The period under examination here was a period of radical change in cartography. During the last decades of the eighteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth century, the army “engineer-geographers”, topographers, geodesists and surveyors, worked actively in western Europe. They measured territories, they created and collected systematic corpuses of quantitative data on the places and their inhabitants, in order to produce the multi-sheet, large scale and detailed maps that we usually call General Staff Maps. The army replaced the academy. During the French

²³ [Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félicien Peytier], *Carte de la Grèce rédigée et gravée au Dépôt de la Guerre d’après la triangulation et les levés, exécutés par les officiers du Corps d’État-major* (Paris, 1852).

²⁴ *Δρομοδείκτης τῶν ἀκολουθῶν ὀκτῶ μερῶν, μεθ’ ἀξιολόγων ὑποσημειώσεων τοῦ καθενὸς μέρους: Πελοποννήσου, Βοιωτίας, Ἀττικῆς, Θεσσαλίας, Ἠπείρου, Μπόσνας, Μακεδονίας καὶ Θράκης* (Venice: Typ. Michail Glyky, 1829).

²⁵ Dimitris Dimitropoulos and Eleni Kyramargiou, eds., *Αλλάζοντας τον χάρτη: Ζητήματα μετονομασιῶν στη Μεσόγειο, 19ος–20ός αιώνας* (Athens: Institute for Historical Research, NHRF, 2020).

Revolutionary Wars, the Consulate and the Empire (1792–1815), the old *Dépôt de la Guerre*, founded by Louis XIV in 1688, was revamped. Its headquarters in Paris and its satellite offices and topographic bureaus in the countries forming the Napoleonic Empire emerged during this period as a network service for collecting, archiving and evaluating information, and producing new maps for military purposes – something between a central intelligence service, a general military archive and an army cartographic service.²⁶

The Ottoman lands in Europe were not mapped this way; the first map of a south-eastern European region to be made with modern techniques was the map of the Peloponnese, produced by French army engineers between 1828 and 1832. In the absence of a systematic topographic survey and in order to supply the army and the market with reliable maps of the region, the French military cartographic services worked on a “hypothetical triangulation”.²⁷ This was realised by using the road network of the area as a conjectural triangulation foundation for the map. In order to achieve this, they collected all the available information on the itinerary distances between places in the region, and they verified it against the descriptions of earlier geographers and travellers’ explorations, special reconnaissance missions, reports from consuls, commercial agents and missionaries, measurements of longitudes and latitudes collected by hydrographic expeditions or correspondents of the Paris Observatory.

The reconstruction of the six maps of the Digital Atlas was achieved by restoring their resources. Hence, the first two cartographic documents forming the atlas, Lapie’s 1822–1825 map of European Turkey in 15 sheets and its derivative 1826 map of Greece in four sheets (see figs. 2 and 3 in the following article), are supplemented by cartographic sublayers dedicated to their main source materials, as attested in their titles and verified in the relevant documentation. First comes the narrative of François Pouqueville, former general consul of France at the court of Ali Pasha in Ioannina. The work was published in five volumes on the eve of the Greek War (1820–1821), and then in six volumes (1826–1827) supplemented with maps by Lapie. It is the main overall geographical description of the Greek national space, a systematic

²⁶ See Robert Fulton, “Crafting a Site of State Information Management: The French Case of the *Dépôt de la Guerre*,” *French Historical Studies* 40, no. 2 (2017): 215–40; and Michel Roucaud, “Le renseignement militaire opérationnel sous le Consulat et l’Empire (1799–1815)” (PhD diss., Université de Panthéon Sorbonne (Paris I), Paris, 2015).

²⁷ The term was coined by the French general, politician and cartographer Frédéric Guillaume de Vaudoncourt in his *Mémoire annexé à la carte de la Turquie d’Europe à la droite du Danube, ou des Beglerbegliks de Roum-Ili, de Bosnie et de Morée en quatre feuilles* (Munich: Reinhard, 1818). See also the next article of this Special Section, herein, p. 161.

though controversial projection of the ancient countries on the Ottoman administrative districts of the region. Then comes the travel narratives and itineraries of the antiquarian scholars Sir William Gell and Edward Dodwell, and the secret reconnaissance of Jacques Boudin, comte de Tromelin, French emissary to European Turkey during the Napoleonic Wars. These thematic sublayers contain place names cited in each source, and, wherever available, the proposed census of the population and the administrative jurisdictions of the country. The thematic sublayers are further supplemented with a selection of brief descriptions of places extracted from the relevant texts as well as the rich topographic illustrations made by the authors or included in their editions (fig. 2).




Figure 2. The documentation layers of the four-sheet map of Greece by Pierre Lapie (Paris, 1826). By selecting from the menu (left), the user can visualise locations, descriptions and images drawn from the main sources of the map, namely the publications of William Gell, Edward Dodwell, François Pouqueville and J.-J. Boudin de Tromelin. The screenshot shows locations extracted from Gell's narratives and itineraries (1810–1823).

Three of the main cartographic sources of the atlas introduce “scientific” cartography, in other words the cartography based on in situ measurements produced by the army engineer-geographers. In response to Governor Kapodistrias’ request for technical assistance in mapping the country, the French expeditionary force under General Nicolas-Joseph Maison was accompanied by a corps of army engineer surveyors and a scientific commission of natural scientists, Hellenists and architects under Bory de Saint Vincent, an army geographer and natural sciences specialist. By order of General Maison, a topographic office was set up in March 1829 at the headquarters in Methoni

and a surveying platoon of engineers was detached from the occupation army in order to undertake the surveying work. Lieutenant-Colonel Barthélemy was appointed head of the topographic office.²⁸

The French scholars and technicians surveyed the country and its monuments, cities and fortresses, conducted the census of the population and studied its natural resources, flora and fauna, and minerals. In short, they supported the efforts of the revolutionary Greek authorities, offering modern tools for the administration of the country under construction. The French surveyors worked actively in the Peloponnese in 1829, despite the fact that they faced many and constant obstacles, diseases (a typhoid epidemic and the endemic malaria),²⁹ political turmoil and social unrest, as well as substantial problems of coordination. The surveying team took orders from the general staff of the French army of occupation, the Natural Sciences Section of Scientific Commission, while the central cartographer, Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félix Peytier, was attached to the governor of Greece. A total of 18 army engineers, as well as Bory de Saint-Vincent and Puillon de Boblaye, worked in succession.³⁰

The scientists worked in close collaboration with the army topographers in the production of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets, the 1833 geological and historical map of the Peloponnese by Puillon de Boblaye, and the 1852 final map of Greece in 20 sheets, as Peytier, assisted by a new team of six French army surveyors, continued to work after the departure of the French expeditionary force.³¹ The thematic sublayers of these maps contain quantitative geodesic and statistical data assembled and published by the members of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, as well as descriptions and

²⁸ Jean-Baptiste-Geneviève-Marcellin Bory de Saint-Vincent, *Expédition scientifique de Morée : Section des sciences physiques*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *Géographie* (Paris: Levrault, 1834), 50.

²⁹ Most of the young officers who mapped the Peloponnese fell ill from the typhus pandemic. Ten of them were forced into early retirement, while three lost their lives: Captain de Saint-Généis mapping Corinth (†1830), Lieutenant de Chièvres in the Argolis (†1829) and Lieutenant Caffort in Elis (†1829). His comrade Lieutenant Clausade buried him on the banks of the Alpheus before he returned, seriously ill, to France. See H.-M.-A. Berthaut, *Les ingénieurs géographes militaires (1624–1831): Étude historique* (Paris: Imprimerie du Service Géographique, 1902), 2:467–68.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 464–76; Stelios Papadopoulos, ed., *Liberated Greece and the Morea Scientific Expedition: The Peytier Album in the Stephen Vagliano Collection* (Athens: National Bank of Greece, 1971); Yannis Saïtas, ed., *Το έργο της Γαλλικής Επιστημονικής Αποστολής του Μοριά (1829–1838)*, vol. 1, *Τμήμα Φυσικών Επιστήμων* (Athens: Melissa, 2011); and Saïtas, ed., *Το έργο της Γαλλικής Επιστημονικής Αποστολής του Μοριά (1829–1838)*, vol. 2, *Τμήμα Αρχαιολογίας, Τμήμα Αρχιτεκτονικής, Γλυπτικής Επιγράφων* (Athens: Melissa, 2017).

³¹ Berthaut, *Les ingénieurs géographes militaires*, 2:475.

topographic images extracted from the narratives and the 1835 *Atlas* of the expedition or the richly illustrated archaeological editions and other relevant publications (fig. 3).




Figure 3. The documentation layers of the six-sheet map of the Peloponnese (Paris, 1832). By selecting from the menu (left), the user can visualise locations, descriptions and images drawn from the main sources of the map, namely the publications of the Natural Sciences and Section and the Architecture and Sculptures Section of the French Scientific Expedition.

The last map of the atlas is the map of the northern frontier of Greece. It was based on a survey conducted by the International Boundary Commission in 1832 and concluded in 1834. The map of the borderline would be the subject of an endless diplomatic tug-of-war before being accepted by the Sublime Porte in December 1835. Published in Athens by the Royal Lithography in 1837, it is the first legal cartographic document in the history of cartography of Greece. The map is supplemented by brief descriptions extracted from the proceedings of the Boundary Commission and the report made by the British commissioner, Colonel George Baker.³²

The demarcation of the borders faced many obstacles, as the Sublime Porte was not ready to recognise the independence of Greece, and Britain was worried by the creation of an independent Greek state susceptible to Russian influence.

³² Georgios Apostolides Cosmétis, ed., *Recueil des traités, actes et pièces concernans la fondation de la royauté en Grèce et le tracé de ses limites* (Nafplion: Imprimerie Royale, 1833), 86–95; George Baker, “Memoir on the Northern Frontier of Greece,” *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 7 (1837): 81–95. See also Ilias-Astrinos Venianakis, “Η οριοθέτηση των ελληνοτουρκικών συνόρων και η Ήπειρος – Θεσσαλία (1832–1836),” *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 36 (2002).

The inhabitants were also upset, especially those who suddenly found themselves on the wrong side of the frontier, as well as the Ottoman administrators of the neighbouring regions, who wished to become independent from the Porte. With their toleration or their encouragement, the border zone became soon a haven for marauding bands and disgruntled bandits, who, according to circumstances, took refuge on one side or the other of the border, a zone of anarchy where the law of the strong reigned. The adventures of the commission reveal the complexity of the conditions that arose from the creation of a centralised national state in a space that functioned for centuries within a decentralised multinational empire.

Mapping the Historical Testimonies

The restitution of the landscape of the Greek War of Independence and of the creation of the Greek state makes possible the annotation and illustration of historical events. Among the various sources of information produced during the time period in question, we opted to include in the atlas a series of map sheets containing first-hand testimonies extracted from the published memoirs of Greek combatants and philhellenes.³³ Research was conducted on 34 works, forming a total of 50 volumes (see the appendix “List of selected memoirs of combatants and philhellenes”). The excerpts were selected on the basis of a time line of the major revolutionary events that occurred between 1821 and 1832, in order to highlight the revolutionary episodes, and to illustrate the variety of perceptions of the same event. The digital atlas includes therefore a sum of more than 300 testimonies, attached to the places where the events took place, and accompanied, wherever possible, by relevant illustrations.

Published for the most part soon after the events by literate or illiterate combatants, these memoirs served multiple functions. They commemorated battles and political events, giving detail on them to a wider audience; they were evidence of the participation of their authors in the war, since after the creation of the state many veterans claimed either a position in the administration or some financial reward. Their memoirs preserved the memory of the national uprising while boosting the irredentism of the “Great Idea”.³⁴ But mainly they transmitted the personal experience of their authors who wished to say “what

³³ The corpus of the revolutionary memoirs represented a feasible option within the frame of a three-year project. The Digital Atlas is an open-ended project and can include in the future supplementary layers of source material extracted from other corpuses, such as the press, the administrative or diplomatic documents, historiography and so on.

³⁴ For the combatants’ fortunes after the war, see Elisavet Tsakanika, *Αγωνιστές του 1821 μετά την Επανάσταση* (Athens: Assini, 2019).

really happened”. The retrospective recovery of “the truth” is what brings memoirs and historiographical works together in an age of historicism. As it has been noted,

Almost everyone appears with the same intentions: eyewitnesses, they want, they say, to show the naked truth, to celebrate the war, to contribute to its real knowledge or even to correct some inaccurate publications. Let’s not forget, however, that “objectivity” is a completely relative concept here: everyone’s personal justification remains, in the final analysis, the most important motivation. How could it be otherwise? The memoir, a genre of autobiographical account as well as an apology, always presupposes an active subject who defends, passionately or coolly, his case, settling his accounts with history.³⁵

Philhellenic memoirs form a special category. The three works which we “edited” for this occasion were published while the war was still in progress. Their aim was to make the Greek Revolution visible to the public in the West, so that it may contribute in turn, materially and morally, to the struggle of the Christian Greeks against the Muslim Ottomans. The three authors are quite different from each other. A soldier, an administrator and a student record their experiences – all wishing to show that they contributed in some way, each in its own field, to the Greek cause. Either focusing on the events, or bringing judgments about persons and situations, their narratives constitute the vital “external” view and, perhaps, the counterweight to the memoirs of the Greek fighters.³⁶

³⁵ Panos Moulas, “Η λογοτεχνία από τον Αγώνα ως τη Γενιά του 1880,” *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, vol. 13 (Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon, 1977), 493. Thanks to their overall scope, their minute descriptions and their wide time coverage, some of the works are considered not as memoirs but as historiographical works. The debate was initiated in the mid-nineteenth century, in which the testimonies of those present at the battlefield were contrasted with those of authors of histories of the war, mostly politicians or administrators. See Eleftheria Zei, “Η Κρητική Επανάσταση του 1821 και η διπλή ματιά του Καλλίνικου Κριτοβουλίδη,” in *1821 και Απομνημόνευμα: Ιστορική χρήση και ιστοριογραφική γνώση. Πρακτικά συνεδρίου*, ed. Dimitris Dimitropoulos, Vangelis Karamanolakis, Niki Maroniti and Pantelis Boukalas (Athens: Hellenic Parliament Foundation, 2020), 133–44. However, they are all subjective products of their time and as such, Trikoupis’ *Ιστορία* is of the same interest as Kolokotronis’ *Διήγησις* as both reflect their authors respective personal view of the war and its challenges. Cf. Nikos Rotzokos, “Τα απομνημονεύματα του εικοσιένα ως υλικό της ιστοριογραφίας,” *Δοκίμης* 2 (1994): 3–11.

³⁶ See Gunnar Hering, *Ο αγώνας των Ελλήνων για την ανεξαρτησία και ο φιλελληνισμός*, trans. Agathoklis Azelis (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2021, first German edition in *Der Philhellenismus in der westeuropäischen Literatur, 1780–1830*, ed. Alfred Noe

Many memoirs were written by Greek fighters themselves, mostly literate combatants or politicians who put their experience on paper and published their work at the time. In other cases, the work was found posthumously, and published by learned editors and historians either in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, with all what this implies in terms of reception and editorial accuracy.³⁷ Finally, there are those who, being illiterate, dictated their memoirs to someone literate, who also undertook the publication. Beyond these layers of temporality and mediation, we have another one, that is, when exactly the memoirs were written: Some memoirs were written during the war on the battlefield, others shortly after, but before the end of the war, and others after the establishment of the Greek state.³⁸

(Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), 17–72; Anna Karakatsouli, *“Μαχητές της Ελευθερίας” και 1821: Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση στη διεθνική της διάσταση* (Athens: Pedio, 2016). For an overview, see George Tolia, “The Resilience of Philhellenism,” *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 13 (2016): 51–70.

³⁷ Many of the works we studied remained in a manuscript form, and they were published much later, down to the mid-twentieth century. In these cases, their effect has to be examined against the intellectual background of the time of their publication, as part of later ideological conceptions of the Greek Revolution. See Philippos Iliou, “Ο χαρακτήρας της Επανάστασης του 1821,” “Η ιδεολογική χρήση της Ιστορίας: Σχόλιο στη συζήτηση Κορδάτου–Ζεύγου,” *Αντί* 46 (1976): 28–34; Cf. Vangelis Karamanolakis, “Ιστορία και ιδεολογία στη δεκαετία του 1960,” in *Η “σύντομη” δεκαετία του ’60*, ed. Alkis Rigos, Seraphim Seferiades and Evanthis Hatzivassiliou (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2008), 84–94. For an overview, see Ioannis Koubourlis, “Η Επανάσταση του 1821 και η δημιουργία του ελληνικού εθνικού κράτους στις πρώτες μεγάλες αφηγήσεις της νεότερης ελληνικής ιστορίας: Από την πολυπαραγοντική ανάλυση στο σχήμα της εθνικής τελεολογίας,” in *Η ελληνική Επανάσταση του 1821: Ένα ευρωπαϊκό γεγονός*, ed. Petros Pizani (Athens: Kedros, 2009), 351–74.

³⁸ For example, Christophoros Perraivos, Fotakos and Kanellos Deligiannis wrote their memoirs themselves, while Theodoros Kolokotronis dictated his to his secretary; the Bishop Germanos of Old Patras wrote his memoirs during the war while Georgios Psyllas wrote his 50 year later and Nikolaos Kasomoulis between 1832 and 1841; Anagnostis Kontakis, Dimitrios Christidis, Nikolaos Karoris and Alexandros Kriezis kept an everyday journal of the events, while Perraivos and Gennaios Kolokotronis based their memoirs on official documents; the memoirs of Konstantinos Metaxas, Deligiannis and Spyromilios were published posthumously, while Nikolaos Spiliadis and Spyridon Trikoupis published their recollections themselves; Kontakis narrates the adventures of his family, while Karpos Papadopoulos aims to rebut Dionysios Sourmelis’ inaccuracies; finally, Artemios Michos and Spyropoulos cover solely the events related to the second siege of Messolonghi, while Spiliadis covers all the events of the war.

The memoirs mainly chronicle the authors' participation in the events. Battles, sieges and other military campaigns, war logistics and general economic issues of the revolution, political events. Combats are sometimes described exhaustively and sometimes not, and details on equipment, strategy or even numbers of dead, wounded, loot, etc., may be given as well. The authors often make judgments about the competence of their fellow combatants, of the central command or on the enemy's strength. Some authors, mainly those in commanding positions, quote insistently from official documents, give the detail of financial issues, such as army salaries, national loans, etc., while special emphasis is placed on the political cementing of the nation, the national assemblies. Attacks on contemporary individuals are not absent, especially in the context of the two civil conflicts during the war, but also information on everyday life – immigration, refugees, death, sexual life, festivities – endow the combatants' memoirs with a cultural and anthropological aspect.³⁹ However, each author's point of interest reveals the ways by which he conceives his own position in local and national terms, an important indicator of the key issue of the shifting identities in revolutionary Greece.⁴⁰

The selection of the excerpts is based on a time line of the Greek War of Independence, compiled by our team. Each excerpt – and the relevant revolutionary event – is charted, being associated to a specific place. The spatialisation of the narratives largely defines our methodology: space is the ground of action of historical figures, and the spatial arrangement of their deeds and thoughts allows us to follow the movements of people, the battles and the various events, through a series of first-hand testimonies. Sometimes continuous and sometimes fragmentary, the combination of places and discourses reconstructs composite, multi-layered narratives of the revolutionary events. The insertion of the historical testimonies in their digitally reconstructed geographical setting gives a specific location to each textual testimony, while the place acquires a supplementary meaning through the narratives.⁴¹ The

³⁹ Cf. *Όψεις της Επανάστασης του 1821: Πρακτικά συνεδρίου*, ed. Dimitris Dimitropoulos, Christos Loukos and Panagiotis D. Michailaris (Athens: Mnimon, 2018).

⁴⁰ See Nikos Rotzokos, "Τοπική και εθνική ταυτότητα στα απομνημονεύματα των Πελοποννήσιων αγωνιστών της Επανάστασης του 1821" and Panagiotis Stathis, "Τα σουλιώτικα απομνημονεύματα: διαπλοκές της ατομικής, τοπικής και εθνικής ταυτότητας," in Dimitropoulos et al., *1821 και Απομνημόνευμα*, 53–75 and 77–103, respectively.

⁴¹ The central concept remains the notion of *lieu de mémoire* ("site of memory"), coined in 1989 by Pierre Nora. Cf. also Aleida Assmann, "History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony," *Poetics Today* 27, no. 2 (2006): 261–73; Jeannette A. Bastian, "Records, Memory and Space: Locating Archives in the Landscape," *Public History Review* 21 (2014): 45–69;

digital charting of some 300 historical testimonies merges a disparate set of discourses for the revolutionary events, in an attempt to build a more holistic and multifaceted narrative of the past (fig. 4).




Figure 4. Methodology of depth mapping: The successive layers of documentation of revolutionary events based on the memoirs of the Greek combatants and philhellenes. On display are all the extracts on events during 1822, as all the proposed sources have been selected from the menu on the left.

The excerpts of the memoirs are further enhanced with pictorial material relevant to the specific events. The association of space, speech and image produces a multidimensional narrative, blending a variety of temporalities and spatialities. Drawing on the works of Greek and European artists, who capture themes and motifs of the Greek War of Independence, we attempted not to bring the events of the Greek war to life through the image, but to recreate the successive layers of their reception and cultural processing. Images, maps, geographical descriptions and historical narratives are both representations and interpretations of the events. Their juxtaposition documents the multiple layers of deposited meaning while shaping a framework for further interpretations.⁴²

Dan Stone, “History, Memory, Testimony,” in *The Future of Testimony: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Witnessing*, ed. Antony Rowland and Jane Kilby (London: Routledge, 2014), 17–30.

⁴² See François Hartog, “La présence du témoin,” *L’Homme* 223–24, no. 3–4 (2017): 169–84, <https://doi.org/10.4000/lhomme.30694>.

Tools and Methodology

The recent and teeming bibliography on spatial humanities showed us that we were not alone in our endeavours and gave names to our experiments, such as “spatial history” “deep mapping” and “storytelling”. We made ample use of the tools they proposed in order to aggregate large sets of data and to communicate the multiple meanings of place by the combined presentation of the natural and the inhabited space, the mediation of personal experiences and of historical topographical illustrations. More specifically, some of the tools used include:

- A Geographical Information System and a spatial database in order to model the historical spatial and non-spatial data and to organise them into different layers;
- Spatial analysis for geo-inference, for example for producing statistical data or for locating the boundaries of administrative units not depicted in the maps;
- Gazetteers (existing ones) in order to correlate historical place names with modern ones;
- Text and image annotations namely to correlate texts and images with the places mentioned or depicted therein;
- Contextualisation of quantitative spatial data with information from historical texts and images;
- Story maps, as a method to correlate and rearrange the entities in space to form a story line and thus produce maps that “tell us stories”;
- Web interactive maps, now the most popular form of publishing historical spatial data that allows users to navigate, interact and retrieve information by applying their own queries.

Each of the six historical maps that form our main documentation corpus was georeferenced and digitised. At first, the reference system of each map was reconstructed (when possible) and each map sheet was georeferenced based on the map sheets (of scale 1:50,000) of the Hellenic Military Geographical Service, the modern cartographic base map of Greece. The georeferencing process allows the digitisation of the maps’ objects (spatial entities) and their systematic comparison to modern ones. Thus, it was possible to locate on the modern map the historical maps’ entities – even those that no longer exist and to correlate their names with modern ones. After the georeferencing, a spatial database with different thematic layers was created in order to store the information extracted from each map (vectorised as points, lines or polygons) following the hierarchy that each map appoints (for example, the settlements categorised as capitals of a prefecture, of a province or of a community, villages etc. The correlation of the historical geographic entities with the modern ones was implemented through a visual interpretation that considered name matching and geographic location proximity based mainly on the map sheets of the Hellenic Military

Geographical Service but also through semiautomated methods in cases where digital databases were available (for example, the Hellenic Statistical Authority database for modern settlements, the ToposText gazetteer, the Pandektis database on “Name changes of settlements in Greece”, etc.).⁴³

The database records for the geographic entities were populated with qualitative data (ancient, alternative, and current names, administrative units within which they are located, place types, bibliographic references, etc.) derived from the historical maps or the accompanying texts. For the settlements, the records were also populated with demographic data,⁴⁴ and since we linked with other existing digital databases, the information was further enriched with data from these external resources (for example, date of place-name change, current population data, url, etc.). To locate the boundaries of the administrative units that were not depicted in the maps, descriptive information from texts was used while specifically for the boundaries of the provinces of 1829–1832, the demographic tables of the French Scientific Expedition, which list the settlements by “commissariat” (επιτροπεία) and province (επαρχία), were used. Based on the proximity of those settlements to the remaining geographic entities depicted on the maps, the boundary lines could be drawn using the Thiessen polygon method.

The final step was to correlate each map’s dataset of geographic entities to each other, a laborious task that, apart from resulting in a database that is unique in volume and richness, also documents each map’s original mathematical accuracy and highlights the relations between the maps of that historical period. Indeed, the maps which form the basis of the Digital Atlas constitute a coherent corpus: they are all products or subproducts of the Dépôt de la Guerre, their fabrication relies on common protocols, and Lapie, the engineer-geographer of the Dépôt, was involved in the production of most of them.⁴⁵ The overall extracted data were assembled in the first, aggregated layer of the atlas and formed the historical

⁴³ See <https://topostext.org/> and <http://pandektis.ekt.gr/pandektis/handle/10442/4968>, respectively.

⁴⁴ The main sources demographic data are those included in Pouqueville’s narrative (2nd rev. and enriched edition, 6 vols. [Paris, Didot, 1826–1827]), and the 1829 census of the Peloponnese compiled by captains Peytier, Servier and Puillon de Boblaye on the basis of the statistical data provided by the Greek revolutionary administration and published by Bory de Saint-Vincent, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Section des sciences physiques*, vol. 2, *Géographie. Géologie* (Paris: Levrault, 1834), 64–94.

⁴⁵ After drawing and publishing his maps of European Turkey (1822–1825) and of Greece (1826), Lapie supervised the production of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets. See Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Recherches géographiques sur les ruines de la Morée, faisant suite aux travaux de la Commission Scientifique de Morée* (Paris: Levrault, 1836), 2.

gazetteer of the period under scrutiny. Thus, an amount of circa 17,000 items of historical data, half of which consists of names of settlements presented in their equivalent provinces and, where possible, with their actual names and their demographic evolution, is offered to researchers. In order to facilitate the consultation of the atlas and to enhance its interactivity, the extracted material is organised in categories and subcategories of spatial entities, which follow the symbols, toponymy and taxonomy of our source maps, such as entities referring to the natural or the inhabited space, and then the settlements' hierarchy, the ruins, the communication networks, the natural resources, the infrastructure and so on.

Acknowledgments

The project had a long maturation and is therefore indebted to numerous people and agencies. It incorporates parts of research endeavours and digital mapping applications conducted under the supervision of George Tolia at the Institute of Historical Research (IHR) over the last decade. First in chronological order comes the charting of the communication networks in the Ottoman Balkans in the early nineteenth century. It was part of “Kripis”, an infrastructure project of the IHR funded by the General Secretariat for Research and Innovation (2012–2015). Historian Katerina Stathi worked on the printed route guides published before and during the War of Independence, while Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis Stratakis created the digital map.⁴⁶ A two year postdoctoral fellowship followed in 2015, granted by the Greek State Scholarships Foundation. It allowed to Gkadolou to work on the 1852 map of the Kingdom of Greece, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre in 20 sheets.⁴⁷ By digitising and georeferencing the map, 13,807 place names (of which 9,843 are settlements) were identified within the 1832 frontiers of the Kingdom of Greece, in other words the Peloponnese, the Cyclades and Central Greece, up to the borderline leading from the Ambracian Gulf in the West coast to the Pagasetic Gulf in the East. Then, under the direction of George Tolia and Alexandra Sfoini, Panagiotis El Gedi and Anna Athanassouli charted three memoirs of philhellenes, within the framework of “Anavathmis”, a collaborative infrastructure project of the IHR (2017–2020).⁴⁸

⁴⁶ <https://kripis2.anavathmis.eu/en/> (EE 1.5: Ελληνικοί δρομοδείκτες 1824-1829).

⁴⁷ Funded by the European Structural and Investment Funds (MIS 5001552).

⁴⁸ <https://philhellenism.anavathmis.eu/> The full title of the project is “Anavathmis: Development of Historical Research: Studies and Digital Applications (MIS 5002357)”. It was part of the “Action for Strategic Development of Research and Technology Institutions”

A more decisive step was taken in 2018. Thanks to a substantial grant from Moreas SA, the digital reconstruction of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets was made possible. Eugenia Drakopoulou, Ourania Polycandrioti and George Toliás worked on the source material, Eleni Gkadolou created the digital map, while the digital application was designed by Pavla SA. Once again, the map was georeferenced so that all the information it contains can be searchable. Its reconstruction consisted in the restoration of the corpus of its sources of information, as they appear in the volumes published by the geographers and architects of the French Scientific Expedition to the Peloponnese in 1829 (*Geography, Geodesy, Statistics, Monuments and Narrative*). They appear as thematic sublayers of the map showing the settlements and the population census of 1829/1832, the ruins and the monuments, the natural resources, the geodetic data and the altitudes of the mountains, a total of 7,000 items of data on the nature, inhabitants and antiquities of the Peloponnese at the end of the War of Independence. The reconstructed map was complemented by the pictorial documentation of the Natural Sciences Section and the Architecture and Sculpture Section of the Scientific Expedition, views of cities, landscapes and monuments. Finally, selected excerpts from the publications of the expedition provide additional information on the state of the place, the conditions and the interests of the scientific exploration. A travelogue is also included, presenting the routes and impressions of the two sections of the Scientific Expedition.⁴⁹

Almost the same team worked in the creation of the Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1852, funded by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation. The maps were created by Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis Stratakis; the memoirs of the Greek fighters were treated by Ourania Polycandrioti, Filippa Chorozi and Panagiotis El Gedi; the iconography of the Greek War of Independence by Eugenia Drakopoulou and the geographical source material by George Toliás. The digital application was designed by Pavla SA. Mention should be made here of two other undertakings that evolved in parallel to the creation of the digital atlas: A map exhibition commissioned to George Toliás by the Cultural Foundation of the National

and funded by the Operational Programme “Competitiveness, Entrepreneurship & Innovation” (EPAnEK) of the Partnership Agreement for the Development Framework 2014–2020, co-funded by Greece and the European Union (European Regional Development Fund).

⁴⁹ <https://moree1829.gr/>.

Bank of Greece on the creation of Modern Greek State (1770–1838)⁵⁰ and his seminar on the same topic at the *École pratique des hautes études* in 2020–2021 and 2021–2022.⁵¹ They both permitted an in-depth study on the cartographic production related to Greece during these crucial years as well as work on the original historical documents.

For providing copies of the historical material, maps and topographic illustrations and the permission to use them, thanks are due to the directors and the map curators of the Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive of the Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, the National Library of Greece, the E.J. Finopoulos Collection of the Benaki Museum, the Library of the Hellenic Parliament, the *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, the British Museum and the Firestone Library of Princeton University.

In August 2021 our dear colleague and art historian Eugenia Drakopoulou passed away. Her commitment to almost all of the abovementioned undertakings was as valued as heartfelt. This Special Section of the *Historical Review* is dedicated to her memory.

Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

⁵⁰ See George Tolia, in collaboration with Eleni Gkadolou and Voula Livani, *Η γένεση του ελληνικού κράτους: Χαρτογραφία και ιστορία 1770–1838* (Athens: Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, 2021).

⁵¹ See Georges Tolia, “La Grèce restaurée: Géographie et cartographie de la Grèce au temps de la guerre d’Indépendance, 1822–1827,” *Annuaire de l’École pratique des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques* 153 (2022): 218–28.

APPENDIX: LIST OF SELECTED MEMOIRS OF COMBATANTS
AND PHILHELLENES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Ainian, Dimitrios. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 7. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Christidis, Dimitrios. P. Poulos and Nikolaos Karoris. *Απομνημονεύματα Αθηναίων Αγωνιστών*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 13. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Chryssanthakopoulos, Fotios (Fotakos). *Απομνημονεύματα περί της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*. Athens: Τυρ. και Vivliopoleio P.D. Sakellariou, 1858.

Deligiannis, Kanelos. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vols. 16–18. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Diamantopoulos, Konstantinos. *Απομνημονεύματα ή αληθή ιστορικά γεγονότα του 1821 μη αναφερόμενα εν ταις Ελληνικαίς ιστορίαις*. Tripoli: Τυρ. I.N. Protopoulou, 1883.

Enmorforopoulos, Dionysios. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 20. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Filimon, Ioannis. *Δοκίμιον ιστορικόν περί της ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*, vols. 1–4. Athens: Τυρ. P. Soutsa kai A. Ktena, 1859–1861.

Foteinos, Ilias. *Οι άθλοι της εν Βλαχία ελληνικής επανάστασεως το 1821 έτος*. Leipzig: s.n., 1846.

Frantzis, Amvrosios. *Επιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος, αρχομένη από του 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Τυρ. I Viktoria tou Konst. Kastorchi, 1839. Vols. 3–4. Athens: Τυρ. K. Ralli, 1841.

Germanos, Metropolitan of Old Patras. *Υπομνήματα περί της επανάστασεως της Ελλάδος: Από το 1820 μέχρι του 1823*. Edited by Kallinikos Kastorchis. Athens: Τυρ. Petrou Mantzaraki, 1837.

Kasomoulis, Nikolaos. *Στρατιωτικά ενθυμήματα της Επανάστασεως των Ελλήνων (1821-1833): Προτάσσεται ιστορία του Αρματωλισμού*. Edited and introduction by Giannis Vlachogiannis. Vols. 1–3. Athens: Pageios Epitropis, 1939–1942.

Kolokotronis, Ioannis Th. (Gennaios). *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 1. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Kolokotronis, Ioannis Th. (Gennaios). *Απομνημονεύματα (χειρόγραφον δεύτερον 1821–1862)*. Edited and introduction by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Athens: National Printing House, 1961.

Kolokotronis, Theodoros. *Διήγησις συμβάντων της ελληνικής φυλής από τα 1770 έως τα 1836*. Edited by Georgios Tertsetis. Athens: Typ. X. Nikolaidou Filadelfeos, 1846.

Kontakis, Anagnostis. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 11. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Koutsonikas, Lambros. *Γενική ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επαναστάσεως*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Typ. tou Evangelismou D. Karakatzani, 1863–1864.

Kriezis, Alexandros D. *Απομνημονεύματα (Γκιοννάλε διά την ανεξαρτησίαν του Έθνους)*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 8. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Makris, Nikolaos. *Ιστορία του Μεσολογγίου*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 19. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Metaxas, Konstantinos. *Ιστορικά Απομνημονεύματα εκ της ελληνικής επανάστασεως*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 6. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Michos, Artemios. *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826) και τινες άλλαι σημειώσεις εις την ιστορίαν του μεγάλου Αγώνος αναγόμεναι*. Edited by Spyridon P. Aravantinos. Athens: Typ. tis Enoseos, 1883.

Oikonomou, Michail. *Ιστορικά της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας ή ο ιερός των Ελλήνων αγών*. Athens: Typ. Th. Papalexandri, 1873.

Papadopoulos, Karpos. *Ανασκευή των εις την ιστορίαν των Αθηνών αναφερομένων περί του στρατηγού Οδυσσέως Ανδρούτζου του ελληνικού τακτικού και του συνταγματάρχου Καρόλου Φαββιέρου*. Athens: Typ. Petrou Mantzaraki, 1837.

Perraios, Christophoros. *Απομνημονεύματα πολεμικά διαφόρων μαχών συγκροτηθεισών μεταξύ Ελλήνων και Οθωμανών κατά τε το Σούλιον και Ανατολικήν Ελλάδα από του 1820 μέχρι του 1829 έτους*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Typ. Andreou Koromila, 1836.

Psyllas, Georgios. *Απομνημονεύματα του βίου μου*. Introduction by Nik. K. Louros; edited and notes by El. G. Prevelakis. Athens: Academy of Athens, 1974.

Schack, F.-R. *Campagne d'un jeune français en Grèce*. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1827.

Sourmelis, Dionysios. *Ιστορία των Αθηνών κατά τον υπέρ ελευθερίας αγώνα: Αρχομένη από της επανάστασεως μέχρι της αποκαταστάσεως των πραγμάτων*. Aegina: Typ. Andreou Koromila, 1834.

Spiliadis, Nikolaos. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Vols. 1–3. Athens: Typ. X.N. Filadelfeos, 1851–1857.

Spyromilios, Ioannis. *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826)*. Edited by Giannis Vlachogiannis. Athens: [Typ. S.K. Vlastou], 1926.

Stanhope, Leicester. *Greece in 1823 and 1824; being a Series of Letters, and other Documents, on the Greek Revolution, written during a Visit to that Country. Illustrated with Several Curious Fac Similes. To which is added, the Life of Mustapha Ali*. London: Sherwood, Jones, and Co., 1824.

Stephanopoulos, Stephanos. *Απομνημονεύματά τινά της Επανάστασεως του 1821*. Tripoli: Typ. tis Fonis ton Eparchion, 1864.

Trikoupis, Spyridon. *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως: Έκδοσις δευτέρα επιθεωρηθείσα και διορθωθείσα*. Vols. 1–4. London: Taylor and Francis, 1860–1862.

Voutier, Olivier. *Mémoires sur la guerre actuelle des Grecs*. Paris, Bossange frères, 1823.

Vyzantios, Christos. *Ιστορία του τακτικού στρατού της Ελλάδος από της πρώτης συστάσεως του κατά το 1821 μέχρι των 1832*. Athens: Typ. K. Ralli, 1837.

MILITARY MAPPING, PHILHELLENIC GEOGRAPHY,
AND THE MAKING OF GREECE, 1811–1827

George Tolia

ABSTRACT: Through an investigation of the resources, the mapping practices, the reception as well the geographical concepts that lie behind a series of maps of Greece produced by the prestigious *Dépôt de la Guerre* during the Greek War of Independence, this article seeks to highlight the links between scientific culture and geographical imagination in the context of philhellenism and to explore the ideological and political function of cartography in the age of nationalism and technological positivism.

Good Maps

The great events which are in motion in the East making it necessary to obtain good maps of these regions, we hasten to announce that the only ones with the help of which it will be possible to follow these events in a completely satisfactory manner are those hereafter, drawn up by Mr. Lapie, the King's first geographer, according to the materials assembled by General Guilleminot, ambassador to Constantinople, and General Tromelin, who has travelled through these regions in different directions.

The advertisement was printed on the back cover of Tromelin's itineraries in European Turkey, published in Paris in 1828 (fig. 1).¹ The time was indeed critical for the East, in the aftermath of the defeat of the Ottoman and Egyptian fleets at Navarino by the allied armadas of the three Great Powers – Britain, France and Russia – on 20 October 1827. The international intervention set the events in motion and the public was closely following the rapid developments

* The present article is based on the study of George Tolia (with the collaboration of Voula Livani and Eleni Gkadolou), *Η γένεση του ελληνικού κράτους: Χαρτογραφία και ιστορία 1770–1837* (Athens: Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, 2021); an earlier version of this article was published in the *Annuaire de l'École pratique des hautes études (EPHE), Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 153 (2022): 218–28.

¹ *Observations sur les routes qui conduisent du Danube à Constantinople à travers le Balkan ou mont Haemus, suivies de quelques réflexions sur la nécessité de l'intervention des puissances du midi de l'Europe dans les affaires de la Grèce, par le lieutenant-général comte de T.* (Paris: Pélicier et Chatet, 1828).




Figure 1. Advertisement for Lapie's maps of Turkey and Greece, printed on the back cover of Tromelin's itineraries in *European Turkey*, Paris, 1828. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France 8-J PIECE-1256.

heralding the birth of Greece, a state that had hitherto never existed but whose presence had haunted the imaginations in the West since the dawn of humanism: the election of a former foreign minister of the tsar, Ioannis Kapodistrias, as governor of Greece, the constant tergiversations of the London Conference and the summit of the ambassadors of the three Great Powers on the island of Poros in order to determine the borders of the country to be; the refusal of the Sublime Porte to recognise any form of independence for Greece and the reluctance of the Egyptian general Ibrahim to evacuate the Peloponnese despite the convention signed in Alexandria between Egypt and Britain; the despatch of the French military expedition to the Morea under General Maison and Tsar Nicholas's I march on Constantinople, leading an army of 100,000 men.

The advertisement underscores the scientific merit of Colonel Pierre Lapie (1777–1850), Charles X's first geographer and engineer-geographer at the *Dépôt de la Guerre*.² It enumerates the materials used by the mapmaker, namely a series of itineraries of Napoleon's emissaries to Turkey, as well as Pouqueville's, Dodwell's and Gell's narratives of their respective journeys in Greece. "Such authorities and the name of Mr. Lapie excuse us from dwelling further on these maps, which show several thousand positions that have not yet appeared on any other map." This statement was not an exaggeration. The 1826 map of Greece for instance, contains some 4,000 place names, of which nearly 2,700 correspond to various types of settlements, drawn from earlier maps of the *Dépôt*, consular reports, itineraries and, above all, Pouqueville's geographical account based on his research during his long service as general consul in Jannina (1805–1815). The advertisement closes with the essentials: the list of the proposed maps and their prices: the "map of Turkey and Greece in sixteen sheets", offered for 80 francs, the "map of Greece in four sheets" for 40 francs, a "general map of the island of Candia in one sheet" for 10 francs, and the "general map of Turkey in Europe in one sheet" for eight francs.

Lapie's maps were neither the first nor the last to be published during the Greek War of Independence.³ However, they were far richer and more accurate than any other maps available at the time. They were also the most impressive thanks to their dimensions, the best executed, since they were the work of the experienced engravers of the *Dépôt*, and the most reliable, since they were produced by a prestigious public institution of the time, the *Dépôt de la Guerre* of the French General Staff. They all derived from Lapie's large map of Turkey in Europe at a scale of 1:800,000 and published by the *Dépôt de la Guerre* in 15 or 16 sheets between 1822 and 1825, measuring a total of 1,950 x 1,520 mm.⁴ A first subproduct of this map was the map of Crete, published in one sheet in 1825,⁵ while the next year (1826) appeared the

² On Pierre Lapie, see Tolia, *Η γένεση του ελληνικού κράτους*, 98–100.

³ Jean Dimakis, "Contribution à la bibliographie des cartes géographiques sur la Grèce et la Turquie, 1821–1833," *Ο Ερασιστής* 9 (1971): 194–99.

⁴ *Carte générale de la Turquie d'Europe en XV feuilles. Dressée sur des matériaux recueillis par Monsieur le lieutenant-général comte Guilleminot directeur général du Dépôt de la guerre et M. le maréchal de camp baron de Tromelin inspecteur général d'infanterie, par le chevalier Lapie officier supérieur au corps royal des ingénieurs géographes, Paris Chez C. Picquet géographe ordinaire du roi, quai Conti no 17, 1822.* Although 15 sheets are mentioned in the title, the map is composed by 16 sheets, the last one covering south-western Anatolia. It must have been completed sometime before 1827.

⁵ *Candie Criti ou Crete. Dressée principalement sur les mémoires et reconnaissances de M.r le Lieutenant Général Comte Mathieu Dumas, ainsi que sur les extraits des auteurs Byzantins et Italiens communiqués par M.r le Chevalier Hase Membre de l'Institut et appuyée sur les*

map of Greece in four sheets and at a scale of 1:400,000, the usual scale of the military topographical maps issued by the Dépôt.⁶ The map of Greece would also appear in a reduced version, in two sheets and at a scale of 1:1,000,000, a few months later (1827), accompanying the second revised edition of Pouqueville's *Voyage de la Grèce*.⁷ The maps are explicitly linked by a note that appears on the last-mentioned one:

N.B.: Due to the small scale of these maps, it was not possible to indicate all the names mentioned in Mr. Pouqueville's work. Those who wish to know them can consult the map of Greece in 4 large sheets drawn up by Mr. Lapie, as well as that of Turkey in 16 sheets.

All these maps were the result of the editorial policy of the Dépôt de la Guerre under the Restoration, which consisted of exploiting the rich material amassed during the Napoleonic era. Indeed, during the wars of the Revolution and the Empire, the Dépôt acted as a central intelligence service, a topographic archive and a military cartographic bureau.⁸ Thanks to its own information as well as the information provided through the network of topographic offices, or dépôts, in the countries controlled by France, and by looting the topographic material of the conquered countries, the Dépôt accumulated an enormous documentary collection which covered all the regions of Europe and beyond. However, a particular interest in the regions of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Ottoman Empire is clearly evident in these collections,⁹ an interest linked to the international antagonism in view of the dismemberment of the Ottoman

observations astronomiques et sur les relèvements de M.r Gaultier Capitaine de Vaisseau par le Chevalier Lapie Officier supérieur au Corps Royal des Ingénieurs Géographes, 1825. Gravée par Blondeau graveur du Roi, Paris Picquet et fils, 1825.

⁶ *Carte physique, historique et routière de la Grèce / dressée au 400000e d'après les matériaux recueillis par Mr le lieut. général comte Guilleminot, ambassadeur à Constantinople et M. le lieut. général comte de Tromelin, Inspecteur Général d'Infanterie, ainsi que d'après les Voyages, Mémoires et Itinéraires de M. M. Pouqueville, Gell, Dodwell, etc. et appuyée sur les observations astronomiques et les relèvements de M. M. les capitaines de vaisseau Gaultier et Smith, par le chevalier Lapie, 1er géographe du roi, etc. – 1:400000. – Paris. – 1826.*

⁷ *Carte de la partie septentrionale de la Grèce moderne – Carte de la partie méridionale de la Grèce moderne, dressée principalement sur les mémoires de M. Pouqueville, membre de l'Institut, et appuyée sur les observations astronomiques de M. Gaultier, par le chevalier Lapie, premier géographe du roi. 1827.*

⁸ Patrice Bret, "Le Dépôt général de la guerre et la formation scientifique des ingénieurs-géographes militaires en France (1789–1830)," *Annals of Science* 48, no. 2 (1991): 113–57; Robert Fulton, "Crafting a Site of State Information Management: The French Case of the Dépôt de la guerre," *French Historical Studies* 40, no. 2 (2017): 215–40.

⁹ H.-M.-A. Berthaut, *Les ingénieurs géographes militaires (1624–1831): Étude historique* (Paris: Imprimerie du Service géographique, 1902, 2: 441–484); Louis Tuetey, *Catalogue*

Empire, what we commonly call “the Eastern Question”. On the initiative of the French military and diplomatic services, as well as those of the Kingdom of Italy, Kingdom of Naples or Illyrian Provinces, reconnaissance missions in the East multiplied, and the image of the Ottoman lands in Europe was built on a novel documentary basis. Gradually, the geographers and cartographers of the Dépôt, supported by a better knowledge of the territories and their history, succeeded to shape an image of the Greek “national” space, its extent and its internal organisation, well before the creation of the Greek state (1832).

Imagining Greece

In the 1822 map of European Turkey, Greece appears as a province of the Ottoman Empire, its name being written on the map with the same font as Albania, Bosnia, Serbia, Bulgaria or Wallachia. It is composed by the sanjaks of Trikala, Lepanto, Negroponte and the Morea. It is not clear whether the western parts of the peninsula, the sanjaks of Jannina and Carlelia (Acarmania), are part of Greece or Albania, whose name appears further up in the North (fig. 2). The extent and the internal organisation of the country are clearer in the 1826 map of Greece, which includes the territories between Mount Olympus and the island of Kythira in the north-south direction, and between the islands of Corfu and Naxos in the west-east direction (fig. 3).

As their titles indicate, both maps are part of the same project, being based on the materials collected by Lieutenant-General Armand-Charles Guilleminot (1744–1840), former director of the Dépôt de la Guerre and French ambassador to the Sublime Porte since 1823, and Lieutenant-General Jacques-Jean-Marie-François Boudin, comte de Tromelin (1771–1842), General Inspector of the Infantry.¹⁰ For the execution of the map of Greece, Lapie made also use of the memoirs and itineraries of François Pouqueville (1770–1838), the itineraries of Sir William Gell (1777–1836) and Edward Dodwell (1767–1832),¹¹ as well as the

général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Archives de la guerre, vol. 2, *Reconnaissances militaires depuis 1790* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1915).

¹⁰ Cf. Charles Mullié, “Armand Charles Guilleminot,” in *Biographie des célébrités militaires des armées de terre et de mer de 1789 à 1850* (Paris: 1852); Henry Lachouque, *Le Général de Tromelin* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1968).

¹¹ William Gell, *The Itinerary of Greece with a Commentary on Pausanias and Strabo and an Account of the Monuments of Antiquity at Present Existing in that Country* (London: T. Payne, 1810); Gell, *Itinerary of the Morea Being a Description of the Routes of that Peninsula* (London: Rodwell and Martin, 1817); Edward Dodwell, *A Classical and Topographical Tour Through Greece, During the Years 1801, 1805 and 1806* (London: Rodwell and Martin, 1819).



M E R D E



Figure 2. Pierre Lapie, *Carte générale de la Turquie d'Europe en XV feuilles* (Paris: Charles Picquet, 1822–1825). Efstathios J. Finopoulos Library/Benaki Museum, Athens, ΦΧ03614.



Figure 3. Pierre Lapie, *Carte physique, historique et routière de la Grèce...* (Paris, 1826). Hellenic Literar

hydrographic surveys of Captains Pierre-Henry Gauttier du Parc (1772–1850) and Henry William Smyth (1788–1865).¹²

Aside from the wealth of information due to the different scale of the two maps, the main divergence in mapping Greece between them consists in the internal make-up of the country. In his 1826 map, Lapie abandons the Ottoman sanjaks and adopts the internal division into provinces and cantons proposed by Pouqueville's *Voyage dans la Grèce*, a work published in five volumes in 1820–1821, and in six volumes in 1826–1827, in a second revised and expanded edition under the title *Voyage de la Grèce*.

Pouqueville's project was geographical and political at once. His aim was to "give the enslaved Greeks back their ancient nationality" and to "unravel the chaos that covers ancient Hellas, the confusion of languages and ruins".¹³ In order to achieve this, Pouqueville proposes (and quite often invents) a systematic parallelism between ancient and modern Greek geography, partly inspired by the unfinished *Description of Ancient Greece* by Jacques Le Paulmier de Grentemesnil (1678), a work that also attempts to document the historical continuity of human settlements in the Greek area.¹⁴ Pouqueville proposes an internal division of the Greek space, Hellenising the Ottoman administrative regions and the overall nomenclature of each region he describes in order to associate ancient and modern jurisdictions and places of all types, creating a "synonymy", which is summarised in the extensive comparative gazetteer that closes the work.¹⁵

Pouqueville's narrative is a geographical description of the Greek lands structured on the historical and geographical description of each Ottoman

¹² On the 1816–1820 hydrographic missions of Captain Pierre-Henry Gauttier du Parc (1772–1850) in the Eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea, see J.-S.-C. Dumont d'Urville, "Relation de la campagne hydrographique de la Gabarre du roi *La Chevrette* dans le Levant et la mer Noire, durant l'année 1820," *Journal des voyages, découvertes et navigations modernes* 9, no. 29 (1821): 273–316; on the exchange of information between Gauttier and Henry William Smyth, see Andrew David, "British Hydrographic Surveys in the Mediterranean, in the Early Years of the Nineteenth Century," *International Hydrographic Review* 6, no. 3 (2005): 10–24.

¹³ The first was inscribed as an epitaph engraved on the marble of his grave at the Montparnasse cemetery, the second in the introduction of F.-C.-H.-L. Pouqueville, *Voyage dans la Grèce*, 5 vols. (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1820–1821), 1:v.

¹⁴ During the last 20 years of his life, Jacques Le Paulmier de Grentemesnil (1587–1670), worked on the comparative geography of ancient and modern Greece. His unfinished work was published in 1678 by Étienne Morin under the title *Graeciae antiquae descriptio*. It covers Illyria, Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, Locris and Focis. See Raoul Baladié, "La géographie historique de la Grèce antique au XVIIe siècle à Caen," *Journal des savants*, no. 2 (1993): 287–331, and no. 1 (1996): 161–259.

¹⁵ Pouqueville, *Voyage dans la Grèce*, 5:501–630.

sanjak, associated with an ancient Greek province and its internal subdivision into cantons, which usually correspond to the Ottoman kazas. Pouqueville's cantons correspond in turn to ancient countries, which can be territories of ancient tribes or nations, ancient cities, Roman provinces or Byzantine dioceses. Pouqueville's system is summarised in the recurrent concordance tables between ancient and modern regions in which are also listed the towns and villages of each canton with their demographic data, drawn from consular reports or church records. Other tables present financial data, also compiled from the reports of consuls to the central offices of the Foreign Ministry. These tables relate to production and trade, the potential of the Greek-owned fleet, with the number of ships per region, their tonnage, the numbers of their crews and cannons.

In spite of its major political and ideological value, Pouqueville's geographical edifice remains conjectural, being based on continuous and precarious associations of ancient and modern places and names. The cantons, for instance, which are the basic spatial unit of his geography, correspond often but not always to the Ottoman kazas, while their ancient counter parts are spatial entities of different historical eras, sometimes settlements of ancient tribes, as described by Strabo, Ptolemy or Pliny, sometimes territories of cities or Roman and Byzantine administrative or ecclesiastical jurisdictions, sometimes pure inventions, inspired by the consonance of the modern name with the name of an ancient hero, a Byzantine lord or commander that he encountered during his erratic readings.

Itinerary Measurements and Hypothetical Triangulation

With its extensive historical narrations and its analytical geographical descriptions, its dense references and the convincing clarity of its tables, Pouqueville's geographical and historical edifice seemed solid. However, its conversion to a map was not a simple task. Lapie had to check all these authentic and spurious items of information against other more reliable sources, and decide their precise location on the map. Lapie did not publish a critical analysis of his working method and the materials he used to produce his maps. We must therefore resort to contemporary accounts, such as the anonymous critical presentation of the map of European Turkey published in the *Bulletin de la Société de géographie*, or the analysis of the map of Greece by Pouqueville, included in the introduction to the second edition of his *Voyage*.¹⁶ We thus

¹⁶ *Bulletin de la Société de géographie* 2 (1825), 11–13. The anonymous author may well be the Hellenist and geographer J.-D. Barbié du Bocage, member of the editorial committee of the *Bulletin*; Pouqueville, *Voyage de la Grèce*, 6 vols. (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 1:lxvi–lxvii.

learn that, for the map of Turkey in Europe, Lapie had recourse to the previous maps published by the Dépôt and to the materials collected by a series of French emissaries sent to the European regions of the Ottoman Empire during the brief Franco–Turkish alliance between June 1806 and July 1807 against Russia and Britain, an alliance broken by the Franco–Russian Treaty of Tilsit (July 1807).¹⁷ During these few months of Franco–Turkish *entente cordiale*, the intense activity of French envoys in Constantinople and the Balkans contributed to the outbreak of the Russo–Turkish War (December 1806), the British naval intervention in Constantinople (early 1807), but also to the conservative revolution in Constantinople, which resulted in the removal of Sultan Selim III.¹⁸

The itineraries of the French army emissaries also formed the structural basis of the map. Immediately after the Treaty of Tilsit, Napoleon sent Guilleminot to Turkey with the aim of appeasing the Ottomans, who were upset with the Franco–Russian alliance, and to mediate in order to bring peace between the Russian and Ottoman adversaries. Guilleminot set out from Tilsit and, through the Danubian Principalities, ended up in Slobodja on the left bank of the Danube (present-day Slobozia in Romania), where a Russian–Turkish armistice was concluded.¹⁹ His detailed itinerary allowed the empirical assessment of distances between a series of localities in the northern regions of the map.²⁰ For his part, Tromelin undertook a mission to Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace between August and December 1807, on the orders of General Auguste de Marmont, governor of Dalmatia. His detailed report contains topographical information, often accompanied by sketchy plans, estimates of the composition of the local populations, military observations and detailed itineraries, some of which were published in 1828.²¹ According to the anonymous author of the *Bulletin*, Tromelin’s itineraries allowed for the correction of the topography of Thessaly and to establish the structure of the hitherto unknown mountain ranges of Pindus.

¹⁷ *Bulletin de la Société de géographie* (1825): 11.

¹⁸ Édouard Driault, *La politique orientale de Napoléon. Sebastiani et Gardane, 1806–1808* (Paris: Felix Alcan, 1904).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 217–33.

²⁰ Cf. “Mémoire de l’adjutant-commandant Guilleminot, sur les observations qu’il a faites et les renseignements qu’il a recueillis, pendant son voyage en Turquie” (Tuetey, *Archives de la guerre*, 2:321); Sorin Şipoş, “La frontière orientale de l’Europe dans le récit d’un officier français au début du XIXe siècle,” *Papeles de Geografia* 55–56 (2012): 207–19.

²¹ Tromelin’s report was published by Édouard Driault in his *Revue des études napoléoniennes* 12 (1917): 344–81, and 13 (1918): 96–124. In 1828, Tromelin published his itineraries together with a plea for an international intervention in favour of Greece (see n. 1 above); in 1829 he also published the French translation of Gell’s itineraries in Greece.

The *Bulletin* also mentions the reports of other French missions, such as “the recent observations” of General Andréossy,²² the reports of the engineers Riollay and Roux de la Mazelière,²³ the reconnaissance of generals Haxo and Foy in Macedonia, which provided new information on the system of mountain ranges where the sources of the great rivers flowing into the Adriatic and the Thermaic Gulf are to be found,²⁴ as well as Barbié du Bocage’s maps made for the first edition of Pouqueville’s *Voyage dans la Grèce*, “which provided new information on the eastern side of the Pindus chain, as far as the Axios River”.²⁵

Lapie was not the first to exploit the rich material on European Turkey collected in 1807. The topographical bureaus of the satellite countries of the French Empire had also made use of it, as evidenced by the map of European

²² An artillery officer and eminent hydrographer, Antoine-François, comte d’Andréossy (1761–1828), was director of the *Dépôt de la Guerre* in 1802, then French ambassador to the Sublime Porte from 1812 to 1814. He studied the hydrography of the Bosphorus and the Black Sea. Among his publications that have survived are: *Description de la route de Kostanizza à Constantinople* (1812); *Mémoires sur l’irruption du Pont-Euxin dans la Méditerranée* (1814); *Voyage à l’embouchure de la mer Noire* (1818); *Constantinople et le Bosphore de Thrace pendant les années 1812, 1813 et 1814 et pendant l’année 1826* (1828).

²³ In the French War Archives are conserved two memoirs by Gaspard Riollay (1783–1861), artillery officer and politician: “Mémoire sur la reconnaissance faite dans la partie nord-ouest de la Bosnie . . ., Laybach, 15 mars 1810” and “Mémoire sur la Bosnie”. See Louis Tuetey, *Archives de la guerre*, 2:321.

²⁴ The army engineer François-Nicolas-Benoît Haxo (1774–1838) introduced contour lines at the larger scale in order to show the ground relief in cartography. In 1807, he undertook a mission to Constantinople, on the orders of Eugène de Beauharnais. He was accompanied by Sorbier. Maximilien-Sébastien Foy (1775–1825), artillery general and Liberal MP under the Restoration, was commissioned to Constantinople in 1807, to train Ottoman artillery officers. He was distinguished at the defence of the Straits against the British assault.

²⁵ *Bulletin de la Société de géographie* 2 (1825): 11–13. The article mentions, in addition, the previous maps of the region published by the *Dépôt* and, in particular, the map of the Peloponnese drawn by Jean-Denis Barbié du Bocage, engraved at the *Dépôt* in 1807 and published by the author in 1814. The map was commissioned in 1802 by the *Dépôt* from the Hellenist and geographer J.-D. Barbié du Bocage, by then geographer of the Foreign Ministry. On Bonaparte’s orders, the ministry had made available to Barbié all the information he had on the region and, by the end of 1802, the map was completed, at a scale of 1:400,000, the usual scale for the *Dépôt*’s topographical maps. The map remained confidential and in manuscript form. It was rectified and completed in 1804 and 1805, and engraved in 1807, when plans for a new French campaign in the Ottoman Empire were revived, on one sheet measuring 580 x 910 mm, without a title or mention of its author. In 1814, after the fall of the empire, Barbié published the map on his own account, completed by a brief critical note. See Tolia, *Η γένεση του ελληνικού κράτους*, 65–71.



Turkey by Gaetano Palma, an Italian engineer officer in the service of Joseph Bonaparte, king of Naples, published in Trieste by the Dalmatian Topographical Office in 1811.²⁶ The map was printed in two sheets, measuring a total of 1,080 x 730 mm, and was written in two languages, French and Greek, an element revealing that the French were counting on the support of the Greek-speaking populations in the prospect of a Franco–Turkish war. Palma based his map on his own reconnaissance of Epirus and Thessaly during his mission to these regions in 1807 as well as on the itineraries measured by other French emissaries at the same time. His map includes a detailed representation of the road network with the distances between stations, marked in hours of walking (fig. 4). It also contains a statistical table of the populations of the most important towns of European Turkey.

The same materials were also used by General Frédéric-François Guillaume de Vaudoncourt (1772–1845) during the difficult years of his long exile. Loyal to Napoleon and an inveterate revolutionary, the former director of the *Dépôt de la Guerre* of the Kingdom of Italy had been sentenced to death during the Restoration, and earned his living in exile by publishing maps and historical essays.²⁷ Guillaume de Vaudoncourt had also first-hand knowledge of the Greek space. At the beginning of 1807, he undertook a mission to Bosnia, Shkodra (Skoutari) and Jannina, as military adviser to Ali Pasha. He remained in Greece until the summer of 1807, visited Epirus, Macedonia and Thessaly, undertook fortification works in Preveza, built cannon foundries in Jannina and gathered intelligence for a possible French invasion.²⁸ His first map of Greece was

²⁶ *Carte de la plus grande partie de la Turquie d'Europe dressée sur d'anciens matériaux rectifiés par les observations astronomiques faites récemment sur les côtes et sur les nombreux renseignements fournis par divers voyageurs. Dédiée à S. E. M. gr le maréchal duc de Raguse ... Par Gaétan Palma, Trieste, 1811/Χάρτης τῆς εὐρωπαϊκῆς Τουρκίας, πάλαι μὲν Ἑλλάδος παρὰ Γαετάνου Πάλμα. Ἔτος 1811, ἐν Τεργεσίῳ.*

²⁷ F. Thierry, *Notice sur le général baron Frédéric-François Guillaume de Vaudoncourt* (Paris: s.n., 1846). A former general in Napoleon's army, Guillaume de Vaudoncourt took part in the 1821 Italian revolt as commander-in-chief of the revolutionary army of Piedmont, and in the revolt of the Spanish patriots against the Bourbons (1823); he returned to France after the amnesty of 1825 and died, destitute, in Passy, in 1845. According to Berthaut (*Les ingénieurs géographes*, 2:342), Guillaume de Vaudoncourt had been appointed provisional director of the *Dépôt de la Guerre* of the Kingdom of Italy in 1804, in the absence of General Bianchi; according to his own statement, he was the director of the *Dépôt*. See F.-F. Guillaume de Vaudoncourt, *Mémoire annexé à la carte de la Turquie d'Europe à la droite du Danube, ou des Beglerbegliks de Roum-Ili, de Bosnie et de Morée en quatre feuilles* (Munich: Setbold, 1818), 8.

²⁸ We have from his hand the “Notes sur la Turquie d'Europe tirées de différents manuscrits,” MS de 131 p., BNF, SG COLIS 3 BIS (1631); “Notes sur différentes opérations

published in London in 1816 in one sheet (fig. 5), and then in 1817 by John Cary in four sheets, measuring a total of 950 x 1,220 mm.²⁹ It shows the lands of the Balkan Peninsula that lay south of Aulon (present-day Vlorë in Albania) in the East and the island of Thasos in the West. The following year (1818), Guillaume de Vaudoncourt published in Munich a map of Turkey in Europe in four lithographed sheets, measuring 920 x 1,260 mm.³⁰ The map is accompanied by a Memoir, containing a critical analysis of the work, an essay on the geography of European Turkey and a table of the main routes in the region.³¹ This table presents 52 routes taken from the reports of French officers dispatched to European Turkey, especially at the time of the Franco–Turkish alliance of 1807, revealing the common documentary basis between this map and that of Lapie of 1822–1825.

exécutées pendant ma mission à Jannina, 1807,” Gennadius Library, Athens, MSS 150. Cf. Emily Neumeier “Trans-imperial Encounter on the Ionian Sea: A French Engineer’s Account of Constructing Ottoman Fortifications,” in *Ψηφίδες ιστορίας της Πρέβεζας α’*, ed. N. D. Karampelas (Preveza: Idryma Aktia Nikopolis, 2018), 11–54. In Epirus, Guillaume de Vaudoncourt collaborated with captains Poncetou, Palma and Turpin de Montigny, envoys of Joseph Bonaparte, king of Naples. See Foivos Oikonomou, “*Ελληνες μισθοφόροι στην υπηρεσία της επαναστατικής Γαλλίας (1789–1815)*” (PhD diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2007), 115–18.

²⁹ Frédéric-François Guillaume de Vaudoncourt, *Map of the Ionian Islands, and the adjacent Part of Turkey; Exhibiting the Ancient & Modern Geography, Drawn Partly on the Spot & from the most Authentic & Recent Materials, by F. G. Chevalier de Vaudoncourt, Late General in the Italian Service. 1816*, copper engraving 463 x 385 mm, included in the book *Memoirs on the Ionian Islands, Considered in a Commercial, Political, and Military, Point of View ... Together with a Comparative Display of the Ancient and Modern Geography of the Epirus, Thessaly, Morea, Part of Macedonia* (London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1816); *A New Map of Greece, Exhibiting the Provinces Governed by Ali Pacha and his Children, viz South Albania, Thessaly, part of Macedonia, Livadia, and the Morea*. A single copy is known, located in the British Library, Maps C.44.b.4. Thanks are due to Konstantinos Kakoulidis for the information.

³⁰ *Carte générale de la Turquie d’Europe à la droite du Danube ou des beglerbegliks de Roum Ili, Bosna et Morée, dressée d’après les meilleures observations astronomiques, itinéraires, cartes particulières, et reconnaissances existantes jusqu’à ce jour, par F. Guillaume de Vaudoncourt*. The map includes four insets with topography plans of the Hellespont, the Bosphorus, Magnesia and Thermopylae. It was reissued in Munich (1821) and Leipzig (1822). The preparation of the map may date back to 1812–1814, when Guillaume de Vaudoncourt was a prisoner in Russia, under the protection of Grand Duke Konstantin Pavlovich. Manuscript notes by Guillaume de Vaudoncourt on the topography of European Turkey, dated 1811, are kept in in the Russian Army Archives and a manuscript map by his hand, in 30, presumably in 8° or in 16° sheets, dated 1816 (Fond 450, opis’ 1, delo 209 and Fond 450, opis’ 1, delo 217, respectively).

³¹ Guillaume de Vaudoncourt, *Mémoire annexé à la carte de la Turquie d’Europe*, 7.



Figure 5. Frédéric-François Guillaume de Vaudoncourt, “Map of the Ionian Islands, and the adjacent Part of Turkey...” *Memoirs on the Ionian Islands, Considered in a Commercial, Political, and Military, Point of View...* (London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1816). Library of the Hellenic Parliament, Athens, ΣΒΕ 107 1816MEM.

The Memoir sheds light on the method adopted for the production of the map. In the absence of geodetic data and a triangulation of European Turkey, the military cartographer proceeded in two steps. Firstly, he converted the itinerary distances into absolute linear distances, taking into account the relief and the road sinuosities; secondly, he adjusted these linear distances into a network, thus creating a grid of triangles whose intersections were the towns situated at the junctions of the road network. This method, which Guillaume de Vaudoncourt calls “a hypothetical triangulation”, was also followed by Lapie in the construction of his maps of European Turkey or Greece, as Pouqueville testifies in the introduction to his *Voyage de la Grèce*.³²

According to Pouqueville, Lapie was able to establish the outline of Greece on the basis of the surveys of the hydrographic expeditions of captains Gauttier and Smyth, thus forming the cartographic “envelope” of the country. Deprived of astronomical observations for the interior of Greece,

Mr. Lapie had to resort to itineraries; and it is by means of their combination that he succeeded in establishing, as the basis of his operations, the positions of the towns of Scodra or Scutari, Uskiup [Skopje], Monastir or Bitolia, Jannina, Ochrida, Castoria, Mezzovo, Larissa, Zeitoun [Lamia], Livadia, Thebes; in Morea, Calavryta, Tripolitza, Leondari and Mistra.³³

He later used similar means to determine secondary positions, thereby creating a system of metric relationships that allowed the geographical coordinates of each position to be assessed. A neophyte in cartography, Pouqueville expands at length on the treatment of itinerary distances:

Each itinerary has been developed on a very large scale in order to take into account all the sinuosities of the roads that the scale of my maps did not allow to represent. As a result of this work, Mr. Lapie has been led to reduce the distances sometimes by a fifth, sometimes by a quarter, sometimes by half and even by two thirds. Thus in the hilly parts, the measurements taken on the halts will always have to be increased because of the more or less elevation of the mountains, or the difficulties that nature presents.³⁴

The common resources, the concomitant testimonies of Pouqueville and Guillaume de Vaudoncourt, as well as Palma’s map listing the distances of each

³² Pouqueville, *Voyage de la Grèce*, 1:lxvi–lxvii.

³³ *Ibid.*, lxviii.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, lxix.

stage of the road network in hours of marching time, confirm that the Dépôt's military cartographers had developed precise and common protocols for the treatment of itineraries and the transformation of a region's communications network into the improvised metric grid of its map.

Reception and Functions

The criticism that Pouqueville received for the lightness of his identifications and inventions was stormy. Colonel Leake was the first to point out the deliberate distortion of names in order to support the author's "paradoxical views"³⁵ while Jean-Antoine Letronne was much more severe. A geographer and archaeologist of a great renown, deeply versed in ancient topography, Letronne would correct Pouqueville's errors in a series of articles published in 1828 and issued in a separate pamphlet the same year, a few months after Pouqueville's election to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.³⁶ According to Letronne, the author's imagination made up for the absence of learned equipment and led the traveller to false etymologies and constant renamings, but also to the invention of ancient cities, peoples and countries.³⁷ The work would have been much more useful, he concludes, "if the traveller had been a little more measured and much more well read, and we should not now be obliged to erase from the maps of Greece the fanciful names added under his authority, or to change the position of others which he misplaced".³⁸ The German historian and geographer Konrad Mannert came to the same conclusion. Pouqueville, he declared, follows his own system, without checking the slightest thing. Furthermore, he claims the reputation of a florid storyteller (*ein blühender Vortrag*): "his path is so covered with flowers that it is difficult to recognise the ground beneath the flowers."³⁹

Criticism of Pouqueville seems to have become a sort of intellectual vogue, judging by Byron's remark: "Pouqueville is always out."⁴⁰ Colonel Leake consoled

³⁵ William Martin Leake, *An Historical Outline of the Greek Revolution with a few Remarks on the Present State of Affairs in that Country* (London: John Murray, 1826), 201–4.

³⁶ Jean-Antoine Letronne, *Analyse critique du Voyage de la Grèce par F.C.H.L. Pouqueville* ([Paris]: [Firmin Didot], [1828]).

³⁷ "Les géographes désireraient qu'il se fût plus souvent défié de ses inspirations." *Ibid.*, 33.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Konrad Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer, das nördliche Griechenland, der Peloponnesus, die Inseln des Archipelagus* (Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1822), v.

⁴⁰ George Gordon, Lord Byron, *The Works of Lord Byron. Poetry*, vol. 2, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), 179, commentary 17.

himself with the idea that no one would take him seriously and that he would soon be forgotten.⁴¹ The prediction was not verified. If the scientific value of the work is debatable, its ideological and political value was great, as it put forward the historical national identity of the revolted Greeks. Pouqueville's overconfident and fallacious composition proposed an overall synthesis of an organised Hellenic territory, which sustained the historical continuity of the Greek presence in the area, Hellenising placenames and inventing etymological bridges between antiquity and Ottoman Greece.

If Pouqueville's geographical identifications were promptly and ardently refuted, the same could not be said for his definition of Greece, the extent and the inner regional organisation of the country, summarised by Lapie's map, which were accepted without any noticeable opposition. This was due to the fact that both Pouqueville's narrative and Lapie's map echoed a consensus on the conception of the country, its borders and its provinces, a consent attained through the long elaborations of the historical and comparative geography of Greece. However, their reaffirmation in the context of the Greek national revolution and the prevailing spirit of philhellenism endowed them with a novel political relevance.

Lapie frequently reissued the maps of European Turkey and Greece and published several reduced versions, which, as we have seen, were promoted by advertising as "the only ones by means of which it will be possible to follow events in a quite satisfactory manner". Many cartographers and map publishers in France and abroad offered to the public maps that reproduced or closely followed his models. Lapie set a standard. In 1827, the mapmaker Auguste-Henri Dufour drew up a version of the map of Turkey in Europe reduced to four sheets, which he signed as "a pupil of Mr. Lapie".⁴² Lapie's lustre was to persist even after the presence on site of engineer-geographers, commissioned to draw an accurate map of the area. Colonel Bory de Saint-Vincent, head of the Physical Sciences Section of the 1829 Scientific Expedition to the Morea, was enthusiastic in his praise:

Mr. Lapie's work, magnificent in terms of its execution, is still most remarkable in terms of the difficulties overcome ... All the officers who were later employed to draw up the new map with which our

⁴¹ "His authority will neither be very extensive nor very durable." Leake, *Historical Outline of the Greek Revolution*, 201–4.

⁴² *Carte physique, politique et comparée de la Turquie d'Europe, présentée à S.A.R.M.gr le dauphin et publiée par P.-J. Lameau, capitaine de 1.ère classe au corps royal des ingénieurs géographes, Chev.er de l'ordre r.al de la Légion d'honneur. Dressée par A. H. Dufour, élève de M. Lapie, gravée par Richard Wahl, ancien élève du Dépôt général de la guerre. Paris 1827.*

work is enriched ... had more than one opportunity to admire how Mr. Lapie had been able to unravel the true state of things in the midst of the chaos in which they had been confused ... it took a kind of divinatory instinct to indicate them in the very places where we, three years later, verified their existence.⁴³

The then undisputed scientific value of the map reinforced its political significance. At the most crucial moment of the Greek War of Independence, when the Ottoman and Egyptian counter-offensive was annulling, one after the other, the conquests of five years of struggle, the map represented Greece as a potential sovereign state. The country appeared as an organised political territory, clearly delimited, with administrative centres and an internal organisation in which the Ottoman first- and second-level administrative districts (sanjaks and kazas) were replaced by Hellenic districts (provinces and cantons), whose names reflected the historical permanence of the Greek presence in this space. In addition, the map was not proposed by philhellenes, “freedom fighters”, liberals, and other nostalgic supporters of Napoleon, opposed to the Restoration and always suspected of having the intention of disturbing the peace imposed in Europe by the Holy Alliance. The map was issued by an official French institution of Charles X, under the direction of two conservative generals loyal to the Bourbon Restoration, the Count of Tromelin and the Count Guilleminot, two officers who had distinguished themselves during the suppression of the insurrection of the Spanish patriots in 1823.

The map also echoes the revolutionary events by including nine topographical plans related to what was happening in insurgent Greece. First, the territories of Parga and Butrint, mainland dependencies of the Ionian Islands and sold in 1819 to the Ottomans by the British, masters of the islands since 1814. This led to the mass exodus of their inhabitants and raised a wave of indignation throughout Europe; then a series of topographic plans showing the political and military centres of the region: Nafplio, the seat of the Greek revolutionary government; Athens and Messolonghi, the political and military centres of East and West Continental Greece, under siege or destroyed; the strongholds of Koroni and Methoni, which Ibrahim had just recaptured, as well as the great port of Navarino, the western sea gate of Greece; and the Isthmus of Corinth with its Venetian fortifications, an essential site for military control of the peninsula.

The map was thus promoted as a means of philhellenic education of the public. Pouqueville invited his readers to obtain “Colonel Lapie’s detailed maps

⁴³ J.-B.-G.-M. Bory de Saint-Vincent, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Section des sciences physiques*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *Geographie* (Paris and Strasbourg: Levrault, 1834), 17.

of Greece: for such is our pronounced love for the Hellenes, that we would like to see their names, their images, those of their tyrants and the historical maps of their country, spread, attract, occupy and fix the attention and the thought of all the peoples of the universe.”⁴⁴ Furthermore, the map was to play a role in the political and diplomatic developments that led to the establishment of the Greek national state. While waiting in Ancona for the ship that was to take him to Greece, Kapodistrias wrote to General Nicolas de Loverdo at the War Ministry in Paris requesting

the outlines of the geographical map of Greece [based on] the Lapie map in four sheets [with] the contours, the layout of the mountains and rivers, and that of the different provinces. These outlines would provide a good working subject for a real map, and in its time they would facilitate me in my statistical and administrative work.⁴⁵

A few months later, when the conference of the representatives of the protecting powers in Poros raised the question of the extent of the future state, Kapodistrias referred them “to the evidence of history and the opinion of geographers”, and proposed the limits of Lapie’s map of 1826.⁴⁶ The map was also used as a reference document in the deliberations on the delimitation of the borders between Greece and the Ottoman Empire. The Convention of Constantinople of 21 July 1832, and the London Protocol of 30 August which ratified it, listed the sequence of localities to be followed by the Boundary Commission on the basis of the Lapie map, and the errors in it gave rise to disagreements between the commissioners and lengthy diplomatic controversies.⁴⁷ Lieutenant-Colonel George Baker, the British commissioner for the Greek–Ottoman boundary, pointed out the errors of the map, considering that they were all due to Pouqueville’s erroneous identifications:

Colonel Lapie’s map, though in itself a very remarkable production, when we consider the many doubtful and heterogeneous sources from which it was compiled, and at the time the best extant, was still very defective on all the most important points of the line ... In the examination of Western Greece and the more central districts of

⁴⁴ Pouqueville, *Voyage de la Grèce*, 1:lxxv.

⁴⁵ Letter, dated Ancona, 23 November/5 December 1827. Cf. Élie-Ami Bétant, ed., *Correspondance du comte J. Capodistrias, président de la Grèce* (Geneva: Abraham Cherbuliez et Cie, 1839), 1:328.

⁴⁶ Andreas Mamoukas, *Tà katà tήν Αναγέννησιν τής Ελλάδος* (Athens: Vasiliki Typographia, 1852), 9:257.

⁴⁷ *Recueil des traités, actes et pièces concernant la fondation de la royauté en Grèce et le tracé de ses limites* (Nafplion: Vasiliki Typographia, 1833), 65 and 71.

Agrafa, the only authority open to a reference lay in the voluminous, though somewhat inaccurate, work of M. Pouqueville, "Voyage de la Grèce", on which, in common with the information supplied by Sir William Gell and Mr. Dodwell, Lapie's map was framed; but we soon found it necessary to shut it up, it being impossible to place any confidence in its details.⁴⁸



The survey of the resources, the mapping practices and the reception of Colonel Lapie's map of Greece reveals the key role of cartography in shaping and establishing territorial identities, and illustrates the ideological and political function of the cartographic enterprise in an age of patriotic nationalism and technological positivism. Furthermore, it confirms the achievements of military cartography before the application of geodetic measurements on the spot, but also its limits, the unattainable mathematisation of narrative descriptions. The French military mapping of revolutionary Greece expressed the desire of the political and military administration in France, in Greece and elsewhere, to proceed to a formal definition of the country as a sovereign and territorial national state through an analytical cartographic representation of its extent, its inner administrative structure, its settlements and its history. The limitations of this ambition were manifest, however. Young Napoleon-Hector Soult de Dalmatie, aide-de-camp to General Maison, observed on his return from Greece in 1831:

If someone believes that he knows a country because he has seen its map, this reasoning will certainly seem specious; but if he is willing to admit that nature is infinitely more variable than the drawing, that it offers at each step dissimilarities which only allow one to judge them when one has seen them himself, he will have recourse to data other than those of the map to found a state and to constitute a nation.⁴⁹

Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

⁴⁸ Lieutenant-Colonel [George] Baker, "Memoir on the Northern Frontier of Greece," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 7 (1837): 82.

⁴⁹ N.-H. Soult de Dalmatie, "La Grèce après la campagne de Morée," *Revue des deux mondes* 1 (1831): 87.

ALTERNATIVE NARRATIVES OF THE GREEK REVOLUTION: AN
INTELLECTUAL MAP OF MESSOLONGHI (1821–1880)

Panagiotis El Gedi

ABSTRACT: The relationship between space and time is quite complex, especially when combined with other categories, such as poetry and history. This study takes Messolonghi as a case study and tries to see space in relation to time. In particular, it proposes, on the one hand, to look at Messolonghi as a chronotope and, on the other, to focus on the poetry of the period from 1821 to 1880. The contribution aims to create an “intellectual map” of Messolonghi in which we can integrate both the memoirs of the combatants and the discourse of poetry, arguing that historiography and literature use similar methods during this period. The Appendix lists indicative poetic material around Messolonghi.

The historiographical works on the Greek Revolution reserve – rightly – a special place for the sieges of Messolonghi and the heroic sortie. Spyridon Trikoupis, for example, includes in his own history a whole chapter on the description of Messolonghi and its siege,¹ while almost all the memoirs of the combatants describe the sortie, sometimes in more and sometimes in less detail. When news of the fall reached Epidaurus, where the Third National Assembly was meeting, work was interrupted under the weight of the events: “When the deplorable news was announced to the National Assembly, which was meeting at that time in Epidaurus, everyone remained speechless and silent for a long time, and as Kolokotronis says, ‘each and every one of them measured our destruction with his mind’.”² The site of Messolonghi, just a few days after its fall, become a site of memory (*lieu de mémoire*) and a national symbol of resistance to Ottoman rule. The surviving combatants, men, women and children, arrived in Nafplio almost a month later, where they were welcomed with honours: “All the people went out to receive them, the cannons fired, and tears of joy and great admiration filled the people, when they observed the figure of the Guard and the saved old Generals”.³

¹ Spyridon Trikoupis, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως: Έκδοσις δευτέρα επιθεωρηθείσα και διορθωθείσα*, vol. 2 (London: Taylor and Francis, 1862).

² Nikolaos Makris, *Ιστορία του Μεσολογγιού*, ed. Emmanouil Protopsaltis (Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957]), 79.

³ Nikolaos Kasomoulis, *Στρατιωτικά ενθυμήματα της Επανάστασεως των Ελλήνων (1821–1833): Προτάσσεται ιστορία του Αρματωλισμού*, ed. Giannis Vlachogiannis (Athens: Pageios Epitropi, 1939), 2:300.

The events of Messolonghi, especially those of the second siege and the sortie, are known nowadays from various sources: administrative documents, the newspaper *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, the memoirs of the combatants and the historical works on the Greek Revolution. Some of these sources are primary sources, that is, written by people who lived through the sortie, and others are secondary sources, that is, they were written on the basis of research by people who did not live through the sortie but who are close to the events in terms of time and space. Although many memoirs can be said to put emphasis on Messolonghi, the main works that have been used as historical sources are the memoirs of Artemios Michos, Nikolaos Kasomoulis, Ioannis Spyromilios, Nikolaos Makris and perhaps Petros Stephanitsis.⁴

At the crossroads of the linguistic and the spatial turn, this article would like to propose the extension of the research of the sources concerning the narrative about Messolonghi and thus expand the historical research on two levels: on the one hand, on the axis of synchrony and, on the other, on the axis of diachrony with the space of Messolonghi as the centre of focus. The proposal focuses on the use of poetry about Messolonghi from 1821 to 1880,⁵ that is, it includes both the years of the revolution and the years of the establishment of the state – in other words: it examines romantic nationalism.

⁴ See Artemios Michos, *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826) και τινες άλλαι σημειώσεις εις την ιστορίαν του μεγάλου Αγώνος αναγόμεναι*, ed. Spyridon Aravantinos (Athens: Τυρ. tis Enoseos, 1883); Kasomoulis, *Στρατιωτικά ενθυμήματα*; Ioannis Spyromilios, *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826)*, ed. Giannis Vlachogiannis (Athens: [Τυρ. S.K. Vlastou], 1926); Makris, *Ιστορία του Μεσολογγίου*; Petros Stephanitsis, *Απομνημονεύματα (1821–1839)*, ed. Triantafyllos E. Sklavenitis (Athens: Etairia Lefkadikon Meleton, 2019).

⁵ Obviously, the topic of the connection between history and poetry is not new, while the more specific issue of poetry and the Greek Revolution has been of interest to scholars, especially on the occasion of the bicentenary in 2021. See Alexis Politis, *1821–1831. Με την ελευθερία γεννιέται και η καινούρια λογοτεχνία: Ποίηση, πεζογραφία, λογιοσύνη* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2021); Eri Stavropoulou, *Η νεοελληνική ποίηση και το Εικοσιένα: Διάλογος με την ιστορία* (Athens: Institute of Historical Research/National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2021). Many poetical texts in the anthology of Thanassis Galanakis, ed., *Χαίρε, ω χαίρε, Ελευθεριά! Ο Αγώνας του 1821 στην ελληνική και ξένη ποίηση* (Athens: Piraeus Bank and Takis Sinopoulos Foundation, 2021). Panagiotis Stathis' paper remains important: "Λογοτεχνία και ιστορική μνήμη: Το Εικοσιένα στην πεζογραφία, 1830–1880," in *Λόγος και χρόνος στη νεοελληνική γραμματεία (18ος–19ος αιώνας): Πρακτικά συνεδρίου στη μνήμη του Αλέξη Πολίτη*, ed. Stefanos Kaklamanis, Alexis Kalokerinos and Dimitris Polychronakis (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2015), 621–54.

Messolonghi as a Chronotope

For geography, Messolonghi is a specific place, while for literature it is a theme. How can we see Messolonghi as a research object, by connecting space and time in an abstract way? By introducing the concept of the chronotope, as Michael Bakhtin suggested, we can reconceptualise Messolonghi:

In the literary artistic chronotope ... spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot, and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope.⁶

The chronotope, of course, has strong connections with reality, since in the chronotope the space and time of literature are equated with real/historical space and time.

Hayden White, elaborating further on the concept of the chronotope, argued for its value in historical studies, as it can combine space and time with social and cultural categories:

the chronotope is directly accessible to analysis by study of both the documentary records of a society and the testimony of individual writers, novelists, poets, journalists, letter-writers, autobiographers, scientists, philosophers, and so on – whose work permits the drawing of a set of the “mental maps” of a given time, place, and cultural condition and the construction of the “legend” which they all took for granted as the common code they shared both for making and reading the terrain of consciousness that they effectively occupied. The construction of something like an “atlas” of such “mental maps” would give us a good idea ... of what was conceived to inhabit the terrain of possible action for agents, individual and collective, at given times and places.⁷

Taking Messolonghi as a chronotope, we can transcend a series of difficulties posed by the juxtaposition of history and poetry, namely the “real” and the “imaginary”. This therefore means that we can not only widen our representations of the past, that is, enrich the historical and documentary material about Messolonghi, but also broaden our mode of perception regarding the ways of representing and perceiving historical space and time.

⁶ Michail Bakhtin, quoted in Hayden White, “‘The Nineteenth-Century’ as Chronotope”, *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 11, no. 2 (1987): 122.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 124.

In addition, the special emphasis on poetry for the period from 1821 to 1880 may be useful in order to look at the question of truth.⁸ It is well known that poetry during this period was mostly patriotic – indeed, it contrasted with the foreign novel – and invoked truth: patriotism was equated with truth and truth of representation with national truth.⁹ The poetry of this period is a historiography with poetic grace. If we take the above into account, we could move beyond the dichotomy of (true) historiography versus (false) literature and realise that there is a confluence of these discourses, since they have the same intentions and purposes, namely to serve the truth of the nation.

An Example of Alternative Historiography within a Historiographic Field

Artemios Michos left his rather well-off family in Epirus and shortly afterwards he found himself in the second siege of Messolonghi. Michos took notes, which he later corrected when the struggle was over and had made a career in the army. These notes, as the editor of his work informs us, were not published for two main reasons:¹⁰ firstly because the events were still fresh and he feared that he would stir up political passions, and secondly because he wished to go to Messolonghi for an examination in order to draw up a topographical map – memory needs space and its representation in order to clarify the meaning.

Michos' papers remained incomplete and were published after his death in 1883. The erudite Spyridon Aravantinos, who published the work from Michos' notes, prefaced the description of Messolonghi from Trikoupis' *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* as an introduction, followed by a diary-like "Brief Description" of the events of the second siege (April 1825–January 1826). This is followed by a continuous and annotated (incomplete) narrative on the same subject with several details, which we should suppose was definitely written after the war and with the assistance of administrative documents, which Michos later collected. The work includes another incomplete list of the combatants who participated in the defence of Messolonghi, and also notes those who were killed during the sortie. Finally, there is a continuous account of some individual military events.

Michos (or Aravantinos) titles this incomplete work *Απομνημονεύματα*. Although his categorisation in this literary genre today could not be said to be

⁸ For a case study, see Dimitris Angelatos, *Πραγματικότητα και ιδανικόν: Ο Άγγελος Βλάχος και ο αισθητικός κανόνας της αληθοφάνειας, 1857–1901* (Athens: Metechmio, 2003).

⁹ See Stavropoulou, *Η νεοελληνική ποίηση και το Εικοσιένα*, 23–38.

¹⁰ Michos, *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου, γ'–η'.*

correct, Michos is essentially compiling a chronicle of the second siege, as he organises his material by date (day and month):

On the 20th [April 1825] the leader of the opposing army, Kütahi, arrived at his camp outside the wall.

On the 29th to the 30th [April 1825] at night, Mitros Vayas and eight others deserted from the enemy camp.

On May 7 [1825] around midnight, a small attack was launched against the enemy.¹¹

If the “Brief Description” is a chronicle because of its diary recording, rather the continuous narrative that follows this part of the work is a chronography, as it intends – but does not succeed, because the author did not complete it – to narrate the events with a different method: the material is organised again in line, that is, chronologically, but the narrative is developed with the assistance of documents and other sources – that is, the author seeks to create a narrative about the events of Messolonghi.¹²

Michos moves within the limits and framework set by the chronotope of Messolonghi and for this reason he chooses to organise the material by day. It should be remembered that Johann Jacob Meyer published the diary of the siege through his *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* – and Michos does exactly the same. His narrative starts from the moment the *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* stops publishing, which means that the author – now privately – continues what Meyer had started, apparently in order to preserve the memory of the events on a day-by-day basis.

So Michos is trying to write a historiographical work, to record in detail the events and to narrate what he has lived. His work is also important for literature, however, even though it is not part of it. The publication of Michos’ *Απομνημονεύματα* provided historical material for the authors of another generation, after that of the struggle. Kostis Palamas had Michos’ work in his library, peppered with marginalia;¹³ Andreas Karkavitsas probably read the work and was inspired to write one of his short stories,¹⁴ while Georgios Drossinis had this work in mind, when he decided to publish the *Ημερολόγιον της πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου* in 1926, by copying Meyer’s diary publications,

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹² About chronicles, chronography and historiography, see Hayden White, “The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality,” *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 5–27.

¹³ See Yannis Xourias, ed., *Κατάλογος της βιβλιοθήκης Κωστή Παλαμά* (Athens: Idryma Kostis Palamas, 2010), 154 (entry no. 1018).

¹⁴ See the short story “Η θυσία,” in Andreas Karkavitsas, *Παλιές αγάπες, 1885–1897* (Athens: Estia, 1900), 169–91 (first published 1896).

commemorating the centenary of the sortie and supplementing the work with what Michos failed to find: a topographical map of Messolonghi.¹⁵

Poetic/Alternative Narratives of Messolonghi

Messolonghi, that is, the events of the sieges and the sortie at this location, became an object of treatment early on. We might divide this elaboration into three moments: before the great events, at the time of the great events, and the impact of these events. But such a straight line would obscure the variety of approaches to this chronotope. Instead, below we will try to present some examples in which Messolonghi is a dynamic category, constantly under development. The material in this regard is only indicative and our intention is to present some interesting aspects that can be placed in dialogue with the historiographical methodology, but without breaking with it or becoming the antithesis of it. These alternative narratives are therefore based not on representation but on the methodology of capture. The majority of the material I have collected is left for future analysis in the Appendix of this article.

The First Siege: A History in Verse

Stassinos Mikroulis lived through the first siege of Messolonghi and decided to write about the siege shortly afterwards. The time of the narrative is 1822–1823, while his work was printed in Messolonghi a year later. It is important to note the title of the work: *Ιστορία της Δυτικής Χ:[έρσου] Ελλάδος*. Although the title would suggest this is an historiographical work, Mikroulis is in fact writing a “simple poem”. What we perceive as a tension between history and poetry does not exist for Mikroulis. Instead, he composes a narrative poem in which he narrates, sometimes in detail and sometimes in summary, the events of the first siege: “I decided to take a pencil in my right hand / to describe the war of Messolonghi / when Omer Pasha and Reshid Pasha attacked it / along with selected Arvanites who obeyed his every command.”¹⁶

We could say that Mikroulis is not a poet, but that he composes a folk rhyme and maybe that is the case. Mikroulis was addressing the national imaginary audience, whom he wanted to inform about the events. Beyond informing, however, he also wants to preserve the events he recounts – and thus his narrative:

¹⁵ See Johann Jakob Mayer, *Ημερολόγιον της πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου 1825–1826*, ed. Georgios Drossinis (Athens: Syllogos pros Diadosin Ofelimon Vivlion, 1926).

¹⁶ Stassinos Mikroulis, *Ιστορία της Δυτικής Χ:[έρσου] Ελλάδος* (Messolonghi: Typ. Dimitriou Mestheneos, 1824), 3.

“May God, the poet of the world, have glory, / To give good light to my soul and my mind. / May your servant record the story of Scondra, / To be a testimony for ever and ever.”¹⁷ In the same direction, Spyridon Paidakos, who funded the publication of the poem, notes: “firstly so as not to forget the brave deeds of the inhabitants . . ., with which they proved to be genuine descendants of those immortal old Greeks and secondly so as to motivate those of the young people who desire the same glory and the same zeal”.¹⁸ Poetry, therefore, preserves the memory of events and has an educational value, just like historiography.

The Romantic Tradition: Poetic Persona and Witness

Georgios Zalokostas was at the second siege of Messolonghi and he survived the sortie. In 1851 he took part in the Ralleios poetry competition, where his work *To Μεσολόγγιον* was awarded a prize. The prize-winning work, which is an excerpt from an unfinished composition, is divided into two parts (“Messolongion” and “Klissova”) and features Dimos, a fighter who takes part in the siege of Messolonghi and the battle of Klissova, as the protagonist. Dimos is a poetic persona of Zalokostas, who was then in the fourth decade of his life:

When I once spent my time on non-poetic pursuits,
Though I was already middle-aged
I now appear as a combatant.
For I am still young in soul, a story of greatness
I will attempt to sing.
Respectful goddess, the veil of the past is lifted
And from the sky, fiery
She bends her right hand to me
And I'll go to the treeless places of Kerasovo.¹⁹

Zalokostas attempts to narrate the past in artistic terms and become a national poet. He is the person who transforms experience into poetry with aesthetic claims, but above all he is the person who transforms the past into history through poetry. It is important to note, however, that Zalokostas exploits the Romantic poetic tradition to achieve his aim: on the one hand, the poetic modes (themes, motifs, language, style) of the poetry of his time and, on the other, a significant Romantic hero. Dimos is most probably drawn from Spyridon

¹⁷ Mikroulis, *Ιστορία της Δυτικής Χ: [έρσου] Ελλάδος*, 14.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁹ Georgios Zalokostas, *Το Μεσολόγγιον: Απόσπασμα ποιήματος* (Athens: Τυρ. Κ. Antoniadou, 1851), 5.

Trikoupis' *Ο Δήμος*, a work whose action is set in Messolonghi.²⁰ Zalokostas attempts to narrate an experienced past and thus to contribute to an imaginary national historiography, since most of his original poetic production is patriotic and draws on recent history and the Greek Revolution.²¹

A Comprehensive Narrative: Oral History

In 1876, the multi-talented Antonios Antoniadis, then a headmaster in Piraeus, published *Μεσολογγιάς*, a work commemorating the 50th anniversary of the sortie. Antoniadis chooses to subtitle his work with a literary term in order to identify it: "historical epic". Indeed, *Μεσολογγιάς* is an epic, insofar as it is organised in 24 rhapsodies, and it is historical in nature, insofar as it concerns the recent historical past. On a second level of reading, Antoniadis constructs a war epic, since, on the one hand, it represents war events and, on the other, the title and the organisation of the material into rhapsodies emphatically recalls the *Iliad* – Antoniadis as another Homeric poet writes an alternative *Iliad* of modern Greece. But there is a third level of reading: *Μεσολογγιάς* is an epic in the sense of a celebration of the heroic deeds of the Greeks, and indeed a historical epic since it is based on historical material.

Antoniadis did not live through the events of Messolonghi, like Michos and Mikroulis; on the contrary, he was nurtured with an national romantic patriotic discourse. But the particular significance of *Μεσολογγιάς* lies in the method Antoniadis chose to write his work:

Old men here [Messolonghi], having just survived the rough skin from the time, tell with justifiable pride, how the Messolonghi artillerymen destroyed the barbarians with bombs ...; how Makris' oxen did not contain a single bomb in the barbarians' flesh ... Women with white hair, under the sorrows of the past, barely able to hold back their wails and tears, pointing to the salty grasses of the earth, with which they fed their children ...; they lead the traveller to the places where the dry blood has not even been able to be wiped from the earth by the rains.

Wishing to transmit these oral traditions to our nation, at a time when material life is overwhelming our young society, I composed *Μεσολογγιάς*.²²

Antoniadis composes a narrative oral history in verse based on the testimonies of those who survived the sortie and after an examination of the location of

²⁰ See Spyridon Trikoupis, *Ο Δήμος* (Paris: Didot, 1821).

²¹ For Zalokostas' poetry and 1821, see Stavropoulou, *Η νεοελληνική ποίηση και το Εικοσιένα*.

²² Antonios Antoniadis, *Μεσολογγιάς: Έπος ιστορικών* (Athens: Τυρ. Κ. Antoniadou, 1876), θ'.

Messolonghi. His informants are elderly men and women. For Antoniadis, the written account of oral history is of interest; this history reflects a living truth, which is national truth and has an educational character. Fifty years after the sortie, the poet believes the nation is in moral decline and his aim is now twofold: to record history and also to stimulate the national spirit. It does not matter if Antoniadis exaggerates, if he presents the events in an inflated way and if plausibility is often abolished in order to emphasise heroism – all this can be justified by his educational purpose, but in parallel by the fact that he does not speak himself – the poet is a mediator between the past and the present, a historian who takes the evidence and transforms it poetically into a narrative.

Future Perspectives

The alternative narratives about Messolonghi presented above do not exhaust the subject, but they do problematise the relationship between poetry and history from the revolution until 1880. As has become clear, there is a confluence of these two kinds of discourse, and poetry does not propose a different truth about Messolonghi, but mainly a methodological multiplicity. Of course, the question remains pending until much of the poetic production is examined in the light of the lens suggested above.

If we accept that even the memoirs of the combatants sometimes present an alternative methodology to historiography, such as, for example, Michos' diary narrative, then we can also see that historiography in this period is governed by multiple tropes. The cases of Mikroulis, Zalokostas and Antoniadis are typical, as all of them compose narrative poems with the purpose of narrating the events concerning Messolonghi and clearly saying that they are writing historiography.

It goes without saying that the site of Messolonghi has been transformed through multiple processes into a site of memory, as Pierre Nora put it. It is also known that through multiple processes the events of Messolonghi were incorporated into a national mythology in order to constitute the imaginary of the newly formed state of that time. If we try to approach Messolonghi through a chronotopic approach, we will realise that the Messolonghi of poetry coincides to a large extent with the Messolonghi of historiography and of the memoirs: the same space and time or, better, the space and time of poetry show great similarities (and probably many times are the same) with historical space and time.

Poets and historians proclaim that what they tell is true, that it really happened and that this is the real truth about Messolonghi. Their discourse constitutes,

creates and produces the chronotope of Messolonghi, the Messolonghi of the subjects of that time, that is, both a monumentalised and a mythologised Messolonghi – but above all a Messolonghi still inhabited and real, which is governed by historicity. Poets and historiographers try in various ways to narrate this historicity.

If, therefore, we were to construct an “intellectual map” of Messolonghi, as White urged, we would include the narratives that constitute it as a chronotope: the historiographical works, the memoirs, literature, etc. In this way we would be able to see that what is understood as Messolonghi by 19th-century subjects is made up of discourses of various kinds and has a dynamic: it is constituted and continually reconstituted.

This article has sought to offer guidelines for the creation of the “intellectual map” of Messolonghi, focusing on the area and the major event of the sortie. How could we extend this process by constructing such maps? How could the creation of an “atlas”, that is, the assembly of many similar such maps, change our perception of the past with regard to space? The digital application Atlas 1821 provides an interesting perspective and sets the basis for this kind of a project.

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Institute of Historical Research / National Hellenic Research Foundation

APPENDIX

MESSOLONGHI: POETIC MATERIAL FOR AN INTELLECTUAL MAP
(1821–1880)

[Anonymous], “Άσμα της περιφήμου συμμαχίας των ενδόξων Αλβανών μετά των ηρώων Ελλήνων της Ηπείρου,” *Εφημερίς Αιτωλική* (Messolonghi), 10 September 1821. Republished in Ekaterini Koumariou, *Ο τύπος στον Αγώνα* (Athens: Estia, 1971), 1:21–22.

Spyridon Trikoupis, *Ο Δήμος* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1821). Reviewed in *Γενική Εφημερίς της Ελλάδος*, no. 9, 4 November 1825, 35–36.

1822

[Anonymous], [MS collection of Freiherr Albert von Sack: *Neugriechische Lieder aus Athen, Kypros, Zakgethos e.t.c.*, 1822], 87: 13. Published as Ioanna Mavrogeorgi, *Neugriechische Lieder: Gesammelt vom Grafen Sack* (Berlin: Romiosyni, 2006). Cf. Socratis Kougeas, “Η προς τους Έλληνας και τα δημοτικά τραγούδια των Ελλήνων αγάπη του Niebuhr,” *Ελληνικά* 12 (1952–1953): 277–88; Spyridon Trikoupis, “Η Λίμνη του Μεσολογγίου,” *Εστία* 1 (1876): 368.

1824

[Anonymous], “Θούριον άσμα,” *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* (Messolonghi), 12 March 1824, 6. Cf. MS. 255 (630), Romanian Academy; Glykeria Protopapa-Bouboulidou. “Χειρόγραφοι συλλογαί ποιητικών κειμένων ΙΗ΄ και ΙΘ΄ αιώνας,” *Δωδώνη* 2 (1973): 342–43.

[Stassinos Mikroulis], *Ιστορία της Δυτικής Χ:[έρσου]* Ελλάδας (Messolonghi: Typ. Dimitriou Mestheneos, 1824), 3–13 (“Η εκστρατεία του Ομέρ Πασά και του Ρουσίτ Πασά εναντίον της Δυτικής Χέρσου Ελλάδας”); 14–23 (“Η εκστρατεία του Σκόνδρα Πασά εναντίον της ίδιας επαρχίας”). Republished by Istoriki kai Ethnologiki Etereia (Athens, 1971). Cf. Olivier Voutier, *Lettres sur la Grèce* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 50; Ioannis K. Mazarakis-Ainian, “Τα ελληνικά τυπογραφεία του Αγώνος (1821–1827),” *Νέα Εστία* 88, no. 1043 (1970): 284.

Iakovos Rizos [Rangavis], “Αίνιγμα,” *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* (Messolonghi), 5 November 1824.

Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, “Ωδή εις τους Έλληνας,” *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* (Messolonghi), 17 September–1 November 1824 [unfinished].

[Angeliki Palli], “Ὀδὴ,” *Ἑλληνικά Χρονικά* (Messolonghi), 17–20 December 1824. Ioannis Mais, [manuscript verses]. Published in Dinos Konomos, “Ἀνέκδοτα στιχουργήματα του Ἰωάννη Μάη για το Μεσολόγγι (1824),” *Ἑπτανησιακά φύλλα* 13, no. 2 (1986): 38–49.

1825

Dionysios Solomos, *Ἕμνος εις την ελευθερίαν* (Messolonghi: Τυρ. Dimitriou Mestheneos, 1825).

F.C.H.L. Pouqueville, *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce: Comprenant le précis des évènements depuis 1740 jusqu'en 1824*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Firmin Didot père et fils, 1825), vol. 4, 129–30 (note) [translation of Markos Botsaris' rhyme and a song about Messolonghi by Olivier Voutier, *Lettres sur la Grèce* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 262–64, 220–24].

1826

Olivier Voutier, *Lettres sur la Grèce* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 206–24 (4. “Τραγούδι ηρωικόν του Μισολογγίου”, 5. “Τραγούδι του Ανατολικού” [=Arnold Passow, ed., *Τραγούδια Ρωμαϊκά: Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860), 253], 7. “Τραγούδι του Μισολογγίου εις ἄχρον ηρωικόν” [=Emile Legrand, ed., *Recueil des chansons populaires grecques* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1874), 128–35].

P.M.L. Joss, *Παραδείγματα ρωμαϊκῆς ποιήσεως: Specimens of Romantic Lyric Poetry* (London: Glynn, 1826), 36–57: “Ὁ Δῆμος, ποίημα κλέφτικον Σπυρίδωνος Τρικούπη”.

[Dimitrios Pavlou?], [two verses in text], *Ἐφημερίς των Ἀθηνών*, 27 March 1826, 129: “Το Μισολόγγι τό ’σωσαν τα στήθη τα δικά σας / του Μπότσαρη η φρόνησις και η ομόνοιά του”. Cf. Alexandre Soutzo, *Histoire de la révolution grecque* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1829), 436–37 (note).

Panagiotis Soutsos, “Τραγούδιον εις την πτώσιν του Μεσολογγίου,” *Γενική Ἐφημερίς της Ελλάδος*, 9 June 1826, 255–56. Republished in Ekaterini Koumarianou, *Ὁ Τύπος στον Αγώνα* (Athens: Estia, 1971), 3:276–81.

Dimitrios Ainian, “Ὀδὴ εις το Μεσολόγγι,” *Γενική Ἐφημερίς της Ελλάδος*, 10 April 1826, 211–12. Republished in Amvrosios Frantzis, *Ἐπιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος, αρχομένη από του 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835*, vol. 1 (Athens: Τυρ. Konst. Kastorchi, 1839) 426–29; Ekaterini Koumarianou, *Ὁ Τύπος στον Αγώνα* (Athens: Estia, 1971), 3:254–56.

Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, *Ανέκδοτα Ποιήματα*, ed. Marquis de Queux de Saint-Hilaire (Paris: Chamerot, 1876), 17–23 (“Ωδή εις Μεσολόγγιον”). According to the Introduction (5) these poems were written around 1826.

Amvrosios Frantzis, *Επιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος, αρχομένη από του 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835*, vol. 1 (Athens: Typ. Konst. Kastorchi, 1839), 424–26 ([Anonymous], “Ύμνος Μεσολογγίου, τον οποίον έψαλλον οι απλοί Έλληνες μετά την πτώσιν αυτού”), 426–29 (Dimitrios Ainian, “Ετερον άσμα Μεσολογγίου”). Republished as Dimitrios Ainian, “Ωδή εις το Μεσολόγγι,” *Γενική Εφημερίς της Ελλάδος*, 10 April 1826, 211–12.

Angeliki Palli, “Τη Μισολόγγη: Ωδή.” Published in Varvara Theodoropoulou-Livada, *Αγγελική Πάλλη Βαρθολομαίη και το έργο της* (Athens: Vakalopoulos, 1939) 44–47.

[Dimitrios Pelekassis], “Ο Τσαμαδός.” Published in Edgar Quinet, *De la Grèce moderne et de ses rapports avec l'antiquité* (Paris: Levrault, 1830), 443 [as folk song; cf. 138–43]. Republished in Arnold Passow, ed., *Τραγούδια Ρωμαίικα: Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860), 256; Ζακύνθιος Ανθών 24 (1877): 404; Dinos Konomos, “Ανέκδοτα κείμενα φίλων και γνωστών του Σολωμού,” *Επτανησιακά Φύλλα* 5 (December 1957): 113–14.

[Iakovos Rizos Rangavis], “Αι παρθένοι του Μισολογγίου.” Published in Glykeria Protopapa-Bouboulidou, “Χειρόγραφοι συλλογαί ποιητικών κειμένων ΙΗ΄ και ΙΘ΄ αιώνας,” *Δωδώνη* 2 (1973): 341–42. Cf. Iakovos Rizos Rangavis, *Ποιήματα*, vol. 2 (Athens: Koromilas, 1836), 251–52.

1827

Karl Theodor Kind, *Neugriechische Volkslieder im Originale und mit deutscher Uebersetzung, nebst Sach und Worterklaerungen / Τραγώδια των νεωτέρων Ελλήνων* (Grimma: Beyer, 1827), 28–30 (XII. “Τραγώδιον του Ανατολικού” [=Arnold Passow, ed., *Τραγούδια Ρωμαίικα: Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860), 253; Olivier Voutier, *Lettres sur la Grèce* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 212–14]).

1828

Georgios Serouios, *Τη σεπτή σκιά του μεγαλωνύμου και μεγαλοδόξου Μεσολογγίου* (Aegina: Ethniki Typografia, 1828), 1–20 (“Ωδή εις το Μεσολόγγιον”), 21 (“Ελεγεία”), 22–38 (“Ωδή εις την Μεσολογγίου φρουράν”).

1829

Alexandre Soutzo, *Histoire de la révolution grecque* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1829), 262–64 [song for Messolonghi; cf. Olivier Voutier, *Lettres sur la Grèce* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1826), 220–24], 436–37 [two verses about Messolonghi; cf. *Εφημερίς των Αθηνών*, 27 March 1826, 129].

1833

Dimitrios Drossos, *Πρόδρομος των ποιητικών πονημάτων* (Livorno: Sardi, 1833), 43–47 (“Εις το Μισσολόγγιον ωδή”).

Loudovikos [Ludwig I of Bavaria], *Ποιήματα περί Ελλάδος*, trans. A.R. Rangavis (Nafplio: Vassiliki Typografia, 1833), 34 (“Μεσολόγγι (μετ’ αποκρουσθείσαν έφοδον)”), 41 (“Όταν απεδείχθη ψευδής η άλωσις του Μεσολογγίου”), 42 (“Επιφώνημα εις το Μεσολόγγι”), 43 (“Εις του Μεσολογγίου την δευτέραν άλωσιν από τους Έλληνας”).

1834

Ilias Christofidis, ed., *Στίχοι ηρωικοί και ερωτικοί διά την ανθούσαν νεολαίαν της Ελλάδος* (Aegina: Typ. Koromila, 1834) 54–55 (“Του Μεσολογγίου”).

1835

Konstantinos Tobras and Konstantinos Ioannidis, eds., *Άσματα διαφόρων ποιητών* (Nafplio: Typ. Tobra kai Ioannidi, 1835) 47–49 (“Άσμα Μεσολογγίου εις ήχον ηρωικόν”).

Andreas Koromilas, ed., *Ανθολογία ή συλλογή ασμάτων ηρωϊκών και ερωτικόν* (Athens: Typ. Koromila, 1835), 42 (“Αντίστασις του Μεσολογγίου κατά των Τούρκων και υπεράπισις αυτού”).

1836

Iakovos Rizos Rangavis, *Ποιήματα*, vol. 2 (Athens: Typ. Koromila, 1836), 251–52 (“Αι αιχμαλωτισθείσαι νεάνιδες του Μεσολογγίου”).

1837

Konstantinos Tobras and Konstantinos Ioannidis, eds., *Άσματα διαφόρων ποιητών* (Nafplio: Typ. Tobra kai Ioannidi, 1837), 73–75 (“Άσμα Μεσολογγίου εις ήχον ηρωικόν”).

1838

Nikolaos Pikkolos, *Φιλομούσου πάρεργα* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1838), 212–19 ([Byron], “January 22d. 1824. Messolonghi. On this day I complete my thirty-sixth year” / “22 Ιανουαρίου 1824, Μεσολόγγι. Σήμερα απογεμίζω τον τριακοστόν έκτον χρόνον της ηλικίας μου.”). Translation of Lord Byron’s poem, written at Messolonghi.

Ilias Christofidis, ed. *Σίχοι ηρωικοί και ερωτικοί διά την ανθούσαν νεολαίαν της Ελλάδος* (Athens: B. Ritz, 1838) 54–55 (“Του Μεσολογγίου”). Cf. the lost edition, maybe with the same poem, Ilias Christofidis, ed., *Ωδαί ηρωικά και ερωτικά διά την νεολαίαν της Ελλάδος* (Piraeus: Typ. Christofidou, 1838).

1839

Amvrosios Frantzis, *Επιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος, αρχομένη από του 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835*, vol. 1 (Athens: Typ. Konst. Kastorchi, 1839), 424–26 ([Anonymous], “Ύμνος Μεσολογγίου, τον οποίον έψαλλον οι απλοί Έλληνες μετά την πτώσιν αυτού”), 426–29 (Dimitrios Ainian, “Έτερον άσμα Μεσολογγίου”), 457–59 ([Anonymous], “Άσμα ψαλλόμενον μετά την πολιορκίαν του Νεοκάστρου”).

1840

Konstantinos Levidis, ed., *Τα Ελληνικά Χρονικά εφημερίς πολιτική εκδοθείσα εν Μεσολογγίω υπό του Δ.Ι. Μάγερ* (Athens: Vassiliko Lithografio, 1840). Reprint of the journal *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* and poems 1824–1826 that are introduced in this Appendix.

1841

Konstantinos Chantzeris, ed., *Ελληνικός Νέος Παρνασσός ή απάνθισμα των εκλεκτοτέρων ποιήσεων της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος* (Athens: Typ. Gargola, 1841), 74–76 ([Dionysios Solomos], “Η πολιορκία του Μεσολογγίου κατά την παραμονήν των Χριστουγέννων του 1822 ή Η θρησκεία ασπαζόμενη την ελευθερίαν”).

1842

Nikolaos Saltelis, *Ο Κυδωνιάτης* (Athens [=Smyrna]: [Graffitis], 1842), 113–21 (“Άσμα Δ’, Μέρος Α’, Πάθη”). This part narrates the events of Messolonghi, among others.

Zois Panou, *Ποιήσεις διάφοροι* (Athens: X.A. [=Christos Anastasiou], 1842), 109–10 (“Μεσολόγγι”).

1843

Λ., “Βύρωνος Ωδή. Γραφείσα εν Μεσολλογίω την 10 Ιαν. 1824”, *Μνημοσύνη* 1 (1843): 11–13. Cf. Pikkolos, *Φιλομούσου πάρεργα*, 212–19.

1845

Anastasios Giannopoulos, *Τα τρόπαια του Θεοδώρου Γρίβα* (Athens: Rallis, 1845), 51–58 (“Η Μεσολογγιάς”).

1847

[Georgios Tertsetis], *Απλή Γλώσσα: Συλλογή ποιημάτων και διηγήσεων* (Athens: Τυρ. Nikolaidou Filadelfeos, 1847), 28–31 (“Ο Ιμπραϊμης και ο Κιουταχής”).

1850

Efrosyni Samartzidou, “Η Μεσολογγίτις παρθένος επί λόφου, θεωρούσα την ωραϊάν Επτάνησον,” *Πατρίς* (Corfu), 24 May 1850, 327. Cf. Georgios Zoras, “Ύμνος εις την Επτάνησον και τον Σολωμόν,” *Επτανησιακά μελετήματα*, vol. 2 (Athens: Spoudastirion Vyzantinis ke Neoellinikis Filologias tou Panepistimiou Athinon, 1959), 191–92.

1851

Georgios Zalokostas, *Το Μεσολόγγιον: Απόσπασμα ποιήματος* (Athens: Τυρ. K. Antoniadou, 1851).

1852

Spyridon Zambelios, *Άσματα δημοτικά της Ελλάδος εκδοθέντα μετά μελέτης ιστορικής περί Μεσαιωνικού Ελληνισμού* (Corfu: Ermis, 1852), 613 (22. “Η έξοδος του Μεσολογγίου” [=Arnold Passow, ed., *Τραγούδια Ρωμαίικα: Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860), 258]), 629 (40. “Έτερον του αυτού” [=Passow, *Τραγούδια Ρωμαίικα*, 5]), 628 (107. “Θάνατος καπετάν Γληγόρη Λιακατά” [=Passow, *Τραγούδια Ρωμαίικα*, 261]).

1853

Anastasios Giannopoulos, *Ανατολικόν πνεύμα εις δύο* (Patras: Τυρ. Georgiadiou, 1853), 62–70 (“Τα εν Μεσολογγίω άταφα σπλάχνα του λόρδου Βύρωνος”).

Emmanouil Stamatakis, ed., *Η Τερψιχόρη ή απάνθισμα ασμάτων κλεπτικών, ηρωικών, ερωτικών, δυστίχων και οθωμανικών* (Athens: Angelidis, 1853) 45–50 (“Άσμα Μεσολογγίου Εις ήχον ηρωικών”).

1854

Theodoros Orfanidis, *Αποσπάσματα εκ του ποιήματος Ο Άπατρις* (Athens: Τυρ. Μανρωματί, 1854), 21 (XXIV).

1859

Georgios Zalokostas, *Τὰ άπαντα* (Athens: Τυρ. Μανρωματί, 1859) 35–63 (“Το Μεσολόγγιον (απόσπασμα)”), 301–5 (“Τοις εχθροίς της Ελλάδος, κατά την πτώσιν του Μεσολογγίου (μετάφρασις)”).

Spyridon Melissinos, *Η πτώσις του Βυζαντίου. Είς στεναγμός του Μεσολογγίου: Η Ενσάρκωσις του Σωτήρος. Τρία αποσπάσματα έκ τινος ανεκδότου ποιήματος επιγραφομένου Ελλάς και Ορθοδοξία* (Corfu: Τυρ. Ιονία, 1859).

Athanasios Iatridis, ed., *Συλλογή δημοτικών ασμάτων παλαιών και νέων* (Athens: Τυρ. Μανρωματί, 1859) 44 (“Ληστές και Μεσολογγίτισσες”), 94 (“Κιουταχής στο Μεσολόγγι”).

1861

Emmanouil Georgiou, ed., *Αφροδίτη η φιλομειδής, ήτοι συλλογή ασμάτων διστίχων, χορού και άλλων διαφόρων* (Athens: Τυρ. Mellon tis Patrídos, 1861) 127 (“Το Μισολόγγι”), 128 (“Εξοδος Μισολογγίου”).

Panagiotis Synodinos, *Εθνεγερτήρια σαλπίσματα: Συλλογή πέμπτη* (Patras: Τυρ. E.P. Christodoulou, 1861), 26–30 (“Το 1854”).

Antonousa Kampourovoula, *Λάμπρω: Τραγωδία εις πράξεις πέντε* (Messolonghi: Ellinika Chronika, 1861). Republished as Antonousa Kampourovoula, *Λάμπρω: Τραγωδία εις πράξεις πέντε*, ed. Konstantinos Fournarakis (Chania: Erisma, 2013).

1866

Spyridon Trikoupis, “Η Λίμνη του Μεσολογγίου,” *Πανδώρα* 17 (1866–1867): 135.

Sofoklis Karidis, *Έμμετρα και πεζά εις βιβλία δέκα. Βιβλίον πρώτον. Περίοδος πρώτη* (Athens: Τυρ. Fos, 1866), 19–24 (Δ'. “Τα θύματα”).

1868

P** [=Ioannis Raptarchis, ed.], *Παρνασσός ή Απάνθισμα των εκλεκτότερων τεμαχίων της νέας ελληνικής ποιήσεως* (Athens: Typ. Radamanthoyos, 1868), 190–93 ([Georgios Zalokostas], “Εκ του ‘Μεσολογγίου’”), 549–52 ([Sofoklis Karidis], “Τα θύματα”).

1870

[Evanthia Kairi], *Άλωσις Μεσολογγίου: Δράμα εις πράξεις τρεις*, ed. E.I.K. [=Elpida I. Kyriakou] (Galați: Fimi, 1870). Kyriakou’s edition of Kairis’ *Νικήρατος* (1826).

1873

Georgios Zalokostas, *Τα άπαντα*, ed. Evgenios Zalokostas, (Athens: Typ. Adelfon Perri, 1873), 47–82 (“Το Μεσολόγγιον (αποσπάσματα)”), 383–88 (“Τοις εχθροίς της Ελλάδος, κατά την πτώσιν του Μεσολογγίου (Εκ των του Φραγκίσκου Δραγομάνου)”).

1874

Emile Legrand, ed., *Recueil des chansons populaires grecques*, 126–34 (70. “Η πολιορκία του Μεσολογγίου”).

1875

Antonousa Kampouraki, *Η έξοδος του Μεσολογγίου: Τραγωδία εις πράξεις πέντε* (Athens: Typ. Vlastou, 1875).

1876

Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, *Ανέκδοτα Ποιημάτια*, ed. Marquis de Queux de Saint-Hilaire (Paris: Chamerot, 1876), 17–23 (“Ωδή εις Μεσολόγγιον”).

Sofoklis Karidis, *Λυρικά ποιήματα: Όνυχες* (Athens: s.n., 1876) 13–17 (Δ’. “Τα θύματα”).

Antonios Antoniadis, *Μεσολογγιάς, έπος ιστορικόν* (Athens: Typ. K. Antoniadou, 1876).

Filologikos Syllogos Elliniki Palingenesia, *Τα κατά την επέτιον εορτήν του πέμπτου έτους της Εικοστής Πέμπτης Μαρτίου 1876* (Athens: Typ.

Adelfon Varvarrigou, 1876) 13–20 (Emmanouil Stratoudakis, “Μεσολόγγι. Επικολυρικών ποίημα”).

Spyridon Trikoupis, “Η λίμνη του Μεσολογγίου,” *Εστία* 1 (1876): 368.

1878

Konstantinos Palamas, *Μεσολόγγι* (Messolonghi: Ditiki Ellas, 1878).

1880

Panagiotis Matarangas, ed., *Παρνασσός ήτοι απάνθισμα των εκλεκτοτερων ποιημάτων της Νεωτέρας Ελλάδος* (Athens: Τυρ. Ν. Roussopoulou, 1880), 213–18 (Georgios Zalokostas, “Εκ του Μεσολογγίου”), 219–25 (Georgios Zalokostas, “Κλείσοβα”), 360–61 (Spyridon Trikoupis, “Η λίμνη του Μεσολογγίου”), 719–22 (Sofoklis Karidis, “Τα θύματα”).

Ioannis Kordoroumpas, *Ο θρήνος και οδυρμός της εξόδου του Μεσολογγίου* (Messolonghi: Τυρ. Gourgourini, 1880).

Undated

[before 1822] Spyridon Trikoupis, “Η λίμνη του Μεσολογγίου.” Published in Tertsetis, *Απλή Γλώσσα: Συλλογή ποιημάτων και διηγήσεων* (Athens: Τυρ. Nikolaidou Filadelfeos, 1847), 32–35; *Πανδώρα* 17 (1866–1867): 135; *Εστία* 1 (1876): 368; Matarangas, *Παρνασσός ήτοι απάνθισμα των εκλεκτοτερων ποιημάτων της Νεωτέρας Ελλάδος* (Athens: Τυρ. Ν. Roussopoulou, 1880), 360–61.

[±1830–1850?] Georgios Lassanis, “Εις το Μεσολόγγι,” *Τα άπαντα Γεωργίου Λασσάνη*, ed. Grigorios Geroukis, vol. 1 (Kozani: Τυρ. Voreiou Ellados, [1952]), 23–47.

Articles

FROM THE GREEK MEDICAL MANUSCRIPTS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO THE PHARMACOPOEIA I OF THE GREEK STATE: PHARMACY AND POLITICAL CHANGE IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Athanasios Barlagiannis, Penelope Seriatou and Vaso Seirinidou

ABSTRACT: The article studies the transition from the medical manuscripts that circulated as a means of knowledge preservation and professional regulation in the early modern Greek world to the first edited pharmacopoeia of the Greek state in 1837. The transition is examined in parallel to the changes in the political, scientific and professional domains attested in southeastern Europe from the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth centuries. After an overview of the Greek state's legal interventions in the pharmaceutical trade, in the context of which the pharmacopoeia was promulgated, and of the efforts to translate the pharmaceutical terms by court physicians and pharmacists, the article compares the *materia medica* of the *Ελληνική Φαρμακοποιία* (Greek Pharmacopoeia) with that of two medical manuscripts that circulated in the period before the formation of the Greek state. By studying the process of incorporation and/or exclusion of pharmaceutical ingredients during the establishment of a new legal culture and of a more formal way of regulating pharmacy in the southeastern Balkans, the article discusses important issues in the history of pharmacy, especially its relationship to politics, ideology and professional rivalries.

The habit of listing substances with therapeutic value (*materia medica*) dates back to ancient times.¹ Specialists of therapy, and also lay people at times, wrote down what seemed to them to be useful for many, if not all, types of ailments.

* This research is co-financed by Greece and the European Union (European Social Fund-ESF) through the Operational Program "Human Resources Development, Education and Lifelong Learning, 2014–2020" in the context of the project "From the medical manuscripts of the 18th century to the first Greek Pharmacopoeia (1837). Aspects of the politics of pharmacy in King Otto's Greece" (MIS 5047975). Research team: Vaso Seirinidou (scientist responsible for the project), Athanasios Barlagiannis (postdoctoral researcher) and Penelope Seriatou (PhD candidate).



Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση
Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο

Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα
Ανάπτυξη Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού,
Εκπαίδευση και Διά Βίου Μάθηση

Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ελλάδας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης



ανάπτυξη - εργασία - αλληλεγγύη

¹ The Egyptian papyrus Ebers, containing one of the most ancient texts with medical recipes, dates to 1600 BC. Erwin H. Ackerknecht, *Ιστορία της Ιατρικής*, trans. Vasilis Paschalis, Giorgos Iliadis, Vasilis Karatzoulis (Athens: Marathia, 1998), 53.

These medical manuscripts were copied through the centuries, creating a certain corpus of drugs and substances that were identified as safe and efficacious: plants, plant parts, metals, stones, minerals, animal parts, extracts or excreta from organisms and chemical substances. This consensus over the *materia medica*, even though their natural origins explain why some substances are used in one place and are absent in another, owes much to the work of the first-century AD Greek healer Dioscorides.² Thanks to his career as a military doctor in the Roman legions and to previous works like Crateus' *Rhizotomicon* (first century BC),³ he was able to register, categorise and classify over 600 medicinal plants. His *Περί ύλης ιατρικής* (*De materia medica*) was perhaps the most influential pharmaceutical text in Europe until about 1500, while in the Ottoman Empire it continued to exert a steady influence even beyond that.⁴

The Greek medical manuscripts of the Ottoman era that were circulating within the empire and were written in modern Greek (with differences in language owing to the needs and origins of the authors)⁵ vary in size, quality and content, ranging from simple notebooks to specialised treatises. Besides medicines, recipes and medicinal ingredients, they could contain information about diseases and their treatment, dietary rules as well as information about the human body and the functions of its organs.⁶ Even though some of them could also contain practical information, like cooking recipes, in order to offer

² Paula De Vos, "European Materia Medica in Historical Texts: Longevity of a Tradition and Implications for Future Use," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 132, no. 1 (2010): 28–47.

³ Jerry Stannard, "The Herbal as a Medical Document," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 43, no. 3 (1969): 213–14.

⁴ Efthalia Tsagkala, "Οι επιβιώσεις του Διοσκουρίδη στα δημοσιευμένα χειρόγραφα γιατροσόφια της Ηπείρου. Συμβολή στην έρευνα της Ιστορίας της ιατρικής και της λαϊκής ιατρικής" (PhD diss., University of Ioannina, 2007).

⁵ Nikolaos E. Papadogiannakis, *Κρητικό ιατροσόφιο του 19ου αιώνα* (Rethymno: Istoriki kai Laographiki Etaireia Rethymnis, 2001), 27; Tina Lendari and Io Manolessou, "The Language of *Iatrosophia*: A Case-study of Two Manuscripts of the Library at Wellcome Collection (MS.4103 and MS.MSL.14)," in *Exploring Greek Manuscripts in the Library at Wellcome Collection in London*, ed. Petros Bouras-Vallianatos (London: Routledge, 2020), 66–112. For a British example, see Emily Kesling, *Medical Texts in Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* (s.n.: Boydell and Brewer, 2020).

⁶ For a recent study on Greek medical manuscripts, Penelope Seriatou, "Από τα γιατροσόφια στα ιατρικά εγχειρίδια: Η διαδρομή προς την επιστημονική ιατρική γνώση και περίθαλψη στον ελληνικό χώρο κατά τον 18ο και 19ο αιώνα" (PhD diss., University of Athens, 2021). See also John Karas, "Η επιστημονική–φιλοσοφική σκέψη στον ελληνικό χώρο κατά την περίοδο της Τουρκοκρατίας: Η περίπτωση των φυσικών–θετικών επιστημών" (PhD diss., University of Ioannina, 1984), pt. 2.

all-round advice on the best way to manage a household (and meet its health needs), they constitute an important source for the history of medicine.⁷ They were handbooks that copied and combined texts from ancient Greek, Byzantine and Arab medical traditions,⁸ in an effort to preserve and further promote pharmaceutical and medical knowledge, especially its practical curative side. Sometimes they updated the therapeutic tradition, with the incorporation, for example, of quinaquina⁹ or of other recipes personally tested by the author.¹⁰ The medical manuscripts represent a centuries-long effort to register the best therapeutic substances for the diseases found in a specific geographical area according to the ideas of reciprocity between the human body and its environment.¹¹

The history of the medical literature and of its uses should take cognisance of and include an important factor underway since the fifteenth century: modern state formation. States had, at first, an economic interest in ensuring a flourishing pharmaceutical trade which was taken up by merchants, apothecaries and doctors (educated ones and empirics).¹² Later, as seventeenth-century

⁷ Henry E. Sigerist, "The Latin Medical Literature of the Early Middle Ages," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 12, no. 2 (1958): 127–46.

⁸ Agamemnon Tselikas, "Τα ελληνικά γιατροσόφια: Μια περιφρονημένη κατηγορία χειρογράφων," in *Ιατρικά βυζαντινά χειρόγραφα*, ed. Thanasis Diamantopoulos (Athens: Domos, 1995), 57–70; Alain Touwaide, "Byzantine Hospital Manuals (*Iatrosophia*) as a Source for the Study of Therapeutics," in *The Medieval Hospital and Medical Practice*, ed. Barbara S. Bowers (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 147–73; Touwaide, "Arabic into Greek: The Rise of an International Lexicon of Medicine in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean?," in *Vehicles of Transmission, Translation, and Transformation in Medieval Textual Culture*, ed. Robert Wisnovsky, Faith Wallis, Jamie Fumo and Carlos Fraenkel (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 196.

⁹ Feza Guneroglu and Seref Etker, "From Quinaquina to 'Quinine Law': A Bitter Chapter in the Westernization of Turkish Medicine," *Osmanli Bilimi Arastirmalar* 14, no. 2 (2013): 41–68. These handbooks were also necessary possessions for merchants, who would want to discern the quality of their merchandise. See Ingeborg Swart, Mieke Beumer et al., "Bodies of Plant and Animal kingdom: An Illustrated Manuscript on *materia medica* in the Netherlands (ca. 1800)," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 237 (2019): 239–44.

¹⁰ Seriatou, "Από τα γιατροσόφια στα ιατρικάεγχειρίδια," 169–71.

¹¹ Christos Papadopoulos, "Post-Byzantine Medical Manuscripts: New Insights into the Greek Medical Tradition, its Intellectual and Practical Interconnections, and Our Understanding of Greek Culture," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 27 (2009): 107–30.

¹² For the work of apothecaries and the pharmacists that oscillated between profit and medical assistance, see Barbara Di Gennaro Splendore, "Craft, Money and Mercy: An Apothecary's Self-Portrait in Sixteenth-Century Bologna," *Annals of Science* 74, no. 2 (2017): 91–107; R. Schepers, "Pharmacists and Medical Doctors in Nineteenth-Century Belgium," *Sociology of Health and Illness* 10, no. 1 (1988): 68–90.

states were becoming more and more involved with their subjects' health interests,¹³ this merchandise became a central object for state regulation and an important incentive for institutional expansion. It was in this context that state pharmacopoeias, which should be considered as distinct from all other medical texts, appeared. A pharmacopoeia is the official list of drugs (simples, compounds and chemically prepared) in which the professionals, recognised as such by an authority, could search for a drug's qualities and active components as well as the ways of conservation and the measures and weights by which to apply it.¹⁴

The first official European pharmacopoeia was the *Ricettario Fiorentina*, published in 1498 in the Italian city of Florence.¹⁵ It was not a *materia medica* but a formulary, noting the officially recognised modes of drug preparation. What distinguished it then from other formularies so that it is considered as the first (modern) pharmacopoeia? Its publication was demanded and imposed by a recognised central authority. George Urdang identified the development of pharmacopoeias (and their iconography) with political changes and reforms worldwide.¹⁶ Pharmacopoeias were "adapted to the needs of a certain political unit" and were "a matter of national ambition, a part and a proof of national sovereignty and unity".¹⁷ As it will be shown next, the *Ελληνική Φαρμακοποιία* (*Greek Pharmacopoeia*) was in no way unaware of these developments.

There is a legalistic aspect behind the publication of a pharmacopoeia: "The development of obligatory pharmacopoeial standards" demand the "force of a legal authority".¹⁸ In the absence of such an authority, it was actually the Hippocratic oath, and hence "an idealistic code of ethical conduct", that constituted a defence against malpractice and drug adulteration.¹⁹ In other words, with the publication of a pharmacopoeia the very notions of patent medicines, illegitimate drugs, quackery and proprietary medicines become concretely and

¹³ Olivier Faure, *Histoire sociale de la médecine (XVIIe–XXe siècles)* (Paris: Anthropos, 1994), 33.

¹⁴ Mark J. Wiggins, and Joseph A. Albanese, "A Brief History of Pharmacopoeias: A Global Perspective," *BioPharm International eBook* (September 2019): 2.

¹⁵ James Shaw and Evelyn Welch, *Making and Marketing Medicines in Renaissance Florence* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), 43.

¹⁶ George Urdang, "Pharmacopoeias as Witnesses of World History," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 1, no. 1 (1946): 46–70.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 46–47.

¹⁸ R.G. Penn, "The State Control of Medicines: The First 3000 Years," *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 8, no. 4 (1979): 294.

¹⁹ E. Fullerton Cook, "History of the Pharmacopoeia," *Food, Drug, Cosmetic Law Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (1946): 518.

meaningfully constructed.²⁰ Moreover, a printed pharmacopoeia, whose content, under the threat of a punishment, could be copied out but not changed, as was the case with the medical manuscripts, created a space within which the law decided which drugs or components were legal and safe to use and which was illegal and harmful. The pharmacopoeia was a legal text, its publication was supported by the justice system which intervened, thus, in the pharmaceutical domain.

The article is the result of a collaborative research project into the political, economic, professional and scientific aspects of the history of pharmacology in southeastern Europe. The research focuses on the transition from the use of the medical manuscripts, as a means for medical knowledge circulation and drug regulation in the early modern Greek world in the Ottoman Empire, to the publication in 1837 of the first officially printed pharmacopoeia in the region. The transition was slow and took time mainly because the publication of the pharmacopoeia, being linked more to transformations in politics, economy and professional organisation than to advances in the scientific, that is, pharmacological, domain, was not readily accepted by all therapy professionals. As is shown in the first part of the article, the shift from handwritten to edited volumes on pharmacotherapeutics was largely related to the increasing need to formally organise the pharmacist profession, to establish its limits and boundaries and to promote a stricter way of scientific research.

This shift and its relevant legal and professional dynamics had important scientific consequences. In a period of transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek state, as the new state was constructing its identity and trying to distance itself from the past and to align more to western Europe and to its science, the court's pharmacists were asking themselves what writing a "Greek" pharmacopoeia would entail: did it have to imitate western European pharmaceutical standards? Was it to turn exclusively to ancient Greek medicine? Or was it to integrate substances used already by local physicians and pharmacists? The indications seem to suggest that the Greek administration and its physicians tried to satisfy all three options. At least, this deduction can be

²⁰ J. Worth Estes, "The Pharmacology of Nineteenth-Century Patent Medicines," *Pharmacy in History* 30, no. 1 (1988): 3–18; Alex Berman, "Conflict and Anomaly in the Scientific Orientation of French Pharmacy, 1800–1873," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 37, no. 5 (1963): 440–62 and, for a contemporary globalised perspective, Maurice Cassier, "Pharmaceutical Patent Law In-the-Making: Opposition and Legal Action by States, Citizens, and Generics Laboratories in Brazil and India," in *Ways of Regulating Drugs in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. Jean-Paul Gaudillière and Volker Hess (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 287–317.

derived from the comparison, made in the second part of the article, between the substances contained in two medical manuscripts of the Ottoman period written in Greek and those integrated into the Greek pharmacopoeia.²¹

By bringing together analytical methods from palaeography, the social history of medicine, the political history of southeastern Europe and the history of pharmacology, the article examines the multiple dynamics (scientific, political, economic, textual and professional) behind the publication of the *Greek Pharmacopoeia I*. These dynamics are described in terms of *discipline* and *standardisation*: the social and political discipline imposed by the Greek state's administration went hand in hand with professional organisation and scientific standardisation, that is, a discipline influencing the ways of proving, observing, curing, demonstrating, controlling, classifying and diffusing knowledge.²²

The Greek Pharmacopoeia I in a Period of Political Transition

When the Greek Kingdom was formed in 1832–1833, it was put under the rule of the Bavarian court of King Othon (1815–1867). His cameralist administrators, such as Georg Ludwig von Maurer (1790–1872), who was responsible for the educational matters of the new state, thought of their work as a rational intervention in societal and scientific issues guided by the unified action of the law. The body of law produced during Othon's reign (1833–1862) was enormous compared to subsequent years, as his court aspired to organise every aspect of social life in the Greek *Polizeistaat*, and, thus, to establish a medical police.²³

The former Ottoman regions under Othon's government lacked any formal organisation in their medical spheres. Even though there were concrete local

²¹ For an Indian example, see Nandini Bhattacharya, "From Materia Medica to the Pharmacopoeia: Challenges of Writing the History of Drugs in India," *History Compass* 14, no. 4 (2016): 131–39.

²² For the notion of discipline, see Max Weber, "The Meaning of Discipline," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 253–64. Very important are also the works of Norbert Elias, especially his *Περί χρόνου* (Athens: Eikostou Protou, 2004).

²³ For cameralism and the police, see Marc Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) and Keith Tribe, "Cameralism and the Science of Government," *Journal of Modern History* 56, no. 2 (1984): 263–84. For medical police, George Rosen, "Cameralism and the Concept of Medical Police," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 27 (1953): 21–42. For the Greek case, see Athanasios Barlagiannis, "Hygiène publique et construction de l'état grec, 1833–1845: La police sanitaire et l'ordre public de la santé" (PhD diss., École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 2017), which offers a comprehensive study of Greek

medical realities, that is, “social relations”, as Charles Rosenberg considers them,²⁴ with their own logic that shared conceptual frameworks and adhered to certain rules for preparing and dispensing medicines,²⁵ it is true that the Ottoman medical market, if there was one at all, was unregulated on the eve of the Greek state’s formation. “In Greece,” writes Maurer, “the idea of controlling physicians, midwives, pharmacists, etc., was a thing unknown. Everybody could exercise his/her profession in total liberty concerning the place and the manner ... That is the reason, it was of an utmost necessity to regulate all these matters.”²⁶ There is, of course, an ideological element in Maurer’s statement since he was trying to legitimise the new regime by arguing that the king was bringing reform, order and novelty. However, this clear-cut image of discontinuity with the past underlines a historical change in the Ottoman medical market at the end of the eighteenth century: the number of people who were prescribing medicines was growing, making the need for a formal distinction between legitimate and illegitimate medical practice more urgent than before.

The European eighteenth century saw an expansion of the medical market and of drug consumption as a result of European imperialism, of the intensification of trading exchanges, and of transformations in mental attitudes that were beginning to consider health as an important element for economic growth, security and happiness.²⁷ The Ottoman Empire was not divorced from these changes:²⁸ it was a time when its political structures, its administration and

public health legislation. Also Barlagiannis, *Η υγειονομική συγκρότηση του ελληνικού κράτους (1833–1845)* (Athens: Estia, 2018).

²⁴ Charles E. Rosenberg, “The Therapeutic Revolution: Medicine, Meaning, and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century America,” in *Explaining Epidemics and Other Studies in the History of Medicine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 9.

²⁵ Athanasios Barlagiannis, “Η ταυτότητα του επίσημου ιατρικού σώματος στην Ελλάδα του Όθωνα: Ανάμεσα στο ευρωπαϊκό επιστημονικό παράδειγμα και τις ντόπιες πολιτισμικές και πολιτικές πραγματικότητες,” in *Identities in the Greek World (from 1204 to Present Day)*, ed. Konstantinos A. Dimadis (Athens: European Society of Modern Greek Studies, 2011), 5:251–64.

²⁶ Georg Ludwig von Maurer, *Ο Ελληνικός Λαός: Δημόσιο, ιδιωτικό και εκκλησιαστικό δίκαιο από την έναρξη του Αγώνα για την ανεξαρτησία ως την 31η Ιουλίου 1834*, trans. Olga Rombaki (Athens: Tolidi, 1976), 2:495.

²⁷ Faure, *Histoire sociale de la médecine*, 33; Harold J. Cook and Timothy D. Walker, “Circulation of Medicine in the Early Modern Atlantic World,” *Social History of Medicine* 26, no. 3 (2013): 337–51; Benjamin Breen, “Drugs and Early Modernity,” *History Compass* 15, no. 4 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12376>.

²⁸ Daniel Panzac, *La peste dans l’Empire ottoman, 1700–1850* (Leuven: Peeters, 1985); Murphey Rhoads, “Ottoman Medicine and Tranculturalism from the Sixteenth

its economy were also undergoing significant transformations.²⁹ The empire's inhabitants were expressing an increasing interest in their health and, as a result, the number of healers and merchants looking to take advantage of this interest was increasing. The phenomenon of the *κομπογιαννίτες*, the seasonal travelling merchants who could go as far as Crete and Asia Minor, even India, to sell the natural products of their mountains, was in no way a fortuitous one. They had started to make their presence felt around 1670 when they found a way out of their poverty by supplying the growing medical market place of the Ottoman Empire and beyond.³⁰ Merchants, army men, physicians and sailors were traveling abroad more frequently and, progressively, the number of Greek subjects of the sultan studying in foreign medical faculties multiplied. Conversely, European subjects, like the infamous *καλογιατροί*, individuals who (purportedly) practiced medicine and pharmacy, found a profitable way of living in the Ottoman Empire. Their numbers were such that it was believed by the Christians of the empire that "anyone who was born or who has travelled to the West is a doctor or knows medicine".³¹

During this period of transformations, the number of medical manuscripts and of the printed texts (herbals, pharmacopoeias, formularies, *iatrosophia* and manuals) multiplied,³² after the first printed medical text in Greek appeared in

through the Eighteenth Century," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 66, no. 3 (1992): 376–403; G.A. Russell, "Physicians at the Ottoman Court," *Medical History* 34 (1990): 243–67, and Nuran Yıldırım, *A History of Healthcare in Istanbul* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2010). Specifically for the Greek Orthodox communities, Efi Kanner, *Φτώχεια και φιλανθρωπία στην Ορθόδοξη κοινότητα Κωνσταντινούπολης, 1753–1912* (Athens: Katarti, 2004).

²⁹ Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). For an analysis of the changes in health and medicine within the context of the transformations in the millet administration, see Athanasios Barlagiannis, *Ιατρική ιστορία της Επανάστασης του 1821: Οι απαρχές της συγκρότησης της ελληνικής δημόσιας υγείας, 1790–1831* (Athens: Hellenic Open University Press, 2022), chap. 1.

³⁰ Giorgos Avogianos and Christina Kyriakopoulou, "Οι κομπογιαννίτες και τα βότανα τους," Ηλιοχώρι (Ντομπρινοβο) Ζαγορίου website, 14 January 2009, <https://iliochori.wordpress.com/2009/01/14/647/>. Also Georgios Vavaretos, *Κομπογιαννίτες, Ματσουκάδες: Οι ξακουσμένοι αυτοδίδακτοι γιατροί απ' το Ζαγόρι της Ηπείρου* (Athens: Epirotiki Etairia Athinon, 1972).

³¹ Jean Bouros [Ioannis Vouros], "Quelques mots sur l'état actuel de la médecine en Grèce," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Médecine de Paris* 7 (1841–1842): 871.

³² According to our count, based on Yiannis Karas, *Οι επιστήμες στην Τουρκοκρατία: Χειρόγραφα και έντυπα*, vol. 3, *Οι επιστήμες της ζωής* (Athens: Estia, 1994). See also, Dimitrios Karaberopoulos, *Η ιατρική ευρωπαϊκή γνώση στον ελληνικό χώρο, 1745–1821* (Athens: Stamoulis, 2003).

1724.³³ Alain Touwaide has traced 160 of these manuscripts³⁴ while Agamemnon Tselikas thinks that more than 250 have survived.³⁵ The increase in the numbers demonstrates, on the one hand, their social necessity and, on the other, the power balance within a profession that was expanding, or that was just coming into being. The thriving trade in cures favoured not only physicians and other professionals of therapy but also the unscrupulous. The distinction between the two was difficult to detect and the flourishing medical literature tried to clarify matters while satisfying three more social and scientific requirements: the patient's need to help themselves in the absence of specialised care (self-medication); the transmission of knowledge within the profession; and the standardisation of pharmacy.

Pharmaceutical literature was then faced with a contradiction: on the one hand, writers, authors and copyists would want to create the standards of pharmacotherapy and to homogenise it, in order to protect patients from exploitation. On the other, since there was no formal or institutional demarcation line between legal and illegal practice, the medical manuals reflected the rivalry between all those aspiring to control the definition of illegality and the process of standardisation.³⁶ Monks, priests, physicians, medical empirics and cunning folk (and anyone else, for that matter) were producing texts that could not, however, deal with the problem of standardisation and homogenisation since the texts' quality was not controlled by any official institution. Since most texts were handwritten, it was particularly difficult to assure that their copies respected any procedure of knowledge transmission. Anyone could add anything to a text under Hippocrates' authority. As one manuscript stated:

We have written to you, Man, many interpretations and many drugs ... The reason is that if one [cure] isn't found, you should use

³³ Giorgos Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκίδων στη Βενετία (1670–1854): Συμβολή στη μελέτη του ελληνικού βιβλίου κατά την εποχή της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Athens: Bouras, 1987), 200, and Dimitrios Karamperopoulos, *Ιστορία της ιατρικής: Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία 1750–2000* (Athens: Stamoulis, 2009).

³⁴ Alain Touwaide, *Greek Medical Manuscripts – Diels' Catalogue*, vol. 2.1, *Diels Catalogue with Indices* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019).

³⁵ Agamemnon Tselikas, “Η συνάντηση Ανατολής και Δύσης στους νεοελληνικούς ιατροσοφικούς κώδικες,” *Θέματα Ελληνικής Παλαιογραφίας* 34 (2004): 556; Penelope Seriatou, “Μαντζούνια και αλοιφές: Συνταγές ίασης της λαϊκής ιατρικής σε ένα γιατροσόφι του 18ου αι.” (Master's thesis, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2013), 39–45.

³⁶ See Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 80.

the other one. And if you don't find that one, you use another ...
 And you, as a man, you can chose the one from the other and do the
 one that is more useful as you discern and act.³⁷

Readers of the medical literature were left to decide for themselves, since no one else could officially and formally assure them of a medicine's safety and efficacy.

Even though Ottoman society had already established informal ways to supervise pharmaceutical enterprises (through the family or the guild institution, traditional practices or educating its professionals in community schools), the multiplication of those offering a medicinal treatment created the need by the turn of the nineteenth century to intensify the practices to control them.³⁸ It was not by chance then that in 1818 the *Φαρμακοποιία Γενική* (*General Pharmacopoeia*) was published in Constantinople by the physician and archimandrite Dionysios Pyrros.³⁹ It was a scientific endeavour linked to the process of organising the Orthodox millet.⁴⁰ However, even if it seems that the patriarch was involved in its publication and that many "notables of the Morea" were among its subscribers, it is far from sure that the *General Pharmacopoeia* constituted the official pharmacopoeia of the Orthodox Church. Due to the administrative conditions of the period, any controlling effort by any formal institution could not be anything more than occasional. The question, thus, of who would be incorporated in the profession and who would be excluded remained; the Greek administration of the subsequent period tried hard to resolve it.

The efforts of the first two decades of the nineteenth century in fact paved the way for the Greek court's interventions after 1833. From a broader perspective, the Greek medical police neither updated nor reformed the Ottoman past, it

³⁷ Cited in Tselikas, "Τα ελληνικά γιατροσόφια," 67.

³⁸ Barlagiannis, *Ιατρική ιστορία της Επανάστασης του 1821*, 46–55.

³⁹ See Ioanna Stavrou and Eythimios Bokaris, "Το 'παζλ' Χυμικής/Χημείας – Φαρμακοποιίας/Φαρμακίας στις αρχές του 19ου αιώνα στις ελληνόφωνες περιοχές της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας," in *Τεχνολογία και Κοινωνία στην Ελλάδα: Μελέτες από την Ιστορία της Τεχνολογίας και τις Σπουδές Επιστήμης και Τεχνολογίας* (Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon, 2015), 55–80.

⁴⁰ The exact same process, if not more rapid and successful, had produced the Nomokanons, texts with a juridical content. Many manuscripts codifying ecclesiastical and family law, adapted to local customs and to local contexts, were circulating down to the eighteenth century, when the compilation of the Byzantine jurist Constantinos Armenopoulos was edited and imposed as the only juridical document to all Christians of the Ottoman Empire by a consolidated ecclesiastical power. See Socrate Petmézas, "L'organisation ecclésiastique sous les Ottomans," in *Conseils et mémoires de Synadinos, prêtre de Serrés en Macédoine (XVIIe siècle)*, ed. Paolo Odorico (Paris: Association Pierre Belon, 1996), 505.

was rather building on it, incorporating practices and actors, and multiplying or, more precisely, intensifying medical surveillance.

A police force is an organisation authorised by a collectivity to regulate social relations within itself by utilising, if need be, physical force. Therefore, when the word police is used it should be understood in terms of a practical function and not in terms of a given body of men.⁴¹

A *Polizeistaat* was not about changing things, nor dismantling local social life; its government was “manipulating, maintaining, distributing, and re-establishing relations of force”.⁴² In other words, King Othon’s medical police was more to do with past political and scientific efforts than its administrators would have acknowledged openly, even though novel institutions and practices were indeed introduced, like the *Pharmacopoeia I*.

The *Greek Pharmacopoeia I (Pharmacopoea Graeca iussu regio)* served

the need to bring to [Greece] some order to the kind and to the preparation of medicines, because, since there was no university in the Greek state, nor physicians and pharmacists returning from different European universities and schools to prescribe and prepare medicines according to the method they were taught; as a result ... there is obvious damage for the diseased and for physicians and pharmacists alike.⁴³

The search for order and policing in the medical marketplace brings to mind the notion of “sanitary security” (*sécurité sanitaire*), as analysed by Sophie Chauveau: “This notion describes the project for the control and the surveillance of pharmaceutical products in order not to damage public health, and the guarantee that this security will be employed is one of the main attributes of the medicament, even for the judicial domain.”⁴⁴ The *pharmacopoeia*, backed by the state’s force and judiciary system, guaranteed public health.

⁴¹ David H. Bayley, “The Police and Political Development in Europe,” in *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, ed. Charles Tilly (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 328.

⁴² Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population, Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*, trans. Graham Burchell (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 407.

⁴³ From the Introduction to the 1837 *Greek Pharmacopoeia*.

⁴⁴ Sophie Chauveau, “Genèse de la ‘sécurité sanitaire’: Les produits pharmaceutiques en France au XIXe et XXe siècles,” *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 51, no. 2 (2004): 91.

Furthermore, the pharmacopoeia reinforced an important element in the circulation of pharmaceutical knowledge: the printed volume. The printing press had a special impact on knowledge production and circulation. A printed book represents a “closed” or a definite world whose content cannot be easily renegotiated.⁴⁵ Even if readers were using it as if it were a manuscript, making notes on it, corrections to or copies from it, the printed book opened the way to start envisaging the text as the result of a process of proving, experimenting and acquiring knowledge and not merely as part and parcel of that process. Interestingly, the debate as to whether a printed book or a manuscript was the best means to circulate knowledge and scientific deliberation was not easily answered by the Christian physicians of the Ottoman Empire who were accustomed to expressing doubts about the former’s credibility.⁴⁶ As studies have shown, medical epistemology guided the text editing during the process of translation and transcription of a manuscript⁴⁷ and, conversely, the book’s format has had a decisive role in the history of science.⁴⁸ In other words, a pharmacopoeia could only be a printed text.

The *Pharmacopoeia* was compiled by the German chemist Xaver Landerer (1809–1885), chief pharmacist of the Greek king, member of the Medical Council and professor of pharmacology, chemistry and botany at the Athens Medical Faculty and at the Athens School of Pharmacy; Josef Sartori (1809–1880), a German who was employed as a royal pharmacist; and by Ioannis Vouros (1808–1885), a physician who served as secretary to the Medical Council and whose dissertation (in the University of Halle) was on Greek pharmacology.⁴⁹ Three elements are worth noting here: first, pharmacists and chemists played a central role in the compilation of the pharmacopoeia, something which was an innovation in a period when physicians edited other nations’ pharmacopoeias;

⁴⁵ Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World* (London: Routledge, 2002), chap. 5.

⁴⁶ Triantafyllos E. Sklavenitis, “Η δυσπιστία στο έντυπο βιβλίο και η παράλληλη χρήση του χειρόγραφου,” in *Το βιβλίο στις προβιομηχανικές κοινωνίες* (Athens: INR/NHRF, 1982), 283–93.

⁴⁷ Faith Wallis, “The Experience of the Book: Manuscripts, Texts, and the Role of Epistemology in Early Medieval Medicine,” in *Knowledge and the Scholarly Medical Traditions*, ed. Don Bates (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 101–26.

⁴⁸ Andrian Johns, “The Uses of Print in the History of Sciences,” *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 107, no. 4 (2013): 393–420.

⁴⁹ Ioannis Vouros, *Dissertatio inauguralis de pharmacologia graecorum veterum in genere quam consensu facultatis medicae Halensis, ut Doctoris medici gradum rite adipiscatur AD D. XXXI Iulii C1D1CCCCXXIX. Publico examinis ubiicit Ιωάννης Βούρος, Chius* (Halle: Gebauer, 1829).

second, none of them was born within the Greek state's borders (Vouros was from Chios), and third, all of them had studied in a German state. The king chose the editors of the pharmacopoeia from professionals with studies in German universities since they had to have access to the *Bavarian Pharmacopoeia*, which served as the model for the Greek one.⁵⁰ The Bavarian and some French administrators of the royal court saw their role as civilising a former Ottoman province, and “civilisation” meant at the time “being a European”.⁵¹ The science of pharmacy in Greece should, then, have been a European one. But European pharmacy was not unknown to most, if not all, Greek physicians and pharmacists, since they were educated in European universities, especially Italian and central European ones.⁵² The choice of the editors, all of them foreigners to the local social conditions of the Greek state, was tied to larger administrative choices made by the king, as John Petropoulos has underlined: Othon wanted to make sure that his administrators were loyal to his person and not to local warlords and local political elites. Landerer, Sartori and even Vouros did not (yet) have such ties with local societies and were absolutely dependent on the king's goodwill.⁵³

These personnel choices had indirect influences on the science of pharmacy. Pharmacy was becoming irrelevant at any national and local context, thus contradicting the Paracelsian idea that, in the words of a Greek medical empiric, “God is not so naive to have the fevers in Greece and their cures in China.”⁵⁴ The administration of a medication, proposed by a “Bavarian” Pharmacopoeia and adopted by the “Greek” one, no longer depended on individual and local “constitutions” but on the action of a particular substance on a particular human condition. The beginnings of scientific universality and drug specificity was put in place in 1837, thanks to the specific choices made by the court, even though the

⁵⁰ Skevos Philianos and Helen Skaltsa, “Étude comparative de la première édition de la Pharmacopée hellénique (1837, 1868) et de la pharmacopée bavaroise (1822),” 31st International Congress for the History of Pharmacy, Heidelberg, 1993. Professor Helen Skaltsa has written extensively on the Greek Pharmacopoeia. We would like to thank her for giving us access to the abovementioned paper.

⁵¹ John A. Petropoulos, *Πολιτική και Συγκρότηση Κράτους στο Ελληνικό Βασίλειο (1833–1843)* (Athens: National Bank of Greece, 1997), 1:194.

⁵² Manolis Patiniotis, “Scientific Travels of the Greek Scholars in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Travels of Learning. A Geography of Science in Europe*, ed. Ana Simões, Ana Carneiro and Paula Maria Diogo (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2003), 58–63.

⁵³ For a further analysis of these administrative choices by the king, see Barlagiannis, *Η υγειονομική συγκρότηση*, 72–79.

⁵⁴ Cited by Vavaretos, *Κομπογιαννίτες, Ματσουκάδες*, 45. For Paracelsus, see Agnes Arber, *Herbals: Their Origin and Evolution. A Chapter in the History of Botany, 1470–1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 217–18.

direct purpose of the Bavarian administration was actually to assist the adaption of the Bavarian pharmacy to local conditions in Greece.

This being so, the pharmaceutical enterprise of 1837 could not hope to completely satisfy the principle of scientific universality. The effort to compile a “Greek” pharmacopoeia from the “Bavarian” one was one of accommodation, adaptation and translation. At a period of nation building and nationalism, the kind of pharmaceutical substances imposed by the *Pharmacopoeia* of 1837 had still to be “Greek”, that is, the pharmacopoeia should comprise “old and new medicines that we know by experience that physicians use in Greece”.⁵⁵ Scientifically, the effort had two outcomes. Firstly, physicians slightly distanced themselves from Paracelsus. Even if a “particular pathology” or a “special physiology” was impossible to exist only in one country as distinct to another,⁵⁶ diseases did present themselves with different aspects depending on the localities and on the climate and, hence, demanded not so much different cures, but different quantities of the same drug as was applied universally.⁵⁷ The idea differed from the one already expressed in a manuscript “regarding the constitution and the genre [γένος] of the plants, the stones and the metals” that required the “doctor to know his art as well as the way all other things were made and their constitution”.⁵⁸

Secondly, the *Pharmacopoeia* represented an enormous work of translation and, eventually, of the establishment of Greek pharmaceutical terminology. The translating enterprise, which was not novel in the region but was the most successful, was fundamental to the development of pharmacy in Greece. Until 1832–1833, a pharmacist used the language of his studies (French, Latin but mostly Italian), introducing thus “the confusion of the languages of Babel”. For Vouros, the author of that observation, the solution was to impose Latin as a lingua franca.⁵⁹ His opinion was expressed in 1831. Six years later the

⁵⁵ From the Introduction to the 1837 *Greek Pharmacopoeia*.

⁵⁶ Nicolaos P. Parissis and Jean A. Tetzis, *De l'île d'Hydra (Grèce) au point de vue médical et particulièrement du Tzanaki, maladie spéciale de l'enfance et des maladies des plongeurs* (Paris: Moquet, 1881), 5–6.

⁵⁷ See the opinion expressed in 1847 by the Greek Society of Medicine, General State Archives (GAK), Vlachoyiannis Collection, f. D56. The idea did not always promote national unification; it could also undermine it. For example, the local physician on the island of Santorini thought that “the maximum of a dose proposed by the *Pharmacopoeias* is given here as a minimum of it” because of “the more powerful constitution” of the inhabitants, Iosif De-Kigallas, *Γενική στατιστική της νήσου Θήρας* (Ermoupoli: Typ. G. Melistagous Makedonos, 1850), 57–58.

⁵⁸ MS 9(11), Korgialeneios Library, Argostoli, Kefalonia, p. 10.

⁵⁹ Ioannis Vouros, *Περί νοσοκομείων σχεδίασμα* (Paris: K. Everarte, 1831), 90.

Pharmacopoeia appeared both in Latin and in modern Greek. It was a novelty even by western European standards, since it was one of only two at the time written in the vernacular.⁶⁰ Moreover, the appendix of the work comprised the corresponding terminology in English, French, German and Ottoman Turkish, serving thus two objectives. First, the work aspired to establish ties between Greek and western European science, showing that the process of formatting the first was essentially dependent on an “Europeanising” attitude. Second, the terminology should be accessible to the natives, former Ottoman subjects, that is, to the majority of Greek pharmacists at the time.

The participation of Vouros, a native to the larger eastern Mediterranean region, is thus explained: he was considered the one with the necessary “local pharmaceutical experience” but who was not a native of the Greek Kingdom. In fact, it was his quality as such an intermediary that made him secretary to the Medical Council in the first place. When discussing the need for a secretary to the council, the interior minister demanded that the candidate know “well the language and the habits of the country”, proposing Vouros for the post.⁶¹ Vouros was indeed the perfect choice, satisfying all the presuppositions demanded by a “Greek” pharmacopoeia, which was the result of a balanced political and scientific approach to pharmacy during a period of transition from one political, linguistic and scientific regime to another.

One final remark relates to the centrality of the Medical Council: two of the three authors of the *Pharmacopoeia* were members of it. Landerer was a member for his whole professional career and Vouros became its president in 1840. Through the Medical Council, the king and his court physicians (all of whom were members, if not presidents, of the council) exercised control of the profession, in fact they were creating it. The council served during the whole century as the examination committee of every therapy professional. Having passed the council’s exams, the professional obtained a diploma, the only legal document permitting the practice of a pharmacist, of a physician and of a midwife in Greece. Each of these professionals, the members of the newly established official medical and paramedical body of the country, was obliged by law to apply the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* of the Medical Council.⁶²

⁶⁰ The other one was the US Pharmacopoeia, written also both in Latin and in English and published in 1820.

⁶¹ GAK, Othonian Archive, Archives of the Ministry of the Interior, f. 204, doc. 48.

⁶² Decree on the Greek Pharmacopoeia, *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως* (ΦΕΚ), no. 17, 13 May 1838. It was printed in 1,200 copies between 1837 and 1838 and accessible in every “public library” for six drachmas, GAK, Othonian Archive, Archives of the Ministry of the Interior, f. 190, doc. 42.

“*De materia pharmaceutica*”

Which substances did the *Pharmacopoeia I* incorporate to be considered a Greek one? Did its authors respect their promise to integrate substances that “physicians use in Greece” or did they just translate the Bavarian version? How extensive or how limited was the effort to “Europeanise” the local pharmacy and, conversely, how close did the *Pharmacopoeia* remain to the medical manuscripts’ tradition? From the legislative texts and the administrative procedures, we now pass to the *materia medica*, or as the *Pharmacopoeia* calls them, the *materia pharmaceutica* (part 1, pp. 1–170).

First of all, as Skevos Philianos and Helen Skaltsa have shown, the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* did not blindly imitate the Bavarian. Choices were made on the form, the organisation of the material, the language and the content.⁶³ Concerning, for example, medicinal plants or plant parts, the *Greek Pharmacopoeia I* comprises 27 substances that are absent from the Bavarian one while, in turn, it omits 21 substances that exist in its German prototype. In other words, there were scientific divergences. It is difficult for the current research to attribute them to Landerer, Sartori and Vouros’ concern about adapting their work to the local pharmacotherapy. However, their work did take into account the Greek medical manuscript tradition, as it is shown next by the comparison of two such manuscripts with the *Pharmacopoeia I*.

The first manuscript to be compared is the MS 92 from the Zagora Public Library archive.⁶⁴ It is a *iatrosophion* written at the beginning of the eighteenth century (1708) by the physician Michail Kontopidis, who also signed it.⁶⁵ Fifty years later the text was enriched by Constantinople Patriarch Kallinikos IV. Kontopidis, on the one

⁶³ Philianos and Skaltsa, “Étude comparative de la première édition de la Pharmacopée hellénique,” 2–3 and 5.

⁶⁴ Zagora is a historical village in the Pelion peninsula, Thessaly.

⁶⁵ Markellos-Michail Kontopidis (1651–1716) was an educated doctor from the island of Naxos. He studied medicine in Padua University. An *iatrosophion* is a medical manuscript containing diverse medical information (even, in some cases, the expected curative progress), often mentioning a renamed medical authority (Hippocrates, Galen, Meletius, etc.). They belong to the category of post-Byzantine texts that were produced between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. They record ethnomedical data very important for the history of medicine and therapeutics in the Greek regions up to the nineteenth century, Konstantinos Amantos, “Ιατροσοφικός κώδιξ,” *Αθηνά* 43 (1931): 148–70; A. Kouzis, “Contribution à l’étude de la médecine des zenos pendant le XVème siècle,” *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 6 (1927–28): 77–90; Touwaide, “Byzantine Hospital Manuals,” 148–49; Touwaide, “Arabic into Greek,” 196; Quinlan, “Ethnomedicine”; Seriatou, “Από τα γιατροσόφια στα ιατρικά εγχειρίδια,” 18.

hand, had copied extensively the work of Dioscorides when he was studying medicine at the University of Padua, even though he has included current medicinal knowledge. According to Kallinikos' notes, on the other hand, MS 92 is a copy of the sixth volume of the original work of Dioscorides, which we know, however, had only five volumes. In any case, even if the reference was about Dioscorides' disputed work *On other Pharmaceuticals*, the manuscript (MS 92), like many other *iatrosophia*, shares many medicinal materials with Dioscorides' texts such as: *αλθέα* (althaea), *μολόχα* (malva), *γλυκάνισο* (anise), *αψίνθια* (absinthium), *ηδύοσμος* (spearmint), *δυσκύαμος* (hyoscyamus), *ραβέντι* (rhubarb), *αφιόνι* (opium), *κρόκος* (saffron), *απήγανος* (common rue), *ελαφοκέρατο* (elkhorn fern), *στύψη* (potassium alum), *βασιλικός* (basil) and *μάραθος* (fennel).⁶⁶ The second manuscript that is compared with the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* is the MS 244 that dates from the eighteenth century.⁶⁷ It is a medical manuscript, written probably by a professional and entitled *Αουστριακή Φαρμακοποιία* (*Austrian Pharmacopoeia*). The work copied its *materia medica* from western European texts, as the author himself acknowledged. Both manuscripts are characteristic examples of the eighteenth-century pharmaceutical tradition in the Greek regions since they mainly list substances with their uses.

As far as our methodology is concerned, ethnopharmacology, by raising questions about the survival of medicinal material, has proposed effective routes by which data can be successfully extracted from the texts. As Efraim Lev argues, the use of different sources, in kind and in origin, can produce reliable results.⁶⁸ Paula De Vos, for example, examined a number of medical texts and presented a compiled list of 439 simples that were shared by all of them.⁶⁹ As for the problem of equating past terminology with its modern one, the work of Andreas Lardos' on the *Iatrosophikon* of Cyprus is very promising.⁷⁰ Very helpful here was also the Aromatic Plants of Epirus database established by the University of Ioannina.⁷¹ Thanks to it, as well as

⁶⁶ For Dioscorides' text, see Tsagakala, "Οι επιβιώσεις του Διοσκουρίδη," 43–110.

⁶⁷ MS 244, Archives of Historical Documents, National Historical Museum, 22. See S. Lampros, "Κατάλογος των κωδίκων των εν Αθήναις Βιβλιοθηκών πλην της Εθνικής. Β' Κώδικες της Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής Εταιρείας," *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων* 10 (1913): 184.

⁶⁸ Efraim Lev, "Reconstructed *materia medica* of the Medieval and Ottoman al-Sham," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 80, no. 2–3 (2002): 167–79.

⁶⁹ De Vos, "European *Materia Medica* in Historical Texts," 28–47.

⁷⁰ Andreas Lardos, "The Botanical *Materia Medica* of the *Iatrosophikon*: A Collection of Prescriptions from a Monastery in Cyprus," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 104, no. 3 (2006): 387–406.

⁷¹ University of Ioannina, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Pharmacology, *Αρωματικά Φυτά της Ηπείρου*, <http://mediplantepirus.med.uoi.gr/pharmacology/plant.php>.

to other works,⁷² it was possible to associate the local names of many substances with their scientific terms and their Latin ones as well. In this respect, the fact that the author of MS 92 (the Zagora *iatrosophion*) also provided the Latin and the Arabic names (written in Greek letters) of the substances helped the identification of the ones included in the Greek *Pharmacopoeia*.

The results of the comparison are illustrated in the table in the appendix. The table comprises all 354 substances and pharmaceutical products (in Latin and in Greek) contained in the Greek *Pharmacopoeia* (columns 2 and 3). The other columns include only the shared *materia medica* between the *Pharmacopoeia* and MS 244 (*Austrian Pharmacopoeia*), on the one hand (column 3), and MS 92 (the Zagora *iatrosophion*), on the other (column 4). As the table shows, the Greek *Pharmacopoeia* shares 142 substances with MS 244 and 51 with the MS 92. Given that MS 244 includes a total of 271 substances, and MS 92 a total of 123, then half of MS 244 (52 percent) is included in the Greek *Pharmacopoeia* while the respective percentage for MS 92 is 41 percent. In this respect, there is little difference between the influences on the two manuscripts. However, if we relate the number of the shared substances from each manuscript to the total of 354 substances contained in the Greek *Pharmacopoeia*, then 40 percent of its content coincides with that of the *Austrian Pharmacopoeia* while only 14 percent of it is the same with the content of the Zagora *iatrosophion*. In other words, the Greek *Pharmacopoeia I* shares more with the *Austrian Pharmacopoeia*, that is, with western European *materia medica*, than with MS 92, which more closely followed Dioscorides, that is, ancient Greek pharmacotherapy.

Concluding remarks

In the context of the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek state, the approach used for diffusing knowledge (a printed book or a manuscript) was linked to the process of political centralisation, to the professionalisation of pharmacists and to the history of the science of pharmacy. With the printed version, standardisation, control and harmonisation were introduced to or imposed on the pharmaceutical trade to a larger extent than before 1833, a process that occurred simultaneously on both the local/national and on the

⁷² Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias, https://greek_greek.en-academic.com/; Pantazis Kontomichis, *Η λαϊκή ιατρική στη Λευκάδα* (Athens: Grigoris, 1983); G.A. Rigatos, *Λεξικό ιατρικής λαογραφίας* (Athens: Vita, 2005); Gunnar Samuelsson, *Φαρμακευτικά προϊόντα φυσικής προελεύσεως*, trans. and ed. Pavlos Kordopatis, Evi Manesi-Zoupa and Giorgos Pairas (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2004); Roula Goliou, *200 βότανα και οι θεραπευτικές ιδιότητές τους* (Thessaloniki: Malliaris Paideia, 2008).

global levels.⁷³ The very history of editing pharmacopoeias concerns the dialectics between national and international efforts to standardise pharmacology that were taking place within the larger period of European political and scientific expansion. The Greek case that incorporated a “German” pharmacology in order to promote or to form a “Greek” one was one such event in this dual process.

The aforementioned differences between the Greek and the Bavarian pharmacopoeias were due to the efforts of the court physicians to incorporate local substances, respecting, thus, the local natural environments and medical habits that were slowly being transformed into national ones. As there were limits set on the straightforward imitation of the European pharmacopoeial standards, the same limits applied to the incorporation of the local pharmaceutical traditions represented in the eighteenth-century Greek medical manuscripts.

Of course, the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* continued to quote past uses. For example, like many important *iatrosophia*, its second part comprised detailed instructions, descriptions and precise dosages for the preparation of the chemical pharmaceutical formulations.⁷⁴ Interestingly enough, its *materia pharmaceutica* included also recipes for various fruit syrups for the confection of desserts as well as flavour enhancers for drugs. However, the *Pharmacopoeia* regularised profound changes to past forms of knowledge diffusion and ways of professional organisation. As the comparison between its *materia medica* and the substances contained in MS 244 and MS 92 has shown, the *Pharmacopoeia* did not slavishly follow the medical manuscript derived from the ancient Greek medical tradition. Instead, it shared more substances with the *Austrian Pharmacopoeia* manuscript.

As a result of this national and international process of translation, imitation, incorporation and exclusion, the local substances omitted from the *Pharmacopoeia I* that remained in use in Greece and in circulation in medical manuscripts until well into the twentieth century⁷⁵ were identified as “quackery” and “medical empiricism”. The notions were not reified entities; they describe dynamic processes practiced by professional rivalries and scientific quarrels in the face of which the state was meant to play the role of arbitrator. As is noted, the term “medical empiric” was first used

⁷³ Domingos Tabajara de Oliveira Martins et al., “The Historical Development of Pharmacopoeias and the Inclusion of Exotic Herbal Drugs with a Focus on Europe and Brazil,” *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 240 (2019): 1–11.

⁷⁴ Seriatou, “Μαντζούνια και αλοιφές,” 39–45.

⁷⁵ Violetta Hionidou, “Popular Medicine and Empirics in Greece, 1900–1950: An Oral History Approach,” *Medical History* 60, no. 4 (2016): 492–513; Penelope Seriatou, “Η λειτουργία της εμπειρικής ιατρικής, οι θεραπευτές και τα χειρόγραφα τους,” *Τα Ιστορικά* 70 (2019): 71–88.

to describe a certain category of therapists in an 1831 text.⁷⁶ With the appearance of legal authorities interested in health and medical issues, internal divisions within the profession became clearer and more formal. From a certain point of view, the legal interventions established internal as well external boundaries that were of help in defining and distinguishing the professional and the scientific from all other forms of therapy. To put it another way, from the publication of the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* onwards, the scientist used the printed version and the medical empiric (or any other therapist) the manuscript, which gradually came to include prayers and magic symbols.⁷⁷ The manuscript during the nineteenth century lost any pretension to a scientific allure.

The *Greek Pharmacopoeia* should not, however, be considered as marking any clean break or rupture. The eighteenth century increased the professional tendencies inherent in the growth of the medical production: this was an important step towards the constitution of pharmacy as a formal profession and as a standardised science. As is shown by the comparisons made in this article, the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* was conceived at a moment when the state and its physicians wanted to satisfy the demand expressed by eighteenth-century patients and therapists for efficiency, legality and health security. In this respect, the present article may bridge the gap between ethnopharmacology and biomedicine.⁷⁸ The “science of ethnopharmacology is the interdisciplinary investigation of the full set of medical approaches that use remedies of vegetable, animal, or mineral origin”.⁷⁹ The *Greek Pharmacopoeia*, by including such natural substances, offers itself as an object of research for ethnopharmacology. On the other hand, since the *Pharmacopoeia* helped establish the foundations for scientific universality, its medicinal and botanical information was not specific to some geographical and cultural area and the substances included were openly available in the market. Moreover, by giving a significant place to chemistry and to chemical products, the same text is also of interest for the history of biomedicine.

⁷⁶ Lazaros Vladimirov, “Ο εμπειρικός γιατρός στην Τουρκοκρατία,” in *Η θέση του γιατρού στην κοινωνία (II)*, ed. P.N. Ziogiannis, A. Diamantopoulos, E. Vogiatzakis, E. Koumantakis (Athens: Etaireia Diadosis Ippokratreiou Pnevmatos, 2015), 86–87.

⁷⁷ Seriatou, “Από τα γιατροσόφια στα ιατρικά εγχειρίδια,” 184 and 243.

⁷⁸ Medical anthropology investigates modern European pharmacy as a specific, culturally bounded, system of knowledge, as a specific expression of ethnopharmacy, and not as a universally applied scientific system. See, for example, Lorna Amarasingham Rhodes, “Studying Biomedicine as Cultural System,” in *Medical Anthropology: Contemporary Theory and Method*, ed. Thomas M. Johnson and Carolyn F. Sargent (Westport: Praeger, 1990), 159–73.

⁷⁹ Jacques Fleurentin, “From Medicinal Plants of Yemen to Therapeutic Herbal Drugs,” in *Herbal Medicine in Yemen: Traditional Knowledge and Practice, and their Value for Today’s World*, ed. Ingrid Hehmeyer, Hanne Schönig and Anne Regourd (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 154.

The state's intervention played a role in the development of biomedicine from ethnomedicine.

The development is not a linear one. Current trends in pharmacognosy have now returned to "traditional" modes of healing in order to find drugs for illnesses resistant or non-responsive to modern medicine.⁸⁰ Even if it is not a full return, since modern European pharmacy has developed from practices that were not at all "traditional" in the past, the current attentiveness to herbs shows that the *Pharmacopoeia* did not spell the end to such interests. In the nineteenth century, the professional and scientific rivalries were not over; they just obtained different forms. Indeed, the very existence of this legal text of 1837 could actually hinder pharmaceutical innovation. For example, what happened to drugs produced after the publication of the *Pharmacopoeia*? The French government commissioned, for example, the Medical Academy to examine every new medicine and publish its recipe in the academy's bulletin, until a subsequent edition of the Codex (the French *Pharmacopoeia*) could integrate it properly. Hence the need arose for constant re-editions to keep the pharmacopoeias up to date.⁸¹ In Greece, the role for certifying a drug's composition was in the hands of the Medical Council, while the *Greek Pharmacopoeia* has appeared in five main editions with a total of 14 supplements. But then again, the economic question persists: what about patents? What happens when a merchant or an inventor would like to keep his drug's recipe secret? How may his copyright interests – and economic profits – be protected without harming public health or without him being considered as a quack?⁸²

The article has demonstrated the importance of the publication of the *Pharmacopoeia* for the history of medicine and pharmacy. It has argued that its publication involved much struggle, competition and conflict. It has focused on the use of medical manuscripts and on the political, scientific, ideological and professional dimensions of pharmacy. Further research should also include that of the economy.⁸³

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

⁸⁰ G.P. Sarlis, *Αρωματικά και φαρμακευτικά φυτά* (Athens: Agricultural University of Athens, 1994), 2.

⁸¹ Georges Dilleman, "Les remèdes secrets et la réglementation de la pharmacopée française," *Revue d'histoire de la pharmacie* 23, no. 228 (1976): 37–48.

⁸² See, for example, *Ο Ελληνικός Ταχυδρόμος/Le Courier Grec*, 6 October 1838.

⁸³ David L. Cowen, "Liberty, Laissez-faire and Licensure in Nineteenth-Century Britain," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 43, no. 1 (1969): 30–40.

APPENDIX

Shared *materia medica* between the *Greek Pharmacopoeia I* and two medical manuscripts (MS 244, National Historical Museum; and MS 92, Zagora Public Library).

	Greek Pharmacopoeia I (all substances)		MS 244 (shared substances)	MS 92 (shared substances)
	Latin term	Greek translation		
1	<i>Abrotani herba, Artemisia abrotanum</i>	Αβροτόνου πόα	Αβρότονον	Αβρότανον or Αρτεμισία ¹
2	<i>Absinthii herba, Artemisia absinthium</i>	Αψινθίου πόα	Αψίνθια ποντιακή, Αψίνθια κοινή	Αψινθίαν
3	<i>Acetum (crudum)</i>	Όξος αγοραίων		
4	<i>Acidum muriaticum crudum</i>	Αλικόν οξύ αγοραίων		
5	<i>Acidum nitricum concentratum</i>	Νιτρικόν οξύ άκρατον		
6	<i>Acidum nitricum dilutum crudum (Aqua fortis)</i>	Κεκραμένον νιτρικόν οξύ αγοραίων		
7	<i>Acidum pyro-lignosum crudum</i>	Πυροξυλικόν οξύ αγοραίων		
8	<i>Acidum succinicum crudum</i>	Ηλεκτρικόν οξύ αγοραίων		
9	<i>Acidum sulphuricum crudum</i>	Θειϊκόν οξύ αγοραίων	Λάδι βιτριλίου	
10	<i>Acidum sulphuricum rectificatum</i>	Θειϊκόν οξύ καθαρισμένο		
11	<i>Acidum tartaricum</i>	Τρυγικόν οξύ		
12	<i>Aconiti herba, Aconitum napellus et Aconitum neomontanum</i>	Ακονίτου πόα	Νάπελους	Ακόνιτον
13	<i>Agaricus albus, Boletus laricis</i>	Αγαρικόν το λευκόν	Αγαρικόν άσπρον	Αγαρικόν

14	<i>Alcanae radix, Anchusa tinctoria</i>	Αγχούσης ρίζα		
15	<i>Alcohol venale</i>	Οινόπνευμα αγοραίων		
16	<i>Allii bulbis, Allium sativum</i>	Σκορόδου βολβός	Σκόρδιον	
17	<i>Aloe lucida, Aloe spicata soccotrina et perfoliata</i>	Αλόη	Αλοή	
18	<i>Althaeae radix, herba et flores, Althaea officinalis</i>	Αλθαίας ρίζα, πόα και άνθη	Δενδρομολόχα	Αλθέα or Αγριομολόχα
19	<i>Alumen crudum, Sulphus aluminiae</i>	Στυπτηρία αγοραίος	Στύψη	
20	<i>Ambra grisea, Ambra</i>	Άμβαρ		
21	<i>Ammoniacum, Heracleum gummiferum, Ferula orientalis, Gummi ammoniacum</i>	Αμμωνιακόν κόμμα		
22	<i>Ammonium muriaticum crudum</i>	Άλας αμμωνιακόν αγοραίων	Νισαντήρι	
23	<i>Ammonium subcarbonium crudum</i>	Υπανθρακική αμμωνία αγοραίος		
24	<i>Ammonium subcarbonicum pyro-oleosum, Subcarbonas</i>	Υπανθρακική αμμωνία εμπορευματική		
25	<i>Ammonium subcarbonicum pyro-oleosum liquidum</i>	Υπανθρακική Αμμωνία εμπορευματική υγρά		
26	<i>Amygdalae dulces et amarae, Amygdalus communis</i>	Αμύδαλα γλυκέα και πικρά	Μύδαλα	
27	<i>Amylum</i>	Άμυλον	Νισεστές	
28	<i>Angelicae radix, Angelica Archangelica</i>	Αγγελικής ρίζα	Αγκέλικα	Αγγέλικα
29	<i>Angusturae cortex, Bonglandia trifoliata, Angostura cuspare</i>	Αγγοστύρας φλοιός		

30	<i>Anisi semen et oleum, Pimpinella anisum</i>	Ανίσου σπέρμα και έλαιον	Άνισουμ στελάτουμ	Γλυκάνισον
31	<i>Aqua pluvialis, Aqua fluviatilis, Aqua fontana</i>	Ύδωρόμβριον, ύδωρποτάμιον, ύδωρπηγαίον		
32	<i>Argentum</i>	Άργυρος		
33	<i>Argentum foliatum</i>	Άργύρου φύλλα		
34	<i>Armoraciae radix, Cochlearia armoracia</i>	Ραφανίδος της αγρίας ρίζα		
35	<i>Arnica radix et flores, Arnica montana</i>	Δωρονίκου του ορεινού ρίζα και άνθος		
36	<i>Arrowroot, Maranta arundinacea</i>	Μαραντάμυλον		
37	<i>Arsenicum album, Acidum arsenicosum (vitreum)</i>	Άρσενικόν λευκόν		
38	<i>Artemisiae radix Artemisia vulgaris</i>	Άρτεμισίας ρίζα		
39	<i>Asa foetida, Ferula asa foetida</i>	Σίλφιον το μηδικόν		
40	<i>Asari radix, Asarum europaeum</i>	Ασάρου ρίζα		
41	<i>Aurantii folia, flores, fructus immaturi, fructus maturi horumque epidermiis</i>	Πορτογαλίας φύλλα, άνθη, καρπός άωρος, καρπός ώριμος και η επίλεπς αυτού	Κύτρον	
42	<i>Aurum</i>	Χρυσός		
43	<i>Aurum foliatum</i>	Χρυσού φύλλα		
44	<i>Avena excorticata, Avena sativa</i>	Βρόμος λελεπισμένος		
45	<i>Axungia suilla, Sus scrofa</i>	Στέαρ χόιρειον	Γουρουνόστογκον	
46	<i>Badianae semen, Illicium anisatum, Polyandria</i>	Άνίσου του αστερείου σπέρμα		
47	<i>Balsamum pervianum, Myroxylon peruiferum</i>	Βάλσαμον περουβικόν	Μπάλσαμον της Περού	

48	<i>Balsamum toluatanum, Myroxylon toluiferum</i>	Βάλαμον τολουταϊκόν	Μπάλαμον	
49	<i>Bardanae radix, Arctium bardana et Arctium lappa</i>	Αρχείου ρίζα		
50	<i>Baryta sulphurica nativa</i>	Βαρύτις θειϊκή αυτοσυστατος		
51	<i>Basilici herba, Ocimum basilicum</i>	Ωκίμου πόα		
52	<i>Belladonae radix et folia, Atropa belladonna</i>	Ευθαλείας ρίζα και φύλλα	Μπέλλα ντόννα	
53	<i>Benzoe, Styrax benzoe</i>	Βενζόη		
54	<i>Berganiottae oleum, Citrus aurantium, Bergamia vulgaris</i>	Έλαιον περγαμινόν		
55	<i>Bismuthum</i>	Βίσμουθον		
56	<i>Bolus armena</i>	Βόλος αρμενία	Βόλος αρμένικος	
57	<i>Buccu folia, Diosma crenata</i>	Διόσμου φύλλα		
58	<i>Butyrum oville, Ovis aries</i>	Βούτυρον προβάτειον		Βούτυρο
59	<i>Cacao, Theobroma cacao</i>	Κάκαον	Κακάο	
60	<i>Cajeputi oleum, Melaleuca Leucadendron s. Melaleuca cajeputi</i>	Έλαιον λευκο δένδρινον		
61	<i>Caincae radix, Chiococca anguifuga, Frutex brasiliensis</i>	Εχιοκόκκου ρίζα		
62	<i>Calami radix, Acorus calamus</i>	Καλάμου του αρωματικού ρίζα	Καλάμι αρωματικόν ρίζα	
63	<i>Calcaria muriatica oxygenata</i>	Τίτανος έγχλωρος		
64	<i>Calcaria usta</i>	Τίτανος κεκαυμένη		
65	<i>Camphora, Dryobalanops Comphora et Laurus camphora</i>	Καφουρά	Κάμφορα	
66	<i>Cancrorum lapides, Cancer Astacus, Astacus fluviatilis</i>	Λιθάρια των ποταμιών καρκίνων		Καβούρους

67	<i>Canella alba</i>	Κιννάμωμον το λευκόν	Κανέλα άσπρη	
68	<i>Cannabis semen, Cannabis sativa</i>	Καννάβευος σπέρμα,		
69	<i>Cantharides, Meloe vesicatorius, Lytta vesicatoria</i>	Κανθαρίδες	Κανθαρίδας	Κανθαρίδαις
70	<i>Capilli veneris herba, Adiantum capillus veneris</i>	Αδιάντου πόα		
71	<i>Carbo animalis</i>	Ζωάνθραξ		
72	<i>Carbo vegetabilis</i>	Άνθραξ		
73	<i>Cardamomum minus, Alpinia cardamomum, Elettaria cardamomum</i>	Καρδάμωμον το μικρόν	Κάρδαμον μικρόν	
74	<i>Cardui benedicti herba, Cnicus benedictus, Centaurea benedicta</i>	Ακάνθας της ιεράς πόα		
75	<i>Caricae, Ficus carica</i>	Ισχάδες		
76	<i>Caricis arenariae radix, Carex arenaria</i>	Αμμοφύτου ρίζα		
77	<i>Carvi semen et oleum, Carum carvi</i>	Κάρου σπέρμα και έλαιον	Κάρβους	
78	<i>Caryophyllatae radix, Geum urbanum</i>	Γέου ρίζα	Καριοφυλλάτα	
79	<i>Caryophylli eorumque oleum, Caryophyllus aromaticus s. Eugenia carryophyllata</i>	Καρυόφυλλα και το εξ αυτών έλαιον	Καραφύλλια	
80	<i>Cascarillae cortex, Croton eluteria</i>	Κασκαρίλλης φλοιός	Κασκαρίλλα	
81	<i>Cassia cinnamomeae jusque oleum, Laurus cassia</i>	Κιννάμωμον ξυλώδες και το εξ αυτού έλαιον	Κάσια ξύλινη	
82	<i>Cassia flores, Laurus cassia, Laurus malabathrum</i>	Κασσίας άνθη	Κάσια φίστουλας	
83	<i>Castoreum, Castor fiber</i>	Καστόριον	Καστόριον	

84	<i>Catechu, Mimosa catechu, Acacia catechu</i>	Λύκειον		
85	<i>Centaurii herba, Chironia centaurium s. Gentiana centaurium s. Erythraea centaurium</i>	Κενταυρίου πόα	Κενταύριον μικρόν	
86	<i>Cera flava et alba</i>	Κηρός κίτρινος και λευκός	Κερί άσπρο, κίτρινο	
87	<i>Cerasa acida, Prunus cerasus, Melanocarpa</i>	Βύσσινα	Κεράσια μαύρα	
88	<i>Cervi cornu, Cervus elaphus</i>	Κέρας ελάφιον	Ελάφιον	Κέρατο Ελάφου
89	<i>Cetaceum</i>	Κήτους σπέρμα		
90	<i>Chamomillae ramanae flores</i>	Χαμαμήλου άνθος		Χαμομήλα
91	<i>Chamomillae vulgaris flores, Matricaria chamomilla</i>	Λευκανθέμου άνθος	Χαμομήλα	
92	<i>Chelidonii herba, Chelidonium majus</i>	Χελιδονίου πόα	Χελιδώνιον μεγάλον	
93	<i>Chenopodii herba, Chenopodium ambrosioides</i>	Χηνοποδίου πόα		
94	<i>Chinae radix, Smilax china</i>	Κίνας ρίζα	Κίνα κομπιάρικη ρίζα	
95	<i>China fusca</i>	Κίνα φαιά		
96	<i>China regia, Cinchona angustifolia, Cinchona lancifolia</i>	Κίνα βασιλική		
97	<i>Chininum sulphuricum</i>	Κινίνη θειική		
98	<i>Cichorei radix, Cichorium intybus</i>	Κιχωρίου ρίζα		
99	<i>Cina semen, Artemisia contra</i>	Άβροτόνου του άρρενος σπέρμα		
100	<i>Cinnabaris</i>	Κιννάβαρι		
101	<i>Cinnamomi cortex et oleum, Laurus cinnamomum</i>	Κιναμώμου φλοιός και έλαιον		

102	<i>Citri fructus et oleum, Citrus medica</i>	Μηδικά μήλα και το εξ αυτών έλαιον		
103	<i>Clematidis herba, Clematis erecta</i>	Κληματίδος πόα		
104	<i>Coccinella, Coccus cacti</i>	Ανθηρόκοκκος	Κριμέζι	
105	<i>Cochleariae herba, Cochleariae officinalis</i>	Κοχλιαρίδος πόα		
106	<i>Coffeae semen, Coffea arabica</i>	Καφφέας σπέρμα		
107	<i>Colchici radix et semen, Colchicum autumnale</i>	Κολχικού ρίζα και σπέρμα		
108	<i>Colocynthis, Cucumis colocynthis</i>	Κολοκυνθίδες		
109	<i>Colombo radix, Cocculus palmatus, Menispermum palmatum</i>	Κολόμβου ρίζα		
110	<i>Colophonium, Pinus sylvestris</i>	Κολοφόνιον		
111	<i>Conchae, Ostrea edulis</i>	Κόγχαι		
112	<i>Conii maculatiherba, Conium maculatum</i>	Κωνείου πόα	Τζικούτα κοινή	Κόνιο
113	<i>Capaivae balsamum, Copaifera officinalis</i>	Βάλσαμον κοπαϊκόν		
114	<i>Coriandri semen, Coriandrum sativum</i>	Κοριανου σπέρμα		Κόρεον
115	<i>Creta alba</i>	Κρητίς		
116	<i>Crocus, Crocus sativus</i>	Κρόκος		
117	<i>Crotonis oleum, Croton tiglium</i>	Κρότονον έλαιον		
118	<i>Cubebae, Piper cubeba, Piper caudatum</i>	Μυρτιδανον		
119	<i>Cuprum</i>	Χαλκός		
120	<i>Cuprum aceticum crystallisatum</i>	Οξικός χαλκός κρυσταλλωμένος		

121	<i>Cuprum subaceticum</i>	Ίος χαλκού(ιόςξυστός)		
122	<i>Cuprum sulphuricum crudum</i>	Χαλκός θειικός	Βιτριόλι χαλκού	
123	<i>Curcumae radix, Curcuma longa</i>	Κροκόρριζα		
124	<i>Cydoniae fructus et semen, Pyrus cydonia, Cydonia vulgaris</i>	Κυδωνίων καρπός και σπέρμα		
125	<i>Dactyli, Phoenix dactylifera</i>	Φοινικοβάλανο		
126	<i>Dauci radix, Daucus carota</i>	Σταφυλίνου ρίζα		
127	<i>Digitalis folia, Digitalis purpurea</i>	Ελύτρου φύλλα		
128	<i>Draconis sanguis, Calamus draco</i>	Αίμα δρακόντιο	Αίμα δράκοντο	
129	<i>Dulcamarae stipites</i>	Γλυκυπίκρου Κλωνία		Στύφος, στρύχνος
130	<i>Elaterii pepones</i>	Σίκκος άγριος		
131	<i>Elemi</i>	Έλημον		
132	<i>Erucae semen, Sinapis alba</i>	Σινάπεως του λευκού σπέρμα		
133	<i>Euphorbium, Euphorbia officinarum</i>	Ευφόρβιο		
134	<i>Fabae albae, Phaseolus vulgaris</i>	Δύλιχοι		
135	<i>Farfarae folis, Tussilago farfara</i>	Βηχίου φύλλα		
136	<i>Ferrum, mars, ferro</i>	Σίδηρος		
137	<i>Filicis maris radix, Aspidium filix mas</i>	Πτέριδος ρίζα		
138	<i>Foeniculi semen, Foeniculum vulgare</i>	Μαράθρου σπέρμα		Μάραθo
139	<i>Foeni groeci semen, Frigonella foenum graecum</i>	Τήλεως σπέρμα		

140	<i>Formicae, Formica rufa</i>	Μύρμηκος		
141	<i>Fumariae herba, Fumaria officinalis</i>	Καπνού πόα	Καπνός	Καπνόν
142	<i>Galangae radix, Alpinia galanga</i>	Γαλάγχης ρίζα	Γαλάνγα	
143	<i>Galbanum, Bubon galbanum, Selimun galbanum</i>	Χαλβάνη	Γάλμπανο	
144	<i>Gallae, Quercus infectoria</i>	Κηκίδες		
145	<i>Gentianae radix, Gentiana lutea</i>	Γεντιανής ρίζα	Γεντριάνα	Γεθιανή
146	<i>Graminis radix, Triticum repens, Agropyrum repens</i>	Αγρώστιδος ρίζα		Άγροστις
147	<i>Granati cortex radices et cortex fructus, Punica granatum</i>	Ρόας ριζής φλοιός και σίδια (ρόας λέπη)		
148	<i>Graphites</i>	Γραφίτης		
149	<i>Gratiolae herba, Gratiola officinalis</i>	Ηρακλεία πόα	Γραντζιόλα	
150	<i>Guajaci lignum, Cortex ligni et resina, Guajacum officinale</i>	Ιερόξυλου φλοιός, ξύλον και κομμυρητήνη		
151	<i>Guttae gummi, Garcinia cambogia, Mangostana cambogia</i>	Χρύσοπον		
152	<i>Gypsum</i>	Γύψος		
153	<i>Hederae terristris herba, Glechoma hederaceum</i>	Χαμαικίσσου πόα	Κισσός γαιώδης	
154	<i>Helenii, Enulae radix, Inula helenium</i>	Ελενίου ρίζα	Λένιο σαντο	
155	<i>Hellebori albi radix, Veratrum album</i>	Ελλεβόρου του λευκού ρίζα	Σκάρφη	
156	<i>Hellebori nigri radix, Helleborus niger</i>	Ελλεβόρου του μέλανος ρίζα		
157	<i>Helmintochortos, Ceramium helmintochorton</i>	Ελμινθόχορτον		

158	<i>Hippocastani cortex, Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	Ιπποκαστάνου φλοιός		
159	<i>Hirudo, Hirudo medicinalis</i>	Βδέλλα		
160	<i>Hordeum, Hordeum vulgare</i>	Κριθή	Κριθάρι	
161	<i>Hydrargyrum</i>	Υδράργυρος	Υδράργυρος ζωντανός	
162	<i>Hydrargyrum muriaticum corrosivum</i>	Αλικού υδραργύρου άχνη		
163	<i>Hydrargyrum oxydatum rubrum</i>	Υδραργύρου κοκκίνη υποστάθμη		
164	<i>Hyoscyami albi folia, Hyoscyamus albus</i>	Υοσκυάμου του λευκού φύλλα		
165	<i>Hyoscyamini grifolia et semen, Hyoscyamus niger</i>	Υοσκυάμου του μέλανος φύλλα και σπέρμα		Δισκίαμο
166	<i>Jaceae herba, Viola tricolor</i>	Ύου του τριχρόου πόα		
167	<i>Jalappae radix, Convolvulus jalappa. Ipomaea jalappa</i>	Ιαλάππης ρίζα	Παλάππα	
168	<i>Ichyocolla</i>	Ιχθυοκόλλα		
169	<i>Jecoris aselli oleum</i>	Έλαιον το εκ του ήπατος του ονίσκου		
170	<i>Ignatiae semen, Strychnos ignatia, Ignatia amara</i>	Ιγνατίας σπέρμα		
171	<i>Imperotariae radix, Imperial ostruthium</i>	Κοιρανίας ρίζα	Ιμπεραδόρια	
172	<i>Jodium s. Jodina</i>	Ιώδες		
173	<i>Ipecacuanhae radix</i>	Ιπεκακουάνης ρίζα	Ιπεπακουάνα	
174	<i>Ireos radix, Iris florentina</i>	Ίριδος ρίζα		
175	<i>Juglandis fructuum cortex, Juglans regia</i>	Καρύων λέπτυρα	Καριδιά	
176	<i>Jujubae, Rhamnus ziziphus, Ziziphus vulgaris</i>	Ζύζιφα		
177	<i>Juniperi lignum et baccae, Juniperus communis</i>	Αρκεύθου ξύλον και σφαιρία		

178	<i>Kali ferruginoso-hydrocyanicum</i>	Κάλιον προυσσιακόν σιδηρίζον		
179	<i>Kali muriaticum oxygenatum</i>	Κάλιον αλικόν οξυγονομένον		
180	<i>Kali nitricum crudum</i>	Νίτρον αγοραίον		
181	<i>Kali oxalicum acidulum, Oxalis acetosella et Oxalis corniculata</i>	Κάλιον οξαλικόν όξινον		
182	<i>Kali subcarbonicum crudum</i>	Κάλιον υπανθρακικόν αγοραίον		
183	<i>Kali sulphuricum crudum</i>	Κάλιον θειϊκόν αγοραίον		
184	<i>Kino, Eucalyptus resinifera</i>	Κίνον		
185	<i>Kreosotum</i>	Σωσίκρεον		
186	<i>Lacca in globulis</i>	Λάκκον σφαιρωτόν		
187	<i>Lacca in granis</i>	Λακκον δακρυώδες		
188	<i>Lacmus, Rocella tinctoria</i>	Καγκάμινον κυανούν		
189	<i>Lactis saccharum</i>	Σάκχαρα του γάλακτος	Γάλα από γελάδα, ζάχαρι	
190	<i>Lactucae virosae herba, Lactusa virosa</i>	Θριδακίνης της φαρμακώδους πόα	Αγριομαρούλι	
191	<i>Lactucarium, Lactuca sativa</i>	Θριδάκιον		
192	<i>Lapathi radix, Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Λαπάθου ρίζα	Ξινολάπαθο	
193	<i>Lauri baccae et oleum, Laurusnobilis</i>	Δάφνης καρπός και έλαιον	Δάφνη	
194	<i>Lauro-cerasi folia, Prunus lauro-cerasus</i>	Δαφνοκέρασου φύλλα		
195	<i>Lavandulae flores et oleum, Lavandula spica</i>	Τιφού άνθη και έλαιον	Λαβεντούλα	
196	<i>Levistici radix, Ligusticum levisticum</i>	Λιγυστικού ρίζα		Λιγούστικο

197	<i>Lichen islandicus,</i> <i>Cetraria islandica</i>	Λειχήν ο ισλανδικός		
198	<i>Lignum campechianum,</i> <i>Haematoxylon</i> <i>camperchianum</i>	Καμπεχιανόν ξύλον		
199	<i>Linisemen et oleum,</i> <i>Linum usitatissimum</i>	Λίνου σπέρμα και έλαιον		
200	<i>Liquiritiae radix,</i> <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i>	Γλυκυρρίζης ρίζα	Γλυκόρριζα	Γλυκόριζα
201	<i>Liquiritiae succus inspissatus</i> <i>crudus</i>	Γλυκυρρίζης χύλισμα αγοραίον		
202	<i>Lupuli strobili, Humulus</i> <i>lupulus faemina</i>	Λυκίσκου στρόβυλοι		
203	<i>Lycopodii semen,</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	Λυκοποδίου σπέρμα		
204	<i>Macis et macidis oleum,</i> <i>Myristica moschata</i>	Μοσχομάκερ και το έλαιον αυτού	Μοσχοκάριδον	
205	<i>Magnesia subcarbonica</i>	Μαγνησία υπανθρακική		
206	<i>Magnesia sulphurica cruda</i>	Μαγνησία θειϊκή αγοραίος (πικρόν άλας)		
207	<i>Malvae arborea e flores,</i> <i>Althea rosea</i>	Ροδαλθαίας άνθη		
208	<i>Malvae folia</i>	Μαλάχης φύλλα	Μολόχα κοινή	
209	<i>Malvae vulgaris Flores,</i> <i>Malva sylvestris</i>	Μαλάχης άνθη	Μολόχα κοινή	
210	<i>Manganum oxydatum</i> <i>(nativum)</i>	Μαγγανήσιον οξειδωμένον		
211	<i>Manna, Fraxinus ornus</i>	Μάννα	Μάννα	
212	<i>Mari herba,</i> <i>Teucrium marum</i>	Μάρου πόα		
213	<i>Marrubii herba, Marrubium</i> <i>vulgare</i>	Πρασίου πόα	Μαρούβιον	Πράσιον
214	<i>Mastiche, Pistacia lentiscus</i>	Μαστίχη	Μαστίχη	

215	<i>Matricariae herba, Matricaria parthenium, Pyrethrum parthenium</i>	Παρθενίου πόα	Ματρικάρια	Παρθενούδι
216	<i>Mel crudum</i>	Μέλι	Μέλι κοινός και ξαφρισμένον	
217	<i>Meliloti herba, Melilotus officinalis</i>	Μελιλώτου πόα	Μελίλοτος	Μελίλοτο
218	<i>Melissae herba, Melissa officinalis</i>	Μελισσοφύλλου πόα	Μελισσόχορτον	Μελισσοβότανο
219	<i>Menthae crispae herba, Mentha crispa</i>	Ηδύσμου του ουλοφύλλου πόα	Αγριοδύσμος, δύσμος	Δύσμον
220	<i>Menthae piperitae herba et oleum, Mentha piperita</i>	Ηδύσμου του πεπερώδους πόα και έλαιον		
221	<i>Mezerei cortex, Daphne mezereum et Daphne gnidium</i>	Δαφνοειδούς φλοιός		
222	<i>Millefolii herba, Achillea millefolium</i>	Χιλιόφυλλου πόα		Χιλιόφυλλον
223	<i>Mimosae gummi, Acacia ehrenbergii, Mimosa seyal et tortilis</i>	Κόμμι (το αραβικόν)		
224	<i>Mori baciae</i>	Συκάμνα (μούρα)	Μοριά	
225	<i>Morphium</i>	Μόρφιο		
226	<i>Moschus</i>	Μόσχος	Μόσχος	
227	<i>Myrrha, Balsamodendron myrrha</i>	Σμύρνα	Μύρα	Μύρριν
228	<i>Nasturtii herba, Sisymbrium nasturtium, Nasturtium officinale</i>	Σισυμβρίου πόα	Νεροκάρδαμον	
229	<i>Natrum carbonicum acidulum</i>	Νάτρον ανθρακικόν όξινον		
230	<i>Natrum mutiaticum</i>	Νάτρον αλικόν	Άλας αλκαλινόν	
231	<i>Natrum subboracicum</i>	Νάτρον υποβορακικόν		

232	<i>Natrum sulphuricum crudum</i>	Νάτρον θεικόν αγοραίον		
233	<i>Natrum subcarbonicum crudum</i>	Νάτρον υπανθρακικόν αγοραίον		
234	<i>Nicotianae folia, Nicotiana tabacum</i>	Νικοτιανής φύλλα	Καπνός	
235	<i>Nuces moschatae, Myristica moschata</i>	Μοσχοκάρυα	Μοσχοκάριδον	
236	<i>Nuces vomicae, Strychnos nux vomica</i>	Κάρυα εμετικά		
237	<i>Nucistae oleum, Myristica moschata</i>	Μοσχοκαρύου έλαιον		
238	<i>Oleum animale dippelii</i>	Σαρκέλαιον του Διππελίου		
239	<i>Oleum animale foetidum</i>	Σαρκέλαιον		
240	<i>Olibanum s. Thus, Boswellia serrata</i>	Λίβανος	Ολίβανον, Θυμίαμα	
241	<i>Olivarum oleum, Olea europaea</i>	Έλαιον	Ελεόλαδον	
242	<i>Ononidis radix, Ononis spinosa et Ononis antiquorum</i>	Ονωνίδος ρίζα	Ονονές	
243	<i>Opium, Papaver officinale et Papaver somniferum</i>	Όπιον		Αφιώνι, Όπιο
244	<i>Origami herba, Origanum smyrnaeum</i>	Οριγάνου πόα		Ρίγανη
245	<i>Ova gallinacea, Phasianus gallus foemina</i>	Ωά της αλεκτορίδος	Αυγόν από κόταν	
246	<i>Paeoniae radix, Paeonia officinalis</i>	Παιωνίας ρίζα		
247	<i>Papaveris capita, semina et oleum, Papaver somniferum, seminibus albis</i>	Μήκωνος κωδία, σπέρμα και έλαιον	Παπαρούνα άσπρη, Παπαρούνα πραντική	Κουτζουνάδα, Όπιο Μικώνιον αγριον
248	<i>Passulae majores, Vitis vinifera</i>	Σταφίδες		

249	<i>Passulae minores, Vitis vinifera var: apyrena</i>	Σταφίδες κορινθιακαί		
250	<i>Petroleum, oleum petrae</i>	Πετρέλαιον	Πετροέλαιον	
251	<i>Petroselini semen, Apium petroselinum</i>	Σελίνου σπερμα		Κουδουμέντο -Μακεδονίσι
252	<i>Phellandrii semen</i>	Φηλανδρίου σπέρμα		
253	<i>Phosphorus</i>	Φωσφόρον		
254	<i>Pimpinellae radix, Pimpinella saxifrage</i>	Εμπέτρου ρίζα	Πιμπρενέλλα	
255	<i>Piper hispanicum, Capsicum annum</i>	Πεπερίς		
256	<i>Peperinum</i>	Πεπέριον	Πιπέρι στρογγυλόν	
257	<i>Piper nigrum et album</i>	Πιπέρι μέλαν και λευκόν		
258	<i>Pix alba, Pinum sylvestris</i>	Ρητίνη λευκή		
259	<i>Pix nigra, Pinus sylvestris</i>	Πίσσα		
260	<i>Plumbum aceticum crudum</i>	Μόλυβδος οξικός αγοραίος		
261	<i>Plumbum oxydatum (rubrum)</i>	Άμμιον		
262	<i>Plumbum oxydulatum (fusum)</i>	Λιθάργυρος	Λιθάργυρος	Λιθάργυρος
263	<i>Plumbum subcarbonicum</i>	Ψιμίθιον	Μολυβόχωμα	
264	<i>Polygalae amaro e herba, Polygala amara, Polygala amarella</i>	Πολυγάλου πόα	Πολύγαλα	
265	<i>Poma acidula, Pyrus malus</i>	Μήλα υπόξινα		
266	<i>Pruna, Prunus domestica</i>	Κοκκύμηλα	Δαμασκηνιά	
267	<i>Psyllii semen</i>	Ψυλλίου σπέρμα		Ψύλλιον
268	<i>Pulegi herba</i>	Γλήχωνος Πόα		
269	<i>Pulsatillae herba</i>	Ανεμώνης της λειμωνίας Πόα		

270	<i>Pyrethri radix, Anthemis pyrethrum, Anacyclus pyrethrum</i>	Πυρέθρου ρίζα		Πύρεθρον
271	<i>Quassiae lignum, Quassia amara, Quassia excelsa</i>	Κάσσιον ξύλον, δένδρον του σουρινάμου	Κβάσια, κάσσια ξύλινη	
272	<i>Quercus cortex et glandes, Quercus aegilops</i>	Δρυός φλοιός και βάλανοι	Δρυς	
273	<i>Ratanhae radix et extractum, Krameria triandra</i>	Ρατανίας ρίζα και ειχύλισμα		
274	<i>Rhei radix, Rheum australe s. Rheum emodi</i>	Ρα ρίζα	Ρέουμ	Ραβέντι
275	<i>Rhododendri folia, Rhododendron chrysanthum</i>	Ροδοδένδρου φύλλα		
276	<i>Rhoeados flores, Papaver phoeas</i>	Ροιάδος άνθος		
277	<i>Ricini oleum, Ricinus communis</i>	Έλαιον κίκινον		
278	<i>Rosmarini folia et oleum, Rosmarinus officinalis</i>	Λιβανωτίδος φύλλα και έλαιον	Ροσμαρίνος	Δεντρολίβανον
279	<i>Rosarum flores, Rosa centifolia</i>	Ρόδα	Τριανταφυλλιά	
280	<i>Rosarum oleum, Rosa moschata</i>	Έλαιον ρόδιον		
281	<i>Rubiae tinctorum radix, Rubia tinctorum</i>	Ερυθροδάνου ρίζα	Ριζάρι	Ριζάρι, Ερυθρόδανον
282	<i>Rubi ideoi fructus, Rubus idaeus</i>	Βάτουδαίας καρπός		Βάτον
283	<i>Rutae herba, Ruta graveolens</i>	Πηγάνου πόα	Κομίδη ρούτας	Απήγανον
284	<i>Sabadillae semen, Veratrum sabadilla</i>	Φθειράγχης σπέρμα	Σαμπατέλλα	
285	<i>Sabinae herba, Juniperus sabina</i>	Βράθυσος πόα	Σαβίνα	
286	<i>Saccharum, Saccharum officinarum</i>	Σάκχαρ	Ζάχαρι	

287	<i>Sagapenum, Ferula persica</i>	Σαγαπηνόν	Σαγαπένουμ	
288	<i>Sago, Sagus rumphii</i>	Σάγον		
289	<i>Salep radix, Orchis mascula, pyramidalis, longibracteata et latifolia</i>	Όρχεως ρίζα		
290	<i>Salicis cortex, Salix fragilis et Salix alba</i>	Ιτέας φλοιός		
291	<i>Salviae herba, Salvia officinalis</i>	Ελελιφάσκου πόα	Αληφασκιά	Αλιφασκιά
292	<i>Sambuci flores et baccae, Sambucus nigra</i>	Ακτής άνθη και σφαιρία	Κουφοξυλιά	
293	<i>Santali rubric lignum, Pterocarpus santalinus</i>	Ξύλον σαγάληνον κόκκινον	Σάνταλον κόκκινον	
294	<i>Sapo domesticus</i>	Σάπων δια στέατος	Σαπούνι	
295	<i>Sapo hispanicus</i>	Σάπων κρητικός		
296	<i>Saponariae radix, Saponaria officinalis</i>	Στρουθίου ρίζα	Σαπονάρια	
297	<i>Sarsaparillae radix, Smilax syphilitica aliaequae hujus generis species</i>	Σαρσαπαρίλλης ρίζα	Σαρσαπαρίλα	
298	<i>Sassafras lignum, Laurus sassafras</i>	Ξύλον σασάφρινον	Σασσαφράς	
299	<i>Scammonium, Convolvulus scammonia</i>	Σκαμμωνία	Σκαμονέα	
300	<i>Scillae bulbos s. radix, Scillamaritima</i>	Σκίλλης βολβός ήτοι ρίζα	Σκύλα	
301	<i>Scordii herba, Teucrium scordium</i>	Σκορδίου πόα		Σκόρντιον
302	<i>Sebum ovillum, Ovisaries</i>	Στέαρ προβάτειον		
303	<i>Secale cornutum, Secale cereale</i>	Βρόμος ερυσιβώδης	Σήκαλη	
304	<i>Secalis farina, Secale cereale</i>	Βρόμιον άλευρον		
305	<i>Senegae radix, Polygala senega</i>	Πολυγάλου του βιργινικού ρίζα		

306	<i>Sennae folia, Cassia lanceolata, Cassia obtusata s. Senna</i>	Σένης φύλλα της Νουβίας, της ανωτέρας αιγύπτου θαμνία	Σηναμική	Σένα ή Σιναμική
307	<i>Sepiae, Sepia officinalis</i>	Σήπιον (σηπίας ξίφος)		
308	<i>Serpentariae radix, Aristolochia serpentaria</i>	Οφίτου ρίζα	Σερπεντάρια	
309	<i>Serpylli herba, Thymus serpyllum</i>	Ερπούλλου πόα		
310	<i>Siliqua dulcis, Ceratonia siliqua</i>	Κεράτια		
311	<i>Simarubae cortex, Simaruba officinalis s. Quassia simaruba</i>	Σιμαρούπης φλοιός		
312	<i>Sinapeos semen, Sinapis nigra</i>	Σινάπεως σπέρμα	Σινάπι	
313	<i>Solani nigri folia, Solanum nigrum</i>	Στρώχνου του μέλανος φύλλα	Σολάνουμ	Στρώφνον
314	<i>Spongia marina, Spongia officinalis</i>	Σπόγγος	Σφουγγάρι	
315	<i>Stannum</i>	Κασσίτερος		
316	<i>Stibium</i>	Στίμμι	Αντιμμόνιον ωμόν ²	
317	<i>Stibium oxydulatum vitreum</i>	Στίβινος ύελος		
318	<i>Stibium sulphuratum nigrum</i>	Στίμμι ένθειον		
319	<i>Stoechadis flores, Lavandula stoechas</i>	Στοιχάδος άνθη		
320	<i>Stramonii folia et semina, Datura stramonium</i>	Στραμονίου φύλλα και σπέρμα	Στραμόνιουμ	
321	<i>Strychninum</i>	Στρώχνιον		
322	<i>Styrax calamita, Styrax officinalis</i>	Στύραξ	Στύρακα	
323	<i>Styrax liquidus, Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	Μελιστύραξ	Στύρακα υγρόν	

324	<i>Succinume jusque oleum crudum</i>	Ήλεκτρον, και το εξ αυτού έλαιον το αγοραίον	Κεχριμπάρι	
325	<i>Sulphuris flores</i>	Θείου άνθος	Τιάφη	
326	<i>Tamarindi, Tamarindus indica</i>	Οξυφοίνικες	Ταμαρήντο	
327	<i>Tanaceti herba et oleum, Tanacetum vulgare</i>	Θηρανθέμιδος πόα και έλαιον	Ταναζτέτουμ	
328	<i>Taraxaci radix, Leontodon taraxacum</i>	Πικραφάκης ρίζα	Ταράξακουμ	
329	<i>Tartarus crudus et depuratus</i>	Τρυξ αγοραίος και καθαρισμένη	Καθάρισμα Ταρτάρου	
330	<i>Tauri fel, os taurus domesticus</i>	Χολή ταυρεία	Χολή ταύρου	
331	<i>Terebinthina communis, Pinus sylvestris et Pinus maritime</i>	Τερεβινθίνη		
332	<i>Terebinthinae oleum</i>	Έλαιον τερμίνθινον		
333	<i>Terebinthina larinica, Pinus larix</i>	Λάριξ		
334	<i>Terebinthina pistacina, Pistacia terebinthus</i>	Τερεβινθίνη χία		
335	<i>Tiliae flores, Tilia europaea</i>	Φιλύρας άνθος	Τίλια	
336	<i>Tormentillae radix, Tormentillae recta</i>	Επταφύλλου ρίζα	Τορμαντίλλα	Μπιστόρτα
337	<i>Toxicodendri folia, Rhus toxicodendron</i>	Τοξικοδένδρου φύλλα		
338	<i>Tragacanthae gummi, Astragalus aristatus</i>	Τραγακάνθης κόμμι	Τραγακάνθη	
339	<i>Trifolii fibrin herba, Menyanthes trifoliata</i>	Μηνυανθούς πόα	Τριφύλλη	Τριφύλλι
340	<i>Tritici furfures, Triticum hybernum et Triticum turgidum</i>	Πίτυρα του σίτου		
341	<i>Ulmi cortex, Ulmus campestris</i>	Πτέλεας φλοιός		

342	<i>Urticae folia,</i> <i>Urtica pilulifera</i>	Κνίδης φύλλα		Τζηκνίδα
343	<i>Uvaeursi folia,</i> <i>Arbutus unvaursi</i>	Αρκτοκομάρου φύλλα	Ούβα ούρος	
344	<i>Valerianae radix,</i> <i>Valeriana sylvestris</i>	Νάρδου της αγρίας (φου) ρίζα	Βαλεριάνα του λόγγκου	
345	<i>Vanilla, Vanilla aromatica</i>	Βανίλλη		
346	<i>Veratrinum</i>	Φθειράρχιον		
347	<i>Verbasci flores,</i> <i>Verbascum thapsus et</i> <i>Verbascum thapsi forme</i>	Φλόμου της θηλείας άνθος	Βερμπάσκουμ	Φλόμος
348	<i>Vinum, Vitis vinifera</i>	Οίνος		
349	<i>Violarum flores,</i> <i>Viola odorata</i>	Ίων άνθος	Βιόλα	Χαμοβιολέταις, Μενεξέδες
350	<i>Viscum album</i>	Ιξία	Βίσκουμ βερτζινούμ	Οξόν
351	<i>Zedoariae radix, Curcuma</i> <i>zedoaria, Curcuma</i> <i>zerumbet</i>	Ζάδερα	Τζεντοάρια	
352	<i>Zincum</i>	Ψευδάργυρος		
353	<i>Zincum sulphuricum</i> <i>crudum</i>	Θειϊκός ψευδάργυρος αγοραϊός		
354	<i>Zingiberis radix,</i> <i>Zingiber officinarum</i>	Ζεγγιβέρεως ρίζα	Τζιτζιβερ	

Note: In the original text, the character “æ” generally appears as “œ”, either by mistake or out of typographical necessity. This issue has been corrected where necessary.

Footnotes

¹ In most cases the author gives two and even three names for each substance.

² <https://www.wordreference.com/definition/stibium>.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A PUNISHER:
CONTROL MECHANISMS AND DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES.
THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ATHENS (1911–1940)

Angeliki Christodoulou, Vassilis Gkonis and Vangelis Karamanolakis

ABSTRACT: This article investigates the control mechanisms and practices of youth discipline in the twentieth century through the example of the archives of the University of Athens Disciplinary Board (1911–1940). The research extends from the introduction of the institution’s first set of regulations and the creation of the disciplinary board in 1911 up to 1940 and the beginning of World War II. The article starts with the assumption that control mechanisms and discipline practices do not remain constant over time; they change according to the spatial and temporal framework and the needs they serve at any given time. The basic working hypothesis is that their functioning and application within an educational institution are directly related to the behavioural patterns and values that the institution cultivated during its historical trajectory as well as to the complex and increasingly changing landscape of Greek society in the interwar period until 1940. At the same time, a comparison is attempted with similar examples to investigate the correlation between the disciplinary policy of the University of Athens and European and American universities.

The subject matter of this article is the investigation of the control mechanisms and the disciplinary practices concerning youth in the first half of the twentieth century by focusing on the example of the disciplinary board of the University of Athens (1911–1940).¹ Our research focuses on the investigation, documentation and study of the activity of the disciplinary board over a long period of circa 30 years by integrating it in the overall operation of the university and bringing forth its supervisory and remonstrative role.

Starting with the enactment of the first definite rules of procedure of the university in 1911 and the creation of the disciplinary board, our research extends chronologically to 1940 and Greece’s entry into World War II. The outbreak of

¹ This article was prepared within the framework of the 2014–2020 NSRF programme entitled “Support for researchers with an emphasis on new researchers: Second cycle”, for which our research team undertook the project “The University as Punisher: Control Mechanisms and Discipline Practices. The Disciplinary Board of the University of Athens (1911–1974).

the war signalled a new period for the disciplinary board, as is reflected in the change in legislation and in the proliferation of cases that were brought before it.

This article considers *a priori* that control mechanisms and disciplinary practices do not remain stable over time; rather, they change on the basis of the spatial and chronological framework within which they operate and also on the basis of the needs they serve at any given time. The basic working hypothesis is that their function and application within an educational institution are directly related to behavioural models and values that the institution itself cultivated over its historical course; moreover, they are also related to the complex and ever-changing political and social background of the Greek twentieth century.

We use a case study in order to generalise the results of the research and to connect them with broader questions regarding the constitution of Greek society in the twentieth century. Within this framework we formulated a series of research questions that allows us to understand the use and function of the notions of *control* and *discipline* and of the mechanisms and practices related to them in the university context.

In particular we look into the reasons and necessities that led to the formation of a special body in 1911, namely the disciplinary board, in order to supervise the *good order* of the university and the *orderly behaviour* of the students. Furthermore, we examine what the board considered transgressive behaviour, what constituted inappropriate student conduct that needed supervision and discipline during the various historical phases of the period under consideration, and, finally, we describe the function of the disciplinary board, its technology and the way in which it constituted its own repertory of procedures for dispensing justice and its own registry of disciplinary penalties.

The choice of our case study is not incidental. First and foremost it concerns the University of Athens, the first university founded in Greece and the country's only one until 1926. In addition to its academic and educational role, the university played a critical ideological role during the nineteenth and twentieth century through its significant contribution to the formation of dominant ideological currents while serving the needs of the community and contributed to social mobility. Through its discourse and practices, the university shaped the image of the male university student and, in the course of the twentieth century, of the female student as well;² it determined and normalised models of behaviour, values and mentalities that ought to characterise the student body.

The disciplinary board played a critical role in this direction, as it undertook to determine and oversee compliance with specific normative models, the

² The University of Athens admitted its first female student in 1890.

evaluation of misconduct or of aberrations and the rendition of penalties in a system that attempted to set an example within the university community. Moreover, all university employees – professors, teaching assistants and administrative personnel – fell under the jurisdiction of the disciplinary board.

This article aims to fill a bibliographic and research gap that exists in the pertinent bibliography. Most historical studies on the university that have been completed or are underway focus on its foundation, its departments, its course during significant historical events and its relation to the executive power. At the same time, relevant research concerning young people and especially male and female university students of the twentieth century usually focuses on their ideological disobedience and their political activism. This present study, however, attempts to bring forth a hitherto unknown segment of the university history, namely the university as *chastiser*; it also wishes to contribute to the discourse regarding the identity of the students over the course of a long historical period and shed light on the transformations it went through on the basis of political and social circumstances.

Both notions – *control* and *discipline* – have been the subject of multiple analyses from various cognitive fields, while a good part of the relevant bibliography pertains to young people.³ In our analysis, which is deeply influenced by the work of Michel Foucault, these two central notions are a constituent part of the study of power relations, which are viewed as a complex and historically determined phenomenon. Power is directly related to knowledge: there is no power relation without the construction of knowledge and there is no knowledge that does not presuppose and does not construct power relations.⁴ Within this framework, control and discipline are political technologies that determine formal institutions and, at the same time, shape the subjects who come into contact with these institutions.⁵ The state determines the mechanisms of control and enforcement of its power over the people, the content and the limits of which are redefined depending on historical circumstances. The necessity of discipline puts into motion a series of mechanisms, methods and techniques which characterise, classify, arrange, analyse, rank, assess and regulate relations and behaviours. Finally, the citizens themselves, in our case the student body, redefine and construct a series of

³ For example, see Barbara Grant, “Disciplining Students: The Construction of Student Subjectivities,” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 18, no. 1 (1997): 101–3.

⁴ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin, 1991), 138.

⁵ Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” in *Art after Modernism: Rethinking Representation*, ed. Brian Wallis (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1986), 420.

practices to respond to the control and discipline mechanisms through their actions and reactions.

The First Disciplinary Regulations in European Universities

The issue of student compliance with behavioural regulations preoccupied members of the university community from early on. During medieval times, university students in Europe did not have a good reputation. From the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, the student image was associated with nightlife, gambling, provocative and aggressive behaviour towards guild members and city authorities, while it was common practice for students to carry and use weapons. The University of Paris was considered an “international nest of sin” and promiscuity, a place which attracted immoral souls from all over the world. Similarly, in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Italy, university professors criticised the laziness and indifference of students towards their academic obligations, and condemned their inclination for promiscuity and luxurious living. Towards the end of the Middle Ages in the universities of the Holy Roman Empire, this criticism acquired another dimension, namely the disappointment in the failure of young students, who had spent their youth in the university and wasted their fathers’ money due to their derelict and indulging lifestyle while at the end the only gain obtained was to bring shame to their family.⁶

The reformation of the University of Paris in 1452 and the charter of Oxford University, the *statuta aularia*, in 1489 were breakthroughs in the legislative history of European universities. Gradually student life began to be regulated on a central level.⁷ The general charter of each university instituted rules for all its members, namely administrative personnel, professors, students and apprentices. In both colleges and dormitories the aim was not only to gain knowledge and methodology but also to acquire social skills and models of behaviour.⁸

In all European universities the notion of decent behaviour, the *Honeste se gerrere*, meant a series of strict orders-prohibitions regarding the appearance of students and their behaviour, their daily interactions, their leisure time and their social gatherings. In particular, the avoidance of women of *all kinds*,

⁶ Rainer Christoph Schwinges, “Student Education, Student Life,” in *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. 1, *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 223; Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in Medieval Culture* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1929), 1–35.

⁷ Schwinges, “Student Education,” 224.

⁸ Michael Benedict Hackett, *The Original Statutes of Cambridge University: The Text and its History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

both outside and especially inside the university, was obligatory. The second prohibition had to do with the use of guns, and particularly with carrying a gun in any meeting or class of the university and also during the night, so as to avoid clashes between students or between students and citizens. The third prohibition referred to the use of modern clothes while emphasis was laid upon simple attire, the so-called “academic wear”. A fourth behavioural trait that was prohibited in European universities was the verbal and factual insulting of fellow students and professors. What was at stake here was personal honour and, even more so, the avoidance of internal clashes. In the charter of the University of Prague, which represented a bridge between older and newer forms of university discipline, there was a catalogue of the most common types of verbal insult that incurred punishment. Moreover, the same charter contained a particular paragraph regarding body injuries that incurred stricter forms of punishment, which influenced to a great extent the charter of many German universities.⁹ In addition to these prohibitions there was a plethora of further regulations which took on a different character in the various universities.

University rules were often violated and universities reacted by imposing sanctions. Every charter included strict orders and prohibitions and was also followed by a specially expressed warning of punishment. It was the duty of those in charge of the universities to ensure that rules were observed everywhere and that violators were found and punished. Universities could impose fines, the amount of which depended on the number and severity of misdeeds, while in more serious cases the culprit was confined to jail or “was excluded”; the latter meant he lost the important protection of university benefits. In Paris, and also in German universities, stricter penalties were imposed on poorer students, who could be expelled more swiftly than wealthier classmates.¹⁰

Up to the French Revolution European universities were organised in a similar way and many of the disciplinary structures of the medieval period and early modern times survived into the nineteenth century.¹¹ There was no distinction between academic and social or moral behaviour, while discipline was paternalistic and strict. The “systems” used for handling discipline were simple and immediate. Students who violated any of the numerous rules that controlled almost all their movements or actions were punished either by their professor or by the president of the college.

⁹ Schwinges, “Student Education,” 225.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 227–28.

¹¹ Walter Rüegg, ed., *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. 1, *Universities in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 6.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century a liberalising tendency emerged in German-speaking universities regarding disciplinary policies. Even though the medieval practice of imprisoning disorderly students was maintained, in the course of time this particular punishment did not retain its initial harsh character, but rather turned into a title of honour for those students who were led into the campus prison.¹² The upgrading of the institution of rector in every university was a considerable breakthrough for the disciplinary system of German universities. From now on rectors acted as *in loco parentis*, namely as “legal guardians” of students, and were responsible for student behaviour in accordance with the rule of decent conduct, the famous *Honeste se gerrere*. In this way presidents and professors were no longer occupied with issues of student discipline on a daily basis. This development was an impetus for the creation of a more modern system of student discipline.

The Greek University Case

The University of Athens was founded in December 1836 on the basis of a royal decree issued by Count Armanberg, chief secretary of King Othon. The foundation of the university in the capital of the new state was part of a wider plan of the new dynasty and constituted the capstone of an educational system that aimed to provide staff for the public and private sectors. The Othonian University, named in honour of its founder, marked the establishment of the first higher education institution not only in the newly established Kingdom of Greece, but also in the Balkans and in the Eastern Mediterranean as a whole.¹³

¹² Towards the end of the nineteenth century, imprisoned students would woo their fellow students to meetings/parties inside the campus prison with alcohol. In German universities prisons were abolished shortly before World War I and today they are tourist attractions in many cities. Mark Twain, *A Tramp Abroad* (London: Penguin, 1998); Carolyn J. Mooney, “Notes from Academe: Germany. Slammer or Shrine? How German Students Left Their Mark on the Walls of a Campus Prison,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1 March 1996): A 55.

¹³ For the history of higher education in Greece and the University of Athens during that period, see Kostas Papapanos, *Χρονικό-Ιστορία της ανωτάτης μας εκπαίδευσης* (Athens: Pierce College, 1970). See also Kostas Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές στην Ελλάδα κατά τον 19ο αιώνα* (Athens: Historical Archive of Greek Youth; Institute for Neohellenic Research of the Hellenic National Research Foundation, 2004); Chaido Barkoula, Kostas Gavroglu and Vangelis Karamanolakis, *Ιστορία του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών 1837–1937* (Iraklion: Crete University Press, 2014).

The December 1836 decree also included the regulations of the future university,¹⁴ a series of provisions concerning student conduct which were mostly copied from German university rules. Students were obliged to pay due respect to university professors and also to state employees and the police. Assemblies and demonstrations were prohibited as were the gathering of petitions, gun possession, the posting of documents without a permit, acting, travelling outside the city without a permit, and duelling. Students also had to declare in writing that they were not members of any secret society.

The surveillance of the diligence, morality and religious conduct of the students was part of the duties of the rector and senate. As regards the penalties, the rector could impose the penalty of scolding either in private or public, custody and incarceration, while the senate was in charge of more serious penalties, such as issuing a warning of suspension, suspension and, finally, expulsion. In the case of expulsion the student was “condemned on a blackboard” and his punishment was announced to his legal guardians and foreign universities. Any student under disciplinary investigation was not allowed to spend a night outside the city without the permission of the rector until the investigation was completed. Whoever attempted to leave the city was threatened with expulsion.

This first regulation was immediately criticised by the press for being a direct copy of foreign models that was uncritically applied to Greek reality. In particular the provisions regarding student conduct were a direct copy of the equivalent Bavarian student regulations issued in 1827,¹⁵ which aimed to restrict student activity connected with the liberal movements of the period and the demand for the unification of the German states. The fear of what was taking place in German-speaking areas, which greatly influenced the authors of the Bavarian regulations, is reflected in the Greek text.

Nevertheless, the regulation was never implemented. The overall conflict between Othon and Armansperg, and the dismissal of the latter, led to the annulment of the royal decree and the issuing of another, in April 1837, in the name of the king himself.¹⁶ The new regulation was considerably shorter. While

¹⁴ “Διάταγμα περί συστάσεως πανεπιστημίου,” *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως* (ΦΕΚ), no. 86Α, 31 December 1836 [henceforth 1836 Regulation]. Also see Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές*, 82–86.

¹⁵ “Satzungen für die Studierenden an den Hochschulen des Königreichs Bayern (26 November 1827),” in G. Döllinger, *Sammlung der im Gebiet der inneren Staats-Verwaltung des Königreichs Bayern bestehenden Verordnungen, aus den amtlichen Quellen geschöpft und systematisch geordnet*, vol. 9 (Munich: s.n., 1838), 254–70; see Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές*, 83.

¹⁶ “Διάταγμα περί συστάσεως πανεπιστημίου” and “Διάταγμα περί προσωρινού κανονισμού του εν Αθήναις συσταθησομένου πανεπιστημίου,” ΦΕΚ, no. 16, 24 April 1837 (henceforth 1837 Regulation).

it continued to follow the German university prototype, it differed considerably especially as regards the disciplinary policy of the institution. The list of prohibited activities was reduced and the policing of student life was scaled back.

According to the regulation, the rector had to keep watch on the students and especially those from the provinces or from abroad and had to notify their relatives whenever they deviated from “the path of virtue and decency”. For this reason he had to know the social circle of the students. During classes, professors were responsible for student conduct. In cases of student misbehaviour, the rector could inflict the penalty of reprimand either in private or before the university council and also order the 24-hour detention of the student. More severe penalties, such as a four-week detention or final expulsion from the university were imposed by the senate upon approval from the Education Ministry.¹⁷ The 1837 regulation, which was clearly more lenient than the previous one, did not define the boundaries of student activities nor the quality of the offences. University students had to pay due respect and obedience to the rector and senate, which were responsible for the surveillance of their diligence, religious conduct and moral values; they were also obliged to live a decent life in agreement with the ethical values and the laws of the state.

This first regulation of the university was retained for 74 years, until 1911. During this period many bills concerning the reorganisation of the university were drafted, yet not a single one was ever passed. During this period the rector and senate decided on the penalties for students engaging in any sort of unlawful conduct, whether it concerned moral matters or was connected to active, mainly nationalist, student movements. The earliest proposal for the establishment of a disciplinary board can be found in pertinent bills drafted at the end of the nineteenth century. One 1896 bill foresaw a disciplinary board that would police the university and also proposed stricter control of student conduct and the suppression of “deviations” from the academic order. In the same spirit, but even stricter, was a bill of 1899 that drafted provisions for students that did not attend class regularly and a registry of disciplinary penalties for predetermined student deviations. The most noteworthy of the proposed penalties was the collective penalty (loss of a semester or a year) for all students of a department or all departments who obstructed lectures or were involved in “rebellious movements”.¹⁸

¹⁷ Articles 29 and 31, 1837 Regulation.

¹⁸ See Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές*, 293–94; Sifis Bouzakis, *Η Πανεπιστημιακή εκπαίδευση στην Ελλάδα (1836–2005): Τεκμήρια ιστορίας*, vol. 1, 1836–1925 (Athens: Gutenberg, 2006), 295–97.

A New Institution: The Disciplinary Board, 1911–1922

The disciplinary board was finally instituted by the 1911 regulation, which was introduced by the new government of Eleftherios Venizelos¹⁹ in the context of a wider legislative change in education and the overall state administration. In 1909, a military movement, the so-called Goudi coup, called for the reformation of public life and the recovery of the country after the defeat in the Greek–Turkish War of 1897. This resulted in the extensive cleansing of the state administration, including the teaching staff of the country's sole university. In 1911 the voting of a new regulation that aimed at the modernisation and Europeanisation of higher education signalled the beginning of a new era for the university.

The new regulation expressed a rule of academic conduct that was maintained in future regulations as well. In particular there was the provision that a student, who was considered an adult for his university obligations, would be faced with disciplinary penalties if he broke the law or the decisions of the senate, if he acted in a way that insulted the dignity of the university or the honour and dignity of his fellow students, if he did not pay due respect to university authorities or the teaching staff, if he disturbed peace and order in the university premises and in general if he behaved in a way that was not consistent with student dignity.²⁰

In accordance with the regulation, a special body was established, the disciplinary board, consisting of 11 members who served a three-year term: the rector, who had the chair, and two professors from each school (Theology, Law, Medicine, Philosophy, Physics and Mathematics). The regulation defined the penalties that could be inflicted by the university authorities in the following order: reprimand by the rector, reprimand by the disciplinary board and the senate, a written warning of expulsion, suspension ranging from 3 months to 2 years and, finally, permanent expulsion. Moreover, even though the regulation recognised the right of assembly upon prior approval, it nevertheless prohibited any student gathering at the university entrance (Propylaea) and any other university premises. At the same time a disciplinary board was also established for teaching staff. It consisted of the members of the senate and six members of the Supreme Court of Greece.

The boundaries of the jurisdiction between the rector and the rest of the members of the disciplinary board were set down at its first meeting in December

¹⁹ Law 3823, "Περί Οργανισμού του Εθνικού Πανεπιστημίου," *ΦΕΚ*, no. 178, 12 July 1911, and Law 3825 "Περί Καποδιστριακού Πανεπιστημίου," *ΦΕΚ*, no. 183, 17 July 1911 (henceforth 1911 Regulation). It is essentially the same regulation that also refers to the students.

²⁰ Article 12, 1911 Regulation.

1911. The lighter penalties (reprimand) were imposed by the rector, while more serious penalties (warning of suspension, temporary or permanent expulsion) were imposed by the disciplinary board. During the period 1911–1922 four disciplinary boards were appointed, each serving a three-year term, while members were replaced during each three-year term of office. There was no set frequency of meetings; the board convened when there were grievances and offences to deal with. During this period, lighter incidents, such as reports of student disobedience or mischief, were examined in a single session and usually incurred the penalty of immediate reprimand. There were some instances, however, such as the one that took place in 1920 when a case occupied consecutive meetings of the board; it concerned 17 students from the School of Dentistry who participated in a strike against one of their professors. The Board convened five times exclusively to deal with this case.²¹

According to the minutes of the meetings, it appears that from 1911 to 1921²² the disciplinary board had to decide on 24 cases. In their majority (19), the cases dealt with student issues that did not all have the same weight. Most common cases (14) concerned individual students and referred to mischief during class or exams (copying, falsification and forgery) and to disrespectful conduct (smoking in university premises, noise or fights during class, swearing at fellow students or professors). There were, however, five cases which took on wider dimensions. Students, either individually or in groups, were brought before the disciplinary board because they were actively involved in student movements and in student organisations; in two cases the movements had a political dimension.

The disciplinary board also had to deal with issues of a moral nature and of the conduct of students outside the university. The five pertinent cases referred to legal transgressions, financial matters and jokes or insults that were not in accordance with appropriate student conduct, as defined by the university authorities.

Even though the establishment of the disciplinary board in 1911 was considered a necessary measure for modernising the university and overseeing the student body, the evidence of the disciplinary cases recorded show that it dealt with a limited number of transgression cases. From 1911 to 1922, when

²¹ See meetings of 28 and 29 January, and 1, 4 and 5 February 1921, Historical Archive of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (HA NKUA), Proceedings of the Disciplinary Board, 1911–1922. The referral to the board was caused by the discontent of students with a Dentistry School professor, Lykourgos Kokkoris, which led them to a strike in December 1920, a disruption of the class and the constitution of a students' committee that delivered a resolution to the Education Ministry demanding the replacement of the professor.

²² Except for the years 1914–1917, for which no proceedings have been found.

more than 14,000 students were enrolled in the university,²³ only 52 students were brought before the disciplinary board to answer for their actions. The activation of the disciplinary mechanisms concerned mostly the activities of male students. The six female students that had to face the board were all students of the School of Dentistry; accused of involvement in the 1920 strike, they were cleared of the charges, however.²⁴

The treatment of the offences depended on their severity, the opinion of the board members, the presumption of guilt or innocence, outside interference, social conditions, the presence of witnesses and the extent of repentance of the student. The legislative intention was for the board to operate as a mechanism that would hand down penalties to students who misbehaved, which would prevent the occurrence of similar incidents. In any case, we know that of the 24 cases that were brought before it, the board only imposed severe penalties on five students (a three-month suspension for two students, a six-month suspension for two students and a year-long suspension for one student). In one case all implicated students were punished with a written warning of permanent expulsion in the case of recurrence. In all the other recorded incidents of disobedience or misbehaviour the board issued a reprimand, always using the term “judged with leniency.” In the early years, the members of the board did not operate as judges, but rather as instructors choosing to counsel rather than condemn.

From Abolition to Reestablishment, 1922–1932

A decade later, in 1922, a new regulation²⁵ abolished the disciplinary board for students but retained it for teaching staff. The reasons for this change are unclear. It is probable that due to the low frequency and severity of incidents, the student-focused one was not deemed necessary; cases could be handled adequately by existing university bodies. It is also possible that professors, who were preoccupied with various responsibilities (teaching, research, management of clinics and labs, and administrative positions), were not willing to undertake the responsibilities of yet another university body; even more so because the disciplinary board had the onerous duty of punishing students, an unpleasant activity that disturbed the relationship between professors and students. In any

²³ Barkoula, Gavroglu and Karamanolakis, *Ιστορία του Πανεπιστημίου*, 238–39.

²⁴ HA NKUA, Proceedings of the Disciplinary Board, 1911–1922, session of 5 February 1921.

²⁵ Law 2905, “Περί οργανισμού του Αθήνησιν Εθνικού και Καποδιστριακού Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 127, 27 July 1922 (henceforth 1922 Regulation).

case, the responsibility for student punishment returned to university authorities, either the rector or the senate depending on the incident and the severity of penalties. The senate dealt with the more severe offences. As regards the code of student conduct, there were no major differentiations from the previous 1911 regulation.²⁶ At the same time the prerequisites for the operation of student unions were set out. In order for a union to be recognised it had to have legal status (an approved statute) and the approval of the rector. If any union deviated from its goals, the senate had the right to dissolve it.²⁷

The revocation of the disciplinary board for students did not last for long. Seven years later, in 1929, the new Venizelos government decided on its reinstatement, reconstituting it in the new university regulation of 1932.²⁸ The occasion for this was a strike, but the real cause was the fear of a new enemy: communism.

The strike, which broke out in November 1929, mainly concerned student matters. It was an unprecedented event in the history of the university since the large-scale participation and determination of the strikers led the senate to shut down the university and allow the police to establish itself in the university premises. At the same time there were violent and cruel incidents during student demonstrations as well as arrests and convictions of students who “defamed” the government in public opinion. Most importantly, however, the authorities considered that the strike was instigated by communist students who participated in the strike committees. On this basis, both the government and the university decided to reinstitute the disciplinary board.

Already from the mid-1920s there was information and indications that communist students were to some extent operating in the university.²⁹ In order to handle this situation, the university proceeded with a series of measures that were mainly paternalistic in character. The need to “protect” the student body and to control the management of their leisure time contributed to the creation of the University Club.³⁰

²⁶ Articles 149–51, 1922 Regulation.

²⁷ Articles 157–60, 1922 Regulation.

²⁸ Law 5343, “Περί οργανισμού του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών,” *ΦΕΚ*, no. 86Α, 23 March 1932 (henceforth 1932 Regulation).

²⁹ Communist student organisations were already noted in 1921. See Angeliki Christodoulou, “Από τον Πάγκαλο στον Βενιζέλο: Κομμουνιστικό κίνημα και αντικομμουνισμός στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών (1926-1928)” (Master’s thesis, Panteion University, 2007).

³⁰ The University Club was established in 1922 in collaboration with the Young Men’s Christian Association. See Despina Farfaratzi, “Ίδρυση, δομές και λειτουργία Πανεπιστημιακής Λέσχης” (Master’s thesis, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2014).

In March 1927 the Education Ministry issued a confidential circular to all public educational institutions recommending the strict monitoring of every pro-communist motion within the student body and proposing the organisation of lectures against communism.³¹ In 1925–1926 the rector, having contacted other European universities, proposed to adopt the practice of Oxford University, namely to require enrolling students to declare in writing that they were not communists.³² In October 1927 the rector distributed to all university schools multiple copies of the book *Ο Κομμουνισμός εν τη πράξει*, written by the anti-communism theorist Georgios Fessopoulos, for use by students.³³

The campaign against communist ideas did not only preoccupy the state and the rectors. In reaction to the great student strike of 1929, the university authorities encouraged the establishment of the National Student Association, a conservative student body that came into systematic conflict with left organisations and later leaned towards fascism.³⁴ At the same time many professors would summon students to their office to advise them against communist ideas. This mentality did not only reflect the conservative ideology of the teaching and the administrative staff of the university, but also their multifaceted close contact with the state apparatus.

If paternalism was one side of the coin, control and repression through the establishment of the disciplinary board was the other. In this regard, the university and state were close accomplices. Moreover, 1929, when the reinstatement of the disciplinary board was decided, was also a milestone year for anti-communist policies in Greece. In June 1929, MPs voted in Law 4229/1929. Known as the *Ιδιώνυμο*; the law not only deemed communist actions, but also communist ideology, as criminal deeds that constituted a particularly dangerous *internal enemy*.³⁵

³¹ “Εκστρατεία κατά του κομμουνισμού. Μέτρα του Υπουργείου της Παιδείας,” *Ριζοσπάστης*, 23 March 1927.

³² Simos Menardos, *Έκθεσις των επί της Πρυτανείας αυτού κατά το έτος 1925–1926 πεπραγμένων* (Athens: s.n., 1930), 11.

³³ “Η νέα επιστήμη,” *Ριζοσπάστης*, 2 October 1927. Fessopoulos was a retired army major general who had served as director of the Special Security Agency.

³⁴ For the National Students Association, see Giorgos Giannaris, *Φοιτητικά κινήματα και ελληνική παιδεία*, vol. 1 (Athens: Pontiki, 1993), 424 and passim.

³⁵ See Neni Panourgia, *Dangerous Citizens: The Greek Left and the Terror of the State* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2009).

How extensive was the phenomenon of communist activity and its repression? The general archive of the University of Athens³⁶ for the period 1922–1932 contains written reports, complaints and official correspondence concerning 84 male and female students who were members of 6 different student unions suspected of communist ideas. Most of them were referred to the senate at least once; 7 male students and 1 female student were suspended for a specific time period, while 8 male students and 1 female student were permanently expelled.

The appearance of *subversive* ideas and the way they were treated constituted a new phenomenon in higher education and concerned university authorities in a systematic way in the 1920s. Yet, in everyday life there were other incidents of “disobedience” that disturbed the “good order” of the university which activated its supervisory mechanisms. In addition to the incidents of student offences and inappropriate conduct of individual students³⁷ that were also present in the previous period, a new phenomenon emerged: the collective prosecution and punishment in response to growing and increasingly dynamic student unionisation. This is due to two main reasons: on the one hand student movements in the 1920s became more demanding and had the support of the emerging left-wing unionism. These demands arose because of the inability of the university to provide the required infrastructure for the increasing number of students. On the other hand, there was an upsurge in the number of student unions (departmental, local, scientific, cultural, etc., as well as political groups), some of which operated on the fringes of the law as set by the university regulation. Whenever needed, the disciplinary mechanisms dealt with this new phenomenon of a multifaceted student presence and student demands with mass appeal: the university authorities issued notices to the governing boards of student unions to answer charges against them either on the basis that they did not have an approved charter or that they deviated from their original goal; notices were also delivered to members of strike committees for organising mass

³⁶ The Protocol Archive, preserved in the HA NKUA, contains all departmental correspondence with other institutions and persons as well as the interdepartmental correspondence of the university along with applications, annotations reports, essays, decisions of bodies, etc.

³⁷ On the basis of the documents preserved in the HA NKUA we infer that university authorities dealt with the cases of 73 students. They concerned educational wrongdoings and inappropriate conduct within the university premises. From what we can tell, the most serious of these offences (identity fraud, forgery of documents) were punished with suspension for 1 or 2 years (4 students), while lighter offences (disrespectful conduct towards a professor or a fellow student, disruption of class, smoking, etc) ended in a reprimand.

movements and to students who played a leading role in demonstrations. In order to control the collegial student bodies, university authorities found allies outside the university.

The interwar period witnessed an intensification of the exchange of information with the state apparatus (police, ministries, courts and the army) regarding student conduct and actions. For example, in November 1928 the rector submitted a request to the public prosecutor's office requesting that he be notified about any criminal charges or indictments against students so that the university could take the necessary disciplinary measures.³⁸ Even though there is insufficient data for the 1922–1932 period regarding the outcome in all cases, nevertheless there are reports and denunciations for 22 incidents that the rector and senate had to deal with: unapproved student gatherings, instances of violence during strikes, and violations of unions. Concerning the latter a characteristic example is the referral to the disciplinary board of the entire governing body of the Students' Community (Φοιτητική Συντροφιά), which, established in 1910, was the first student association to support the use of the demotic language. The rationale behind its referral was that its charter had not been approved by the rector. In reality its indictment was due to its support for demotic, as the early demotic movement at the time was considered to be linked to communism.

Finally, the university's disciplinary mechanisms also monitored student offences that had to do with moral issues and decent conduct outside the university. A total of 21 such cases were registered, following complaints from citizens; they involved 31 male students and may be characterised as "misdemeanours" (improper conduct, financial debts, clashes, disturbing the peace, card playing, drinking); some, however, were more serious (harassment, seduction, robbery, burglary and embezzlement). The usual practice on the part of the university authorities was to summon the students in order to issue them with some advice and a reprimand and, depending on the severity of the offence and the student's repentance, to apply the foreseen penalties. In the process of monitoring and punishing students, the university authorities took the charges into serious consideration, especially when they were came from the state authorities. At the same time, however, they sought to protect the prestige of their institution. On 9 April 1928 the rector filed a complaint to the chief of police that four students who had been arrested by a police lieutenant for disturbing the peace were detained for 24 hours, having previously been humiliated in the street by the lieutenant. The rector considered that this treatment of students was not appropriate since, in the civilised world, students should enjoy the high esteem

³⁸ HA NKUA, Protocol Archive, file 474.4.

of society and the authorities. He maintained that the lieutenant should have simply reported the incident to the university authorities because disciplinary punishment would have been more effective than public humiliation. Finally, the students were summoned to appear before the general secretariat of the university and a few days later the city police department issued a circular to police stations instructing them that when students were arrested for minor misdemeanours they should not be brought to court but rather be reported to the university authorities.³⁹

In 1926, a few years after the annexation of Macedonia by the Greek state following the Balkan Wars, the country's second university was established in Thessaloniki. The spate of student movements that emerged following its foundation led the rector and senate to adopt equally strict disciplinary measures to those implemented in the University of Athens, namely the imposition of very austere penalties ranging from suspension to expulsion.⁴⁰ After 1929, university legislation at the University of Thessaloniki foresaw specific procedures for the organisation of students, their representation, the establishment of student unions, the holding of student assemblies, the invitation to events, etc.; all these could only take place upon prior approval of the rector and fell under his supervision. At the same time a very austere penalty system was imposed, which ranged from a simple reprimand to expulsion from the university. In addition, a personnel file was kept on every single student.⁴¹

1932–1940: From Reinstitution to World War II

The University of Athens disciplinary board was legally reconstituted in accordance with the 1932 regulation, which determined the structure and operation of the university for the following 50 years. Its reinstitution was due to the Venizelos government, which introduced legislation for universities as it had done in 1911. The new university body differed from its predecessors in three ways. The first was in terms of its composition: it consisted of five full professors, who served a three-year term, and one elected professor from each school. The rector no longer participated, while the most senior professor chaired the board. The board convened in the senate hall, thus bestowing additional weight on the disciplinary process. Its nature was the second differing characteristic: for

³⁹ HA NKUA, Protocol Archive, file 470.4.

⁴⁰ Dimitris Mavroskoufis, *Τα “Προοδευτικά Ζιζάνια” του Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: Από τον αντικομμουνισμό του Μεσοπολέμου στον μακαρθισμό του Εμφυλίου* (Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2021), 75.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 74–76.

the first time there was a specific procedure, which resembled a court trial. The meetings of the meetings demonstrate that legal terminology was used at them. Depending on the case, there were provisions for questioning by the rapporteur, the presentation of evidence, the presence of witnesses and lawyers (they attended in five cases) and the use of information from the “personal file” of the student. The third difference was that the aim of the board changed: in accordance with the new university regulation new indictments and sentences were established in cooperation with the state apparatus. According to Article 121, students could be permanently expelled from the university following a definite conviction in the criminal courts or on the basis of the *Ιδιώνυμο* law of 1929. The inclusion of the *Ιδιώνυμο* in the provisions of the disciplinary board enabled the university authorities to apply in full the anti-communist practices, which democratic-liberal professors sometimes opposed. These new regulations gave a new meaning to the notions of *improper conduct* and *disobedience*⁴² and put the disciplinary practices that were already in use from the 1920s on a legal footing. The treatment of what could be termed a political offence became gradually harsher and reached a peak under Metaxas; a dictatorship of a clearly anti-communist nature⁴³ that was in ideological conversation with the interwar Fascist and Nazi regimes.

From 1932 to 1940, the disciplinary board was renewed three times, each serving a three-year term, and dealt with over 200 cases involving about 340 students of both sexes, either in single or multiple meetings. A total of 25 female students appeared before the board. While this number may seem small, female representation in higher education was very low. Taking into account that 7 of the 25 female students were accused of communist activity inside the university, it becomes clear that women had a dynamic presence in student movements.

A central target of the disciplinary board were incidents of infringement of university laws or of *not paying due respect to university authorities and the teaching staff*. The board dealt with cases of lesser or greater importance in every session. In 64 cases, 48 were individual infringements involving 67 students of both sexes. The incidents mostly related to wrongdoings during the course of classes and exams, and also to improper conduct towards the teaching or

⁴² According to article 120 of the regulation, a disciplinary penalty is imposed on students if “he behaves in a way that offends the founding principles of the state”.

⁴³ During the dictatorship arrests and prosecutions of communist citizens, including university students, were systematically published in daily newspapers; the statements of repentance were also published. See, for example, the articles in *Ελεύθερον Βήμα* (5 and 6 May 1938), relating to the arrest of leading communist members and of seven male students and one female student who were members of the Anti-Dictatorship Youth Front.

administrative staff or towards their fellow students. Typical for wrongdoings of this sort was for the case to be referred quickly and for there to be an immediate decision, usually taken in one meeting. It is likely that the board considered such incidents to be “internal” affairs; professors, being members of the board, were experienced in dealing with student issues and did not have to gather evidence and proof from outside sources, thus making the whole process very expeditious. Under the Metaxas dictatorship there was a slight increase in similar cases⁴⁴ while the penalties became stricter. As we shall see below, this differentiation can be viewed as a small sample of the overall turn of the board towards a more austere policy that was influenced by political conditions of the time.

During this period the disciplinary board was called upon to deal with infringements that took place outside the university premises that damaged the image of the *honour and decency of the student*. They mostly involved individual incidents relating to matters of honour, financial debts, breach of promise, harassment, improper conduct towards fellow citizens, card playing, etc. These cases were brought before the disciplinary board on the strength of complaints and some also ended up before the courts. The punishment inflicted by such an important institution in the eyes of Greek society offered justice to the offended citizens. Moreover, even though the university considered the students to be adults, there was, nevertheless, a paternalistic mentality stemming from their perception that their wrongdoings within the institution could damage its prestige. However, the disciplinary board found it difficult to deal with such incidents as they took place outside the university and often there was not enough proof to support the charges. Thus, in half of the relevant cases of the period (15 out of 30) the students were acquitted or freed of the charge due to insufficient evidence. In 1938, when there were a series of charges from hotel and restaurant owners about student debts, the board decided to hand over the reports to the chairman of the board of directors of the University Club in order for him to summon the students and advise them to pay off what they owed; this was probably done in order to relieve the disciplinary board of some pressure.⁴⁵ The club had its own disciplinary apparatus. A year later, in 1939, the board changed tactics: it decided that in cases of debt it did not have any jurisdiction to prosecute students if the charge did not include a transgression against student decency and duties.

⁴⁴ There were 35 referrals, as opposed to 29 in the previous period (1932–1936).

⁴⁵ HA NKUA, Proceedings of the Disciplinary Board of Students [1932–1940], meetings of 1 and 29 October 1938.

During the same period, in addition to the usual student misdemeanours, the board had to deal with 95 incidents related either to group or individual charges of communist activity. A total of 137 students were brought before the body more than once and the frequency of these cases rose during the Metaxas dictatorship. In 11 cases the students were cleared of the charge or acquitted due to doubts, 9 students received disciplinary punishment of the first degree or their case was reassessed and were reprimanded by the senate; in 117 cases suspensions were imposed ranging from 15 days to 2 academic years, 4 students were permanently expelled while 3 students who were initially expelled later had their punishment reduced. In its fight against the “internal enemy” the university had the state apparatus at its side: the Ministry of Public Security, local prefectures, military units and, during the Metaxas dictatorship, the Directorate of Special Security⁴⁶ sent reports to the university concerning the activity of suspect students.

The university disciplinary mechanism functioned both independently of and in parallel with the state authorities. It should be noted that its disciplinary board had been instituted to deal exclusively with transgressive student behaviour related to the institution. Thus in 1934, in a report submitted by the Education Ministry and the Gendarmerie headquarters on communist students, the disciplinary board ruled that it could not proceed with any disciplinary prosecution since the students had not violated any university rules.⁴⁷ On the basis of the numbers mentioned above, it is clear that in a university which numbered 8,000–10,000 students, those prosecuted for their communist ideas were very few in number, representing a small minority indeed. In view of these figures, what was the reason for this great fear, which was not confined to the university? The enactment of the *Ιδιώνυμο* law, especially given that the liberal Venizelos government was behind it, demonstrated the fear the emerging student movement, which had as its point of reference the October Revolution and the establishment of the USSR and which addressed not only students but also the working class and the peasantry, could generate. From the 1930s, anti-communism became the state ideology and led to the establishment of related control and repressive mechanisms. The university undertook a central role in this anti-communist campaign. This was not an exclusively Greek phenomenon. A survey of Europe in the interwar period shows that this also occurred elsewhere. At the height of the first “Red Scare” (1919–1939), anti-communist discourse argued that any member of a communist party was actually

⁴⁶ The Directorate of Special Security was a special division of the Hellenic Gendarmerie originally established in 1929 in order to break up communist organisations. During the German occupation, it collaborated with the Nazis and remained active until 1944.

⁴⁷ Proceedings of the Disciplinary Board, 22nd session, 22 June 1934.

a disciplined agent of the USSR, under the direction of the Comintern, which advocated revolutionary violence. In Fascist Italy in the 1920s, the political supervision of universities was marked by previously unknown sanctions against left-wing students, who in various ways had shown their hostility to the regime. However, it was mostly Jewish students who were expelled and banned from any academic or cultural institution after the racial laws of 1938.⁴⁸ After the Nazi seizure of power in Germany in 1933, all communist students were expelled from university institutes during the purge of alleged Marxist student leaders.⁴⁹ In Spain, from the beginning of the civil war (1936–1939) and also after the victory of the monarchists, many communist and liberal students were forced to drop out of colleges.⁵⁰ In Poland, in 1937 and 1938, police and government actions targeted left-wing students.⁵¹ And in the United States becoming a communist, or a political radical of any type, was a risky business throughout the interwar period. Communist students in US universities were not completely secure and there were a number of expulsions during the 1930s.⁵² By the 1940s, men and women who belonged to the communist party were no longer welcome in US universities.⁵³

In the Greek case, the influence of communist students was far greater than their actual numbers. It was mainly these students, and not the official collegiate organisations, who mobilised in support of student demands. University authorities feared a potential increase in their influence in a period when there were many changes in the profile of the university. The significant rise in the number of registered students (8,000–10,000) during the interwar period and the multiple problems that existed due to the high cost of studies and the lack of the necessary infrastructure, but also problems relating to living conditions and future employment opportunities, as well as students' young age, increased the

⁴⁸ Ruth Ben-Ghiat, "Italian Universities under Fascism," in *Universities Under Dictatorship*, ed. John Connelly and Michael Grütner (University Park: Penn State Press, 2005), 67.

⁴⁹ Giles Geoffrey, *Students and National Socialism in Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 149.

⁵⁰ Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer, "Spanish Universities Under Franco," in Connelly and Grütner, *Universities Under Dictatorship*, 189; Sergio Rodríguez Tejada, "The Anti-Franco Student Movement's Contribution to the Return of Democracy in Spain," *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación* 2, no. 2 (2015): 81.

⁵¹ Lieve Gevers and Louis Vos, "Student Movements," in *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. 3, *Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945)*, ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 352.

⁵² Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 74.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 24.

fear of the university authorities and of the state that the communist Left would recruit masses of students. The imposition of penalties on communist students had a double aim: to expel those involved and to set an example for the rest.

From 1938 to 1940 in particular, students were exiled by the regime and were also punished by the disciplinary board, by being either suspended for a year or expelled outright. Students penalised with expulsion for subversive pro-communist activity could avoid the penalty by signing a written declaration of repentance, in other words, a document renouncing communist ideas. The Metaxas regime used these repentance forms widely. Yet, even before the 4 August dictatorship, the university's disciplinary mechanisms used an early version of a repentance form so students could reduce or even avoid their penalty; this form may be considered an early version of the declaration of repentance.⁵⁴ Students who declared their repentance declaration could return to their studies while those who refused to do so were permanently expelled. Although the *Ιδιώνυμο* law equipped the disciplinary board with powers to expel students who were involved in subversive ideas, it appears that it did not seek to expel students permanently from the academic community but rather to reform them.

On the whole, the presence and the attitude of the students in question were decisive for the outcome of their case. In cases that were heard in absentia, the penalties imposed were heavier, probably because the absence of the student was considered an act of disrespect for the disciplinary procedure. In those cases where the defendant was present, showed repentance and pleaded for leniency, the penalty was lighter than that provided for. The presence of defence witnesses, especially if they enjoyed some social prestige, contributed to a more favourable decision. In a 1937 case involving a student who was charged with communist activity by the Directorate of Special Security, an archimandrite showed up in his defence, testifying that he was a good Christian and a communicant.

In general, rectorate authorities feared collective protests because they considered that they empowered left-wing students and because they generally disturbed the good order of the university. The undertaking of collective initiatives for student matters on the part of students (protests, strikes, etc.) was considered a serious disciplinary matter. For this reason, in many instances the disciplinary board took into account the political dimension of the cases brought before it or investigated whether these cases reflected any such activity. For the period from 1932 to 1936, there are records for 11 such cases, where 32 male and

⁵⁴ The General Archive (HA NKUA Protocol Archive) contains many applications from students from the beginning of the 1930s who had been expelled for pro-communist activity and returned to submit a repentance statement asking for the restoration of their student status.

one female student were accused of participating in a student strike, encouraging class interruptions and walk outs, damaging university property, distributing leaflets, clashing with other students, participating in non-approved unions, etc. The majority of these cases were related to a large student strike that took place in March 1936.⁵⁵ A few months after the imposition of the 4 August dictatorship, the new regime banned student unionism and no more cases related to student unionism were brought before the disciplinary board, which convened for the last time on 13 June 1940, a year before its term ended in June 1941.

The Disciplinary Board: A New Punishment Body

The establishment of the disciplinary board in 1911 was a new link in an old chain. Its creation came to reshape the entire field regarding the control and discipline of students, the imposition of normative prototypes and the definition of the boundaries within which students could operate. This body would undertake the role of *chastiser* of the offender upon identifying his or her action as offensive.

To take things from the very start. According to the principles of the foundation of the University of Athens, as reflected in its first regulation, the monitoring of the student body was in the hands of university authorities, especially the rector and senate. At the same time, however, it was also the duty of the entire staff of the university, both teaching and administrative: professors, porters and clerks, the secretariat, teaching assistants and laboratory curators. These were the people who supervised the daily life of students within the university premises and had the authority to report any deviating behaviour to the rectorate. In cases of minor misdemeanours, other university administrative bodies could take action.

The supervision of student conduct was not limited to the boundaries of the university. In the nineteenth century, social expectations and the image of a virtuous university student, who was considered part of a small elite that would shape the future of the country, resulted in the supervision of students even when outside the university grounds. To this end a web of entities, including private citizens, formed an established a channel of information that secured the

⁵⁵ During the strike of March 1936, the disciplinary board held five special meetings (3, 4, 6, 9 and 13 March) to deal with six cases related to the strike. Twenty-four male students and one female student were brought before the board on the charge that “they psychologically supported the strikers”. The charges against sixteen students were dismissed due to a lack of evidence. Five students were reprimanded and one student was reprimanded in a stricter way while three students were expelled; this latter decision was re-examined.

supervision of students in areas beyond the control of the university authorities. From the early twentieth century, it was self-evident that for whatever offence committed by students, be it of a public or private nature, the university had to be informed as it was the competent authority to deal with transgressions. Even though university legislation considered students to be legal adults, university authorities took on a paternalistic role in treating students as minors who needed supervision.

The institution of the disciplinary board did not change this situation, at least in theory. Control and supervision were exercised by all, with the rector playing a decisive role. Following the identification of a violation through university control mechanisms or outside reports, the disciplinary board was called to judge and impose penalties. Its role as an administrator of justice inside the institution was also illustrated in its procedures.

Procedures

Under the original plan of the disciplinary board in 1911, the rector played a central role in its operation and implementation since he presided over the body. Although the rector lost this role under the 1932 regulation – under which the university schools appointed its members – he still held a pivotal position. The disciplinary procedure could only be initiated on the order of the rector, after his office had received a complaint about a student. The criteria by which every School appointed a professor as a member of the disciplinary board are not clear and the minutes of school meetings contain no clear information in this regard. In a male-dominated university, the body generally consisted of a group of men with conservative beliefs.

Regarding the procedure itself, the defendant was summoned in writing to answer the charges on a specified meeting date. If he did not show up, he was summoned again with his subpoena posted publicly; otherwise he was judged in absentia. During the procedure the defendant submitted either an oral or written statement and answered questions posed by the board. In some cases witnesses were called to testify while in others the prosecutor himself was asked to attend. The 1932 regulation included a provision whereby a student had the right to appear with an advocate. In those cases where the penalty of permanent expulsion was imposed, the student had the right to appeal to the senate within a maximum of 10 days after the disclosure of the penalty. The senate, acting as an appeal body, made the final decision and could lower the penalty. All disciplinary punishments were announced by the rector and was noted in the student's report card, while his parents or legal guardians were officially informed by mail. This particular procedure aimed to ensure the legality and validity of the

university. In 1929, the General Statistical Service of Greece began publishing university disciplinary penalties by number and type of penalty as part of its series pertaining to higher education.⁵⁶

From 1932 the disciplinary board operated practically as a court of justice and even used legal terminology (court hearing, plaintiff/defendant, indictment, interrogation, recurring offence, review of the substance of the case, motion to set aside judgment, precedent/*res judicata*). In view of this, the presence of Law School professors was deemed important since they could ensure the legality of the proceedings and also safeguard the decision of the board on the basis of jurisprudence and their judicial knowledge. What kind of action did the board consider as an offence worthy of punishment, and what exactly needed control and discipline?

The Offence

With the exception of the 1836 regulation, which was never implemented, there was no clear definition of what constituted a student offence except for issues that were related to the operation of student associations and assemblies as well as the *Ιδιώνυμο* law. This ambiguity does not only pertain to university legislation; even the official language of university authorities was elusive. In the context of a deliberate ambiguity, there is only a mere reference to the *good order* of the university, the *good conduct* of the students and their *dignified demeanour*. The word *dignity*, which was systematically used to define a code of student conduct, was deliberately not defined. In the majority of cases that were brought before the disciplinary board, the most frequent accusation was that the students had broken the rule of due respect to university authorities and exhibited a *conduct inconsistent with student dignity*. By taking advantage of the ambiguity of the term *inconsistent*, the university disciplinary mechanisms were free to use this term for whatever they considered a violation of rules.

If the university enjoyed relative autonomy in defining an offence occurring *within its premises*, this was not the case for other instances. It was not just university legislation that defined what was considered an offence regarding political or moral behaviour. Institutions like the judicial authority, the security authorities and the army were in constant communication with the university in order to co-define what was considered an offensive act and how it should be punished.

⁵⁶ Statistics for higher education for the years 1929–1938 and 1955–1970 may be found in the digital library of the Hellenic Statistical Authority (<http://dlib.statistics.gr/>).

There were four categories of offences which resulted in the activation of disciplinary procedures. In the first category, which constituted the majority of the offences, covered incidents relating to student activities in the university premises, both inside and outside lecture halls: disruption of class, copying during exams, improper conduct towards teaching and administrative staff or towards other students, forging the signature of professors, forging state documents, identity fraud during exams, etc.

The second category covered the life and conduct of students outside the university and included violations ranging from offences punishable by criminal law to civil or moral issues such as debts to restaurant owners and landlords, fraud, quarrels, drunken behaviour, adultery, breach of marriage promises, etc. These cases were brought before the disciplinary board on the foot of complaints from private citizens or institutions. In most such cases, the university, due to its inability to verify the incident, played the role of arbitrator or remained uninvolved, on the grounds that it lacked jurisdiction.

The third category related to cases of student unionism and their movements: gathering or holding a meeting without the permission of the rector; participating in a student union that had no official approval; organising a protest or a march; and, finally, going on strike. There were many such instances and usually the disciplinary mechanism was activated against those who were accused of being “instigators”. It is worth repeating that the great student strike of 1929 led to calls for the disciplinary board to be reconstituted.

Finally, the fourth category concerned political beliefs, communist ideology in particular, which in many cases were directly connected with to the previous category. The treatment of *subversive ideas* in the university and the methods of their repression in the twentieth century constitute a special chapter in the history of the institution. It should be noted, however, that disciplinary procedures against left-wing students were swift and their prosecution predated the passage of the *Ιδιώνυμο* law. A significant number of these prosecutions resulted from communications between the university and other state institutions, which attempted – sometimes successfully – to impose on the university their own rules for treating defendants. Correspondence between all involved institutions was systematic and shaped the final outcome of the case.⁵⁷ What penalties die the university impose on offenders?

⁵⁷ The Protocol Archives, where incoming mail is kept, and the files of students indicted by the Disciplinary Board, both kept in the HA NKUA, contain informative correspondence and documents from various official sources indicting students for their activity outside the university. These sources include the City Police, the Gendarmerie, the General and Special

Registry of Disciplinary Penalties

The types of penalties that the university could inflict changed in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While provision existed in the early years of the University of Athens for the imprisonment of students in the university premises – there was actually a room where students could be confined for days – by the twentieth century the penalties ranged from a simple reprimand to permanent expulsion. There was no exact pairing of offence and penalty. Each case was treated as a separate incident and the penalty imposed depended on the beliefs of professors who were in charge of the disciplinary mechanisms at the time, the hearing process, the degree of repentance on the part of the accused student, the political and social circumstances, and the testimonies and mandates both from within and without the institution. For instance, while in 1972 a complaint for class disruption resulted in a recommendation or reprimand, in 1935 this same offence could result in suspension for one year.

The enactment of disciplinary procedures usually followed the same course: a complaint, a summons, a plea, sentencing and public disclosure. Even though the summons to the disciplinary board and the appearance of the pleading student was a private procedure, the imposition of penalties was not at all discreet. The disclosure of penalties, which “exposed” the punished student, functioned as a deterrent for the student body, and aimed at the compliance of all to the university value system, which was necessary for the maintenance of the good reputation of the university. Thus, we may surmise that penalties had a dual audience, one inside and one outside the university.

In any case, any student who was considered an offender did not cease to be a member of the university community. The goal of the disciplinary mechanisms was compliance and not expulsion. “Black sheep” were accepted back into the university fold provided they had repented. Even in the most extreme cases of communist students who had been permanently expelled, their readmittance to student status was possible only on the condition of active repentance and renunciation of their beliefs. From 1935, on the establishment of the declaration of repentance, this process, to the extent that it was connected to political offences, was linked to overall state policy: the public renunciation and reversal of political beliefs was part of the *state’s technology of reversal*⁵⁸ that aimed to destroy the state’s enemies and to set an example for society.

Security offices, the public prosecutor’s office, the Army Corps, the University of Thessaloniki and even high schools and associations.

⁵⁸ Polymeris Voglis, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners during the Greek Civil War* (New York: Berghahn, 2002).

The Disciplinary Board and the Fear of Collective Action

The establishment of the disciplinary board under the 1911 regulation introduced a modern institution into university life. It rearranged the scope of supervision of the entire university community since similar bodies were also established for the administrative and teaching staff. In seeking to modernise university legislation through the institution of these particular bodies, the Greek university followed European prototypes; this was a continuous concern of decision-makers. Moreover, the 1911 regulation recognised for the first time the right of students to assemble. The recognition of this right, which the university and the state had denied for many decades, created a new reality in an institution which a few years earlier had been shaken by clashes (the Gospel and Oresteia riots), which had resulted in fatalities; indeed, the Gospel riots led to the collapse of the government of Georgios Theotokis. The establishment of the disciplinary board was a new weapon in the arsenal of the university to confront future student movements.

It is unclear why the board was discontinued under the 1922 regulation. As we have noted above, it is possible that it was due to the low number of offences brought to its attention and the unwillingness of professors to staff it. The new regulation set the prerequisites for the creation of student associations, thus opening the way for the establishment of various and disparate student organisations, especially in the interwar period. This was the beginning of student unionism, a phenomenon that generated the distrust and perhaps the fear of the rectorate and the state authorities, especially after the great strikes of the 1920s. This did not mean that there were no collective student mobilisations from the nineteenth century to the issuing of the 1922 regulation; in these cases the university enacted its own disciplinary mechanisms.⁵⁹ Throughout the nineteenth century there were numerous upheavals with the participation of many students, who were often punished with very harsh penalties. Yet, there were two significant differentiations that called for the reconstitution of the board in 1932.

The first is connected with the high rise in the student population and the operational issues that resulted from it, as well as with the development of student unionism. The second was the appearance of a new student type, the

⁵⁹ For example, file 35.1, “1868–1869: Mischief in the University”, HA NKUA, contains summons and written pleas of students to the senate; there is also a document of the Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Education titled “On repressing mischief”. This document probably includes student protests during the class of Dimitrios Vernardakis. See Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές*, 544–49.

communist or left-wing student who was regarded as a potential agitator inside the institution. The direct connection of the 1932 regulation with the *Ιδιώνυμο* law reflected this new reality and illustrated the establishment of anticommunism as the dominant ideology that penetrated all university sectors. Despite the fact that most offences were related to student conduct, it was more than clear that the main scope of the disciplinary body was to control political and union activity of students both on an individual and a collective level.

The disciplinary board operated in two directions: on the one hand, it imposed control inside the institution by dealing, in a consistent manner, with incidents which disrupted its “internal” order or attempted to violate the university regulations. From 1932, and especially after 1950, many of these offences were connected with political issues. Yet, even in such cases the body took a condescending approach in its effort to restore interior stability. Its stance towards students aimed to promote a proper way of conduct that stemmed from the model of dignity, submission to the rules of study, respect towards the teaching staff and awareness of the value and importance of studentship. These notions assumed greater weight in the context of collective student offences since there was always the fear of the consequences of mass movements and the inability to keep them in check.

On the other hand, the idea of a university that was responsible for the life of its students both inside and outside its premises was limited to its role as a mere mandatory for the state authorities. The disciplinary board was the body which, through the rector, received complaints from the state and from other institutions and had to ensure that the students concerned were punished. Thus, while the board took care of the “good order” within the university premises by controlling every form of disobedience and violation, it also had the duty to extend the punishment to those who had either been condemned from or were deemed “suspect” or “dangerous” by the state. From 1932 onwards, the connection between court rulings on criminal offences by students cases (in most cases political) and the maintenance of student status signalled a new reality. From the nineteenth century to the interwar period, the university played a leading role in supervising the conduct and overall behaviour of students, considering it to be an internal affair. After 1932, however, the university operated as an extension of the state apparatus, which wanted to control everyone who was not on its side. This was not a self-evident process, nor did it take place without any reactions or resistances. The persistence of the members of the disciplinary board in observing legal provisions, their tendency to show lenience towards students, and especially towards those who had repented, and their effort to maintain order inside the institution through communication and agreements

with students, were characteristics that were influenced by the long tradition of the university, its prestige and its internal realities.

In many cases the idea of a university community resulted in the protection of the offenders, while the university always felt that its independence as an institution was violated by the state. In any case, the university did not feel compelled to obey state orders in disciplinary procedures. Most professors shared the ideology of the state and in many cases they were its main exponents and could also shape it. In this light, one may understand their mistrust and hostility towards whatever they considered *subversive ideology* and student *disobedience* in general. The minutes of the disciplinary board indicate the characteristic hostility with which certain members of the disciplinary board treated female students who were accused of political offences and participation in political movements; they considered that such actions violated the model of female conduct and were dangerous for professional sectors where women were predominant, such as education.

In any case, up to World War II the disciplinary board functioned mainly as a body for the control of the political behaviour of students and their collective protests. Despite the fact that the majority of cases brought before the board had to do with individual student violations, it is clear that the board monitored the political activities of students in unions, be it on an individual or a collective level, in its effort to both maintain order within its premises, but also obey the political commands of the state authorities. During this process, next to the righteous and virtuous model of the student that was shaped in the nineteenth century, there was now added the model of “national-mindedness” and anti-communism as individual characteristics. Therefore, almost a century after its establishment, the Greek university continued to remain captive to political authorities, thus sacrificing in many cases its independence in order to defend the dominant state ideology and fight the “internal enemy.”

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Critical Perspectives

Approches Critiques

Onur İnal and Yavuz Köse (eds.),

SEEDS OF POWER:

EXPLORATIONS IN OTTOMAN ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY

Winwick: White Horse Press, 2019, 292 pages

More than a decade has passed since the seminal publication of *Nature and Empire in Ottoman Egypt* (2011), Alan Mikhail's monograph that inaugurated the expansion of the field of environmental history into southeastern Europe and the Middle East, regions that were uncharted in that manner. Since then, the dissemination of the young field – already an established one in North America and Western Europe – has been uphill work, but has never stagnated.

While the British, French and even Austro-Hungarian transnational empires had their global environmental histories written to a certain degree, up until the publication of this edited volume the Ottoman realm lacked one. In fact this volume constitutes the first attempt at delineating the field of Ottoman environmental history, both in terms of territorial inclusion as well as chronological one, examining case studies from Cyprus to the Crimean pe-

ninsula and ranging from the sixteenth century up to the collapse of the empire. The area and period it tries to cover is immense, even though it comprises only eleven chapters. The ambition of the editors should not surprise us. Both of them are experienced in the field of Ottoman environmental history, and especially Onur İnal ought to be credited as the main scholar that helped foster environmental history in Turkey, being at the same time a prolific writer, the regional representative of Turkey in the European Society for Environmental History (ESEH) and among the founding members of the Network for the Study of Environmental History of Turkey (NEHT).

Mikhail, as an authority in the field, opens the volume with a foreword, giving us a brief glance into the erratically documented past of the interaction between people and the Ottoman natural cosmos. The edited volume has been divided in four parts, which adhere to

common conceptual groupings found in the field of environmental history: “Climate and Landscapes”, “Resources and Energies”, “Technologies and Infrastructures” and “Ideas and Actors”. However, as the reader will note, some chapters transcend this division into parts and match well together regardless of their place in the volume.

The first two chapters of the volume attempt to bring to our attention aspects of the Little Ice Age across the Ottoman realm that question Sam White’s argument linking the social unrest that Anatolia witnessed during the sixteenth century with the ever changing climate of the region. More particularly, the first article, by Elias Kolovos and Phokion Kotzageorgis, explores the effects of the Little Ice Age in the regions of central Macedonia and Crete (both, of course, Ottoman at the time). They conclude that, despite the negative effects of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century climate change on these regions, the impact on the social order was not as devastating as in Anatolia, as White had concluded. For the authors, this is an indicator that White’s argument should still be treated as a regional case-study rather than an all-encompassing theory, the application of which could be extended outside seventeenth-century Anatolia. Along the same lines, the contributor of the second chapter, Mehmet Kuru, seeks to “reconsider the Anatolia-wide demographic growth of the sixteenth century” (35) by examining a set of new parameters. With shifts in the climate of the region, larger agricultural surpluses, supported by the increased military capacity of the empire, in his chapter Kuru embellishes the Ottoman Empire’s peak with environmental characteristics.

The next two chapters transcend environmental history, briefly stepping into the fields of agricultural history, though of course through an environmental point of view. In the third chapter, Suraiya Faroqhi narrates the history of viticulture in the eighteenth-century Bosphorus through the eyes of the Florentine Domenico Sestini, who provided ample information on the matter. Faroqhi poses a very simple question that triggers her story. Why did viticulture in the Bosphorus region eventually disappear, while it had been one of the prominent agricultural activities during the eighteenth century? The environmental-agricultural pattern continues with the next contribution, that of Onur İnal. In this chapter, İnal suggests boldly that the flow of the main commodities of the coastal Asia Minor, namely figs and raisins, were of such immense importance as to render Izmir one of the most prominent port-cities in the eastern Mediterranean. By reversing the city–hinterland narrative (a small-scale centre–periphery paradigm), the author succeeds in highlighting the environmental factors and land-use changes that allowed Izmir to flourish and its countryside to become one of the first cases of intensified agriculture in the Ottoman Empire.

The next chapter is among the most captivating in the volume. In it, Semih Çelik succeeds in constructing a balanced tripartite history, split between people, animals and the forests of Anatolia. Based on precious administrative primal sources of the nineteenth century, Çelik highlights the effort of the Ottoman state to intensify timber extraction using the

local but rarely eager population of the Anatolian forests and their oxen as a workforce. This particular chapter fits rather well with the last chapter of this volume, entitled “Dispossession by Concession: Forest Commons in the Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic”, in which Selçuk Dursun picks up the forest management thread, only this time in the twentieth century. Dursun unravels the process that led to the privatization of forest use which was driven by the state. The concession of forests to wealthy individuals and timber traders, Dursun argues, restricted the access of nearby communities to sylvan goods, a right that they traditionally had held.

Chapters 6 and 7 examine yet another remarkable theme in environmental history, but one that does not receive the recognition it deserves: water. The two chapters, by Styliani Lepida and K. Mehmet Kentel, respectively, investigate the politics of management of this most invaluable resource. On the one hand, Lepida demonstrates the social and political paradigm-shift that was triggered due to the scarcity of reliable water sources in Cyprus during the seventeenth century. As she argues, the control of water became gradually and organically one of the main factors that drove land-acquisition patterns, disputes over water distribution, etc., on the island. On the other hand, Kentel encourages us to take this notion one step further and demonstrates an environmental history of inequality that stemmed from the waterworks at a lake outside Istanbul. As he argues, the massive Terkos Lake waterworks project would eventually supply clean

running water to Pera, Istanbul’s bourgeois neighbourhood. And apart from the fact that the rest of the capital still did not have access to this particular resource, the works at Terkos Lake also restricted the access of the local communities to the lake, thus severing their economic and social coherence, due to the touristic gentrification of the lake that drew scores of Pera residents in their search for a quaint spot near the capital.

Chapter 8, by Mohamed Gamal-Eldin, entitled “Cesspools, Mosquitoes and Fever”, constitutes a very refreshing take on how environmental historians should approach disease as a whole, namely not as fateful incident but as product of poorly planned human activity. Gamal-Eldin asserts that the malaria outbreaks in Ismailia and Port Said, near the Suez Canal, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, were the result of unplanned and hasty urban development projects, such as the construction of irrigation ditches that offered breeding grounds for anopheles mosquitoes. Apart from providing us with precious technical details, the author also comments on these badly thought-out processes as a colonisation effort more than anything else.

Continuing with the same pattern on public health, in chapter 9 Chris Gartien examines the impact that malaria prevention had on the organisation of Ottoman agriculture. The chapter constitutes a comprehensive macroscopic analysis of the parliamentary debates of the late Ottoman Empire. It places special emphasis on highlighting the fact that both camps, one made up by technocrats and the other by wealthy

landowners, negotiated the matter more on ecological rather than on political terms, inaugurating, as Gartiën suggests, a socio-ecological agenda in the politics of the Ottoman Empire.

In the tenth chapter, Yavuz Köse undertakes a thorough discourse analysis of a biography of Alexander von Humboldt that was published in 1932 by Mustafa Niyazi. Niyazi was a geography teacher and wrote this piece not merely to celebrate the contributions of Humboldt to the science of geography. By intertwining the need for nation-building in the young Turkish Republic and geography, Köse rightly argues that Niyazi's publication about Humboldt should be seen as an attempt for the youth of Kemalist Turkey to get well-acquainted with their fatherland.

Overall, İnal and Köse's edited volume is a fine example of the path the new promising field of environmental history must follow in order for it to rise above its marginal label. Despite the fact that environmental history can and *is* being written in many ways, many of which are experimental, relying on hard science and analytical tools that historians commonly find challenging, this volume shows that there is much

merit to be found in the traditional archival approaches of conducting and narrating environmental history. There is indeed a misunderstanding among those not trained in the field of environmental history that in order to engage in environmental historical narratives one must be something of a positivist scientist. This cannot be further from the truth, as every single author in this publication proves that written sources of any kind, when cross-examined and read meticulously, can extend our understanding of long-gone ecosystems and environments. Thus environmental history immediately becomes a viable field for a young historian to acknowledge, study and write. This is what environmental history seeks to do, especially in those national historiographical traditions that have not yet wholly embraced the new field, and this is why İnal and Köse's edited volume ought to be seen as one of the first significant steps towards the recognition of environmental history in the Middle East and Southeastern Europe.

George L. Vlachos

Institute for Historical Research / NHRF

Mark Mazower,
Η ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΗ
[The Greek Revolution],
Athens: Alexandria, 2021, 565 pages.

This important work, and its translation into Greek, has come in time to be added to what was written in 2021 about the Greek Revolution. After many years of research and writing, the author attempts to give as comprehensive a picture as possible of many aspects of the Greek revolt, of the great impact it had abroad, of how, finally, with the “inexhaustible patience of the people” (chap. 16), European intervention was provoked and defeat was avoided. Mark Mazower shows here too how remarkable a historian he is, how he can raise new questions, reassess old ones, seek out unknown or inappropriately used information, and all this in a writing style that seems fictional, fictional but always remains historical. The reader will feel the immediacy and intensity of the description when reading about what the civilians suffered (massacres, captivity, forced displacement, starvation), about the brutality of a war that also had a strong religious character, about Ibrahim’s scorched-earth tactics, about the personality and behaviour of captains, primates and politicians, as well as foreigners who in one way or another were connected with 1821. Among the most beautiful images: the arrival of a Bavarian corps under Lieutenant Christoph

Neezer in Athens, the withdrawal of the Turkish garrison and the raising of the Greek flag on the Acropolis.

Some elements give another dimension to the narrative: It is very aptly pointed out that Napoleon’s death, more than Byron’s, contributed to the strengthening of a new public consciousness that decisively influenced the Greek struggle; Mehmet Ali wanted to be the Napoleon of Egypt; Dorothea Lieven, wife of the Russian ambassador in London and known for her love affairs with Metternich and prominent British politicians, not only contributed decisively to Anglo–Russian rapprochement but is said to have introduced the waltz to Britain; Admiral Codrington, who was discredited for his initiative at Navarino by Prime Minister Wellington, was received with honours by the Russian tsar and danced with members of the imperial family; in London’s taverns and cafés, Greek support contributed to another form of resistance to Tory policy; John Bowring, who was the main founder of the London Philhellenic Committee and chief negotiator of the first Greek loan, was a Bentham supporter (but, above all, he wanted to make money), deceived the Greek committee, became rich and later was appointed governor of Hong Kong

and became involved in the Opium War with China. The picture of the captains is enriched by a detailed description of their outfit, and we learn about the equipment of a philhellene before he left Marseilles for Greece.

In the 18 chapters of his book, Mazower incorporates much that, as ideas, information and, above all, as a method of historical writing, cannot fail to arouse the interest of experts on 1821. Of course there will be disagreements about persons and things, but the payoff is certain. I was thinking how beneficial a postgraduate seminar would be where all the major issues raised in the book could be studied in comparison with other approaches. It would also better highlight what new things the author brings to the table, what testimonies in particular he highlights at the possible expense of others, if there are aspects, which there certainly are, where a critique would be necessary and constructive. I will not dwell on some such cases, but I will venture a few thoughts which do not entirely deviate from what the author says but which I think show how much more complex some of the issues under consideration are.

To oversimplify, the central theme of the narrative is how a people rebelled, endured for six years a struggle against a clearly superior opponent and, ultimately, through this endurance, generated an unprecedented wave of sympathy from European and American public opinion which, combined with the conflicting interests of the major powers in the region, caused them to intervene and save the revolution. And that these conflicting interests were, to a large extent, fostered by an enlightened revolutionary leadership which understood in time that only by

internationalising the Greek struggle and strengthening it from outside could it not be defeated. And this scenario has two protagonists: Alexandros Mavrocordatos and Britain, mainly through the policy of George Canning. I would be the last to question the crucial role that both played but I would hesitate to subscribe to an almost exclusive contribution of both to the success of this ultimately happy development for the revolutionaries. Mazower writes:

Then in 1825, the Egyptians had invaded the Morea. Terrified by the speed of Ibrahim's advance, the Greek chieftains in the Peloponnese appealed to London to mediate with the Sultan for them. George Canning had the opening he sought and sent his cousin, Stratford Canning, to Constantinople as ambassador. On his way to the Ottoman capital at the start of 1826, he moored off Hydra to order to meet with Mavrokordatos, who came aboard his ship for a conversation in which they discussed the idea of making the Morea and the islands a single tributary state of the empire, a goal that fell far short of independence. Their informal conversation turned out to be highly consequential: not only did it signal the Greeks' growing orientation towards the British, an orientation already anticipated by the two loans, but without the conversation between the two men the Holy Alliance might have remained intact and there would have been no Anglo-Russian negotiations, no Protocoll of St Petersburg that spring, no Treaty of London, and no battle of Navarino. (405-6, English ed.)¹

¹ Mark Mazower, *The Greek Revolution: 1821 and the Making of Modern Europe*

I think this is where the exaggeration lies. Mavrocordatos was completely weakened at the beginning of 1826, having also received the consequences of the inability of the Kountouriotis government, of which he was a part, to deal with Ibrahim's successive victories. Accepting British mediation to avoid defeat by retreating from the demand for independence to a form of autonomy was a one-way street for almost the entire revolutionary leadership; this decision no longer depended on Mavrocordatos. And if he did indeed give his consent – information that certainly needs cross-checking – to the creation of an autonomous state with only the Peloponnese and the islands, it reinforces the then widespread fears of many fighters about such a development that would leave Central Greece outside its borders. On the other hand, the process of Anglo–Russian rapprochement had already begun by the end of 1825, as the book points out, so yes, George Canning achieved his main objective, that Russia should not intervene unilaterally in the Greek question, but, as it is also pointed out, without Russian complicity nothing could succeed. Therefore, it was not Stratford Canning's meeting with Mavrocordatos that determined subsequent developments, it was an episode, important of course, in a course now determined by new Anglo–Russian contacts to put some end to prolonged unrest in the Eastern Mediterranean. If Greek endurance caused the intervention of the powers at Navarino, perhaps more emphasis should

have been placed, rather than on Greek diplomacy, on the months gained until that intervention took place, with the successes of Karaiskakis in Central Greece and the irregular warfare of Kolokotronis in the Peloponnese – precious months that did not allow Ibrahim and Kütahi to secure full submission in time, as the sultan wanted, and thus cancel the European intervention.

This exaggeration of Britain's decisive role, combined with the projection of the domestic and foreign policy of Mavrocordatos and his collaborators, as well as his Hydra supporters, as the only salvation for the revolution, would perhaps be mitigated if the end of the revolution was not specified at the end of 1827, after Navarino. The last chapter, chapter 18, does indeed deal with the period 1828–1833, but as a sort of epilogue to what preceded it. Had this too been bravely included in the negotiation, I am sure that more would have been gained and some appreciations of what preceded it might have been more refined.

George Canning was not alive when the news of Navarino reached London. Possibly, had he lived, he might have joined with the British fleet in a forceful intervention of forces to compel the Porte to accept the Treaty of London of July 1827, given that Mahmud II, even after the destruction of the Turco–Egyptian fleet, insisted on the subjugation of the rebels, and might have prevented the Russo–Turkish War of 1828–1829. But his successor in power, Wellington, would not only regard the Navarino as an unfortunate event and use pretexts to dismiss Codrington, but he considered that the July 1827 treaty was no longer advantageous to Britain's interests and

(London: Allen Lane, 2021). The extract appears on the same pages in the Greek edition.

was seeking a way of disengaging from it. It was common knowledge that the majority of the British cabinet and the king himself made no secret of their Turcophile feelings and their dislike of the Greek revolutionaries. And here it should be emphasised that we must not confuse the liberal and constitutional sentiments of the British with the brutal and colonial policy of their government when its interests were at stake abroad or when it was asserting its own aims.

Since a release from the July 1827 treaty was not possible, Wellington insisted that the territories of the negotiated Greek autonomous state be limited to the Peloponnese and the surrounding islands and would disapprove of the British ambassador in Constantinople, Stratford Canning, for accepting, together with his colleagues from Russia and France at the Poros Conference (late 1828–early 1829), a border that incorporated a large part of Central Greece into the Greek state.

In the meantime, France's active involvement in the Greek question would add a new dimension to the Anglo-Russian antagonism. The French Expeditionary Force under Maison would drive Ibrahim from the Peloponnese and through its presence would reinforce France's attempt to regain some of its formerly strong naval presence in the Eastern Mediterranean, which it had lost after the British victories against Napoleon. Finally, only after the victorious advance of the Russian army to the outskirts of Constantinople during the Russo-Turkish War of 1828–1829, the sultan was forced to accept, under the Treaty of Adrianople, the autonomy of Greece as provided for in the July 1827 treaty. Then the British government made a decisive manoeuvre to counterbalance

the consequences of the Russian victory in the Greek question. Wellington proposed an independent rather than autonomous Greek state, but with limited borders on the Ionian side, and the election of a hereditary monarch, which meant setting aside President Ioannis Capodistrias. The other powers agreed and in early 1830 the Greeks gained an independent state. Capodistrias resisted the restriction of borders and without the consent of the Greeks. Mavrocordatos and those around him acquiesced unquestioningly, believing that the removal of the President would avoid the danger of perpetuating the centralised model of government he had imposed and the consequent Russian influence. The resignation of Prince Leopold, whom the three powers had elected hereditary monarch of the new state, postponed, with disastrous consequences, the orderly resolution of the Greek question. His resignation was due, among other things, to the insistence of the Wellington government not to yield on the question of the territorial limitation of the new state. The objection to the question of the northern Greek frontier would be lifted by the new British government in the treaty of 1832.

With this in mind, it would be difficult to attribute Capodistrias' corresponding aversion to the British government, which considered him an agent of the Russians, only to the fact that "he was no great fan of the British governing class either, disliking their snobbery and philistinism" (422, English ed.), and not to emphasise that it was difficult for him to forget that, in violation of the relevant treaty, the commissioner of the Ionian Islands was treating the Ionian Islands as colonies, and that he had feared that something of the same kind would happen to embattled Greece if

Britain accepted the petition for protection which in a moment of desperation many Greeks had asked for and Mavrocordatos had not discouraged. Before Stratford Canning met with Mavrocordatos in the Greek territories, he had talked with Capodistrias in Geneva and he had unequivocally heard from him that he did not want Greece to become a colony of Britain like the Ionian Islands. And, as mentioned, the Wellington government was adamantly refusing to extend the borders of the Greek state entity under formation. A small Greece, a French official had said, would inevitably become the eighth island of the Ionian Sea.

The last chapter of the book, the 18th, is entitled “Love, Concord, Brotherhood, 1828–33”. If it came, as it seems, from what Georgios Mavromichalis, one of Capodistrias’ assassins, is alleged to have said as he faced the firing squad, I think it is unfortunate, to say the least. Mavromichalis, who, it should be noted, sought during his trial to attribute the murder to his now dead uncle Konstantinos, another assassin, does not express the real attempt in this period to “love, concord, brotherhood”. The reasons why the Mavromichalis family opposed Capodistrias are well known and indeed he, despite justifiable indignation, demonstrated, with a lack of political tactics, excessive severity towards them. But I think it is limiting to attribute the murder to a simple revengeful feud, common among the Maniots, and not to place it in a general climate of fierce opposition and complete disparagement of Capodistrias where “tyrannicide” could have taken and did take on a different meaning. And Mavrocordatos and his close associates had played an important role in the creation of this climate.

I have dwelt a little more on issues that I like to think I know somewhat better. Let us return to the great book before us. I admired, among many other things, how the author highlighted in his own way the philhellene movement and its qualitative changes over time. How the Greek Revolution, as a reference point and hope of liberals all over Europe who were fighting or dreaming of political freedoms in their countries under authoritarian rule, gradually, after the atrocities of the Turks, Messolonghi, the resistance of the revolutionaries and the attempted “barbarisation” of the Peloponnese by Ibrahim, acquired a new label that embraced individuals and groups from all over the social and political spectrum. Philhellenism inspired not only liberals, but Christians and philanthropists, becoming in the diversity of its reception a powerful weapon in the then-forming public opinion that governments in Europe and North America could not ignore.

Mark Mazower is widely known. His books, some on Greek history, have been hits and have been read, in their English versions and in translation, by many in various countries. It is therefore fortunate that his new study of the Greek Revolution will be more widely known. A historical study rich in every respect that further demonstrates that the triumph of Greek nationalism over a firmly entrenched dynastic power, with the sympathy and solidarity it engendered, had a significant impact on the societies of the time and forced powerful European states into new forms of collective action.

Christos Loukos

Professor emeritus, University of Crete

Eugenia Drakopoulou,
EIKONES TOY AΓΩNA ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΗ ΖΩΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΡΩΠΗΣ
[Images of the Greek War of Independence in
European history painting],
Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRF, 2021,
140 pages, 29 illustrations.

In her book, the late art historian and Institute of Historical Research/NHRF researcher Eugenia Drakopoulou examines the multifaceted manifestations of philhellenic artistic production, its reception in the societies of nineteenth-century Europe and its lasting impact to this day.

Philhellenism was a multifaceted and multidimensional movement. Its cultural manifestations cover a broad field and reveal a network of relationships on both a real and a symbolic level. People, ideas, artworks and objects constitute a multifaceted landscape with its dynamics, the interweaving of various arts, and multiple mediations as well as references to a timeless Greece. The author approaches this landscape from an expanded and macroscopic perspective, frequently coming at it sideways, turning her lens to secondary or under-illuminated aspects of the phenomenon of philhellenism that contribute to its adequate understanding. Within this context, the connections, extrapolations and extended time spans bring to the fore the importance, the symbolic weight, as well as the resilience of the philhellenic representations, and the powerful echo of philhellenism within historical-political and social

contexts that extend beyond the spatial and temporal coordinates that gave birth to these works.

Drakopoulou signals her perspective, as well as how she intends to tackle the subject of her research, in the very first lines of the introduction:

In April 1979, the president of the Hellenic Republic, Konstantinos Tsatsos, travelled to Paris at the invitation of French President Giscard d'Estaing. At the official dinner held at the Elysée Palace, Delacroix's painting *Greece on the Ruins of Missolonghi* ... held pride of place in the hall. The French president had requested Delacroix's work be transferred from Bordeaux City Hall to the presidential palace especially for this occasion in honour of the Greeks. The French painter's allegorical composition with Greece standing among the ruins had become a symbol. A symbol of nineteenth-century philhellenism as well as of the umbilical cord linking Greece and Europe; in addition, at that particular point in time, it symbolised France's support for the Greek government. (11)

Moreover, as the author subsequently points out, from the moment of its appearance in the historic May 1826 exhibition *Ouvrages de peinture exposés au profit des Grecs*, held at the Galerie Lebrun in Paris, the painting bore a powerful political message.

Drakopoulou interprets the philhellenic works within the context of nineteenth-century history painting with its characteristic features: its visual codes, the documentary dimension, the functionality of the narrative element and anecdotal detail, its rhetoric, its expressive/emotional charge, and symbolic language. At the same time, she also takes into account the crucial role played by the artist's personal inspiration and imagination in the visual rendering of the actual event, especially in the case of the Romantics. Here, the preeminent master is Delacroix, to whom the author understandably pays particular attention. Central to her study is the intersection of the West of classicism, rationalism and antiquarianism and the East of romanticism, the East of exotic otherness but also of violence and blood. This intersection was given shape and symbolised in various classicist and romantic versions of philhellenic works.

In her kaleidoscopic narrative, which also shapes the book's structure, Drakopoulou utilises the informational and, generally, factual material in many ways. Thus, she illuminates from various vantage points the complex phenomenon of philhellenism in Europe with its distinct particularities and qualitative characteristics in the countries in which it developed. Understandably, her attention turns mainly to France, Italy and Ger-

many. As she notes in the introduction, she integrates "the works in the historical context of each country, highlighting the positions and intentions of not only the creators but also of the commissioning clients". She consistently takes into account the political-social parameters that functioned as determining factors for the cultural manifestations of philhellenism: the clash of Liberals and reactionary Ultras in France, the Austrian occupation of Italy, and, in the case of Germany, the catalytic presence of King Ludwig I of Bavaria and the subsequent ascension to the Greek throne of his son Othon.

As regards France, she rightly places emphasis on the artistic institutions and their operation while highlighting the development of the art market there, which resulted in the philhellenic works circulating more freely. In the case of Italy, she focuses on the political role of Italian philhellenic works, a role closely aligned to the historical conditions in the Italian peninsula, as will subsequently become apparent. With regard to German philhellenism, Drakopoulou emphasises, on the one hand, the great importance of its artistic production in documenting the personages and events of the Greek War of Independence¹ and, on the other, philhellenism's institutional dimension, the latter lending high prestige to its monumental cultural manifestations in the post-revolutionary years, both in Othonian Greece and in Bavaria (Munich). These artistic programmes, directly associated with architecture, carried multiple messages. In the spirit of romantic paint-

¹ Tellingly, the author gave the relevant chapter the title "German Documentation".

ings of historical scenes with classicist elements, they were the bridge between ancient and modern Greek history, reflecting the legacy of classical education in German culture and, simultaneously, signalling the intention of the leading actor, the antiquarian and philhellene Ludwig I, to consolidate the newly established bond between the two countries. “In Bavaria, philhellenism was indisputably an affair of state,” Drakopoulou writes (64).

The author methodically explores the conditions under which the works (paintings and prints) were created, tracing, apart from the objective data, the artists’ fields of reference and sources of inspiration: visual works, historical testimonies, travel texts, literary works as well as objects (costumes, weapons). She observes the reception and the trajectories of major as well as minor works in both the public and private sphere well into the late nineteenth century. Regarding the purchase of Delacroix’s painting *Scenes from the Massacres at Chios*, she refers to the correspondence in 1824 between the Comte de Forbin, director-general of the Royal Museums of France, and the Vicomte de la Rochefoucauld, director-general of Fine Arts (20). Forbin, a painter, archaeologist and champion of young painters, had rushed to purchase on behalf of the state Delacroix’s work and certain other history paintings at the opening of the Salon de Paris rather than at its close, as was the custom. Indeed, he did so, without waiting for Louis XVIII’s approval, in order to prevent private individuals from purchasing those “particularly important paintings”, as he wrote in response to Rochefoucauld’s protest (20). It should be noted here that the annual Salon largely shaped how the works were received by

experts as well as by the public; in the 1820s, artists began to find this particularly important. According to renowned Delacroix expert Sébastien Allard:

Public recognition then began to interest them [the Romantics] more than that of their peers. It was a modern stance, which the development of the press contributed to. This attitude particularly defined the two Salons of 1824 and 1827, which were labelled “romantic”²

The case of Ary Scheffer’s painting *Les femmes souliotes* is also indicative of the importance of the Salon. It was purchased by the state after being exhibited and receiving praise during the 1827 Salon.

Prints, which constitute a particularly important aspect of philhellenic artistic production and were occasionally the models for the decoration of utilitarian or decorative objects, occupied the author in various ways, especially in the chapter “Circles of Iconography”. She makes a telling reference to the fluctuations in the French production of prints with subjects from the war of independence, fluctuations indicative of the extent of the impact of various events during the Greek struggle. The prints, along with their narrative captions, utilised the information and communication potential of the multi-reproduced printed image, which was also accessible to the general public. More generally, the synergy of text

² Sébastien Allard, “Delacroix et Delaroche, deux visions du romantisme,” *Grande Galerie: Le Journal du Louvre*, no. 33 (September–November 2015): 102.

and image in its various versions (narrative titles of paintings and captions of prints, descriptions of exhibited works in the various Salon catalogues) is a significant parameter of the production of philhellenic works as regards the signification of the representations and the persons depicted as well as their reception by the public. Drakopoulou also explores this parameter, shedding light on yet another of its aspects, that is, the crucial contribution of written sources as sources of inspiration for the creators of the works. Here, the French diplomat and traveller François Pouqueville, with his book *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce* (Paris 1824) and its Italian translation (banned in Italy) appears as an important reference point. Lord Byron, of course, was another, particularly glamorous, reference point. His literary heroes (especially “The Giaour”), with the broader cultural/religious connotations of the conflict between the Christian West and Islam, offered themselves as a link to a romantic literary philhellenism, which was variously expressed in French paintings and prints. It should be noted that pictorial as well as verbal references to religion (Orthodox Christianity) are common in philhellenic works; not only to religion as a refuge but also to a religion invested with a greater weight of meaning in the light of the dichotomy Christian/Muslim, civilised/barbarian, with their identity connotations. Relevant examples are presented in the book.

Moreover, the author’s thorough research led her to obscure works and sometimes to new readings. One characteristic example is the well-known painting by the Belgian painter Henri Decaisne

titled *Failure of a Military Operation* (1826, Benaki Museum), which the author convincingly links to the failed siege of Patras by the Greeks in the first year of the war of independence while an earlier reading of the painting had associated it with Parga in Epirus.³ Drakopoulou even adds a very interesting angle to the well-worn issue of Markos Botsaris’ identification with Leonidas, shedding light on the connection to Jules Verne’s *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea* with Victor Hugo as the “mediator” (see the chapter on “New Ancient Heroes”).

Drakopoulou also focuses consistently on individuals (artists, high-ranking patrons and other clients, state officials, writers, playwrights, composers, critics and journalists); this lends a singular dynamic along with nuances to the research, revealing processes, mediations and relationships on an ideological as well as on a practical level with their functionality. In the author’s narrative, which differs from a linear, “static” and more conventional treatment of artistic production, what emerges in relief is the philhellenic fever that swept the European societies of the period with its idiosyncratic dimension, with a mobility of ideas, with the convergence of various arts, with a primary and a refracted gaze on a timeless Greece. The author provides various reasons for a multi-layered reading of the representations and, as a result, her text gains in conceptual density and depth.

³ See Claire Constans and Fani Maria Tsigakou, eds., *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση: Ο Ντελακρουά και οι Γάλλοι ζωγράφοι 1815–1848* (Athens: National Gallery–Alexandros Soutzos Museum, 1997), cat. no. 14.

In relation to a currently lost painting of monumental proportions on the subject of the refugees of Parga, whose creation, we learn, probably began in the same year they were uprooted, Drakopoulou brings up a point that is crucial for understanding this work as well as the personality and identity of its creators, the Foggo brothers:

The immediate reaction of these two painters to the events in Parga was not accidental. They came from a liberal family of supporters of the French Revolution that had immigrated to France and returned to London after the Battle of Waterloo ... Their political sensibilities in general, as well as their opposition to England's policy towards Christians in the case of Parga, explains the choice of the subject matter of the painting, which was exhibited in London in 1821. Moreover, this might explain the negative reviews the work received in the English press. (89–90)

Despite the reactions, as the author subsequently informs us, the painting was exhibited again in 1862 at the London International Exhibition.

Consistent with her expanded, macroscopic perspective, Drakopoulou discusses the re-exhibition, even many years later, of specific works, with, sometimes, significant title changes, indicative of how they were perceived relative to specific historical-political conditions on a case-by-case basis, as will become apparent below. Thus, she highlights the timeless visibility of many important philhellenic works, and indeed in environments with institutional weight (museums, art galleries, international exhibitions).

In her introduction, Drakopoulou refers to the commissioning clients, who are another issue that emerges in the book as a key component of philhellenism, with various ramifications beyond the Greek War of Independence. Of particular interest here are Prince Metternich and a relative, the Austrian diplomat Rudolf Franz von Lützow, who both commissioned philhellenic works.⁴ These commissions were the result of a shift in the hostile feelings of the Austrians, which produced a friendlier stance towards Ottoman Greece. However, on this issue, the liberal aristocrats, enlightened collectors, and scholars in Italy held a pivotal position, with their heightened sensitivity and receptivity to the messages of the philhellenic representations. Drakopoulou devotes particular attention to the conceptual, ideological, and symbolic scope of important philhellenic paintings that transcend the locality and events of the Greek War of Independence. In the example of Italy, the author aptly emphasises the political function of history painting, and of the philhellenic works in particular, in the Austrian-occupied Italian peninsula during that period, when the dreams and values of independence, freedom and self-determination had a special gravity and ideological charge. In fact, she underlines the importance of exhibiting works with a Greek subject matter in major Italian cities, where, as she

⁴ In 1840, Metternich commissioned one of the paintings on the death of Markos Botsaris from the important Italian painter Ludovico Lipparini (69).

writes, “they functioned by example as tools for the promotion of the patriotic ideal and the formation of a national identity”. She specifically refers to an Italian work, which

contains a double Greek-Italian national message. This is the great work of Cesare Mussini, which is described in an 1854 catalogue as *Greek Subject Matter from 1824 with Two Central Figures; George Rodios Murders his Wife Dimitra to Save Her from the Turks*, 1849 ... However, in subsequent exhibitions it was presented under the title *Saremo liberi!*, apparently due to the Greek inscription in the painting “Θέλει ἡμεθα ελευθεροί” [We will be free]. (28–29)

Further on, we read that the work

was exhibited in 1849 in Turin, the seat of the king of Sardinia, and since then has belonged to the city’s Palazzo Reale, where it is still located. Given the work’s subject matter, date and the place where it was presented and is preserved, it appears to be directly related to the First Italian War of Independence of 1848–1849. Charles Albert of Sardinia, who was based in Turin, moved against the Austrians, while there was unrest in many Italian cities ... The message of the painting “Freedom or Death” from the Greek War of Independence is transferred to the Italian uprising of 1848 against the Austrians. (29)

In her study, we read that even nowadays philhellenic works are placed in historical-political as well as cultural contexts that resignify them on their

own terms, increasing their conceptual, ideological and symbolic high point. Drakopoulou writes:

In 2017–2018, an exhibition titled *Opera: Passion, Power and Politics* was held at the Victoria and Albert Museum. Seven operas were associated with the seven European capitals in which they had premiered, while simultaneously also representing an important moment in the art and history of these cities. The political and artistic atmosphere of nineteenth-century Milan was fleshed out based on Giuseppe Verdi’s opera *Nabucco*. *The Refugees of Parga*, a painting by the Venetian Francesco Hayez ... was one of the representative paintings in the section devoted to Milan. The opera was staged at the Teatro alla Scala in 1842. Hayez’s work was created in 1831. The historical event it depicts, the departure into exile of the inhabitants of Parga, caused by Ali Pasha’s purchase of the town from the British, occurred in 1819. The selection of this particular painting is explained in the exhibition catalogue’s commentary on the work: “This painting was inspired by the handover of the city of Parga by the British to the Ottoman Sultan [sic] Ali Pasha at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It addresses the themes of exiled patriots and loss of the homeland, subjects that resonate with the story of *Nabucco* – and, arguably, with the feelings of many Milanese living under Austrian rule after the Vienna treaties of 1815.” (14–15)

The fruit of thorough research on many levels and of an in-depth knowledge of European history painting, this work by Eugenia Drakopoulou is yet more evidence of the penetrating gaze she turned to the work of art, its functions and uses within the historical-political and social context of its period and beyond. Thanks to the ways in which she approached and studied the philhellenic artistic production, Drakopoulou broadened the interpretive horizon and provided an example of how to manage

visual material in unconventional ways, generating multifaceted readings of the works and their creators. These are readings that revitalise an entrenched work-centred perspective of the historiography of art, as they graft new dimensions and contents upon it in conjunction with the complexity and polysemy of historical phenomena.

Aphrodite Kouria
Art Historian

Anastassios Anastassiadis,
*LA RÉFORME ORTHODOXE: ÉGLISE, ÉTAT ET SOCIÉTÉ EN GRÈCE À
L'ÉPOQUE DE LA CONFESIONNALISATION POST-OTTOMANE (1833-1940),*
Athènes: École française d'Athènes, 2020, 597 pages.

Le 14 septembre 2022, l'archevêque Hiéronyme d'Athènes et de toute la Grèce est apparu à Schisto, une région située entre le port du Pirée et la zone industrielle de Skaramanga, aux côtés du Premier ministre Kyriakos Mitsotakis, avec en toile de fond des maquettes futuristes de bâtiments et d'infrastructure, pour présenter un grandiloquent projet d'investissement dans 3000 acres appartenant à l'Église: THE GREEN ΣΧΙΣΤΟ (l'épithète *Green* visant apparemment à faire face au reproche que grande partie de ce terrain est une forêt protégée).

Un mois plus tard, dans une interview à *Καθημερινή*, l'archevêque, interrogé sur l'"ambiance de sauvagerie" qui régit la société grecque, répond que "ce qui se passe est certainement une décadence". Il répète quatre fois le mot "décadence", pour conclure qu'il faut "être sérieux, se moderniser dans le bon sens du terme, être capable de manipuler les soi-disant chrétiens".¹ À la question "avec quelle vision, avec quel plan" l'Église réussira, sa réponse est axée sur ΣΧΙΣΤΟ:

Après beaucoup de discussions [avec le premier ministre], je lui ai dit: nous ne sommes pas dans la période outhonienne ou postouthonienne ...

Nous voulons nous donner la liberté d'exploiter notre propriété ... Unissons nos forces. Il m'a dit: le TAIPED [Fonds de développement de la propriété publique et privée] est à votre disposition pour préparer le projet pour vous ... La première chose que nous avons décidé de développer est Schisto ... Le Premier ministre nous a dit: Vous êtes libres de disposer de votre propriété comme vous le souhaitez.

L'archevêque réclame le soutien et la protection du pouvoir politique pour exploiter efficacement la propriété de l'Église. Mais en même temps, il veut souligner son indépendance:

Je porte l'expérience de toutes ces années, les bonnes et les mauvaises, les confrontations avec l'État, les querelles, tout, tout ... Alors que chaque archevêque pendant son mandat faisait 6, 7, 8 prélats, pendant mon mandat ... on a fait un total de 57 sur 80 ... C'est notre succès que l'État n'intervienne pas dans la sélection.

Même s'il s'arrête en 1940, le livre de Tassos Anastassiadis nous offre, peut-être pour la première fois, une base historique solide et un cadre conceptuel approprié pour comprendre le langage du chef de l'Église, ses échanges avec le

¹ *Καθημερινή*, 23 octobre 2022.

chef du pouvoir politique et la manière dont il utilise l'histoire. Il nous permet de décoder cette configuration apparemment contradictoire qui combine attachement à la "tradition" et "modernisation", dépendance et autonomie. Car, selon Anastasiadis, l'Église de Grèce "est engagée dans un processus de négociation permanente", ou dans une "interdépendance antagoniste", avec l'État; une négociation qui "continue encore et toujours", mais dont le paradigme "a surtout été solidement établi dans les années 1923–1936".

Le rôle de l'Église dans la Grèce moderne est tellement tenu comme une évidence (tant par ses défenseurs que par ses détracteurs) qu'il 'a rarement fait l'objet d'une analyse systématique, contrairement à d'autres champs de l'histoire de la Grèce moderne. À l'exception d'études d'histoires événementielles "internes", écrites par des ecclésiastiques ou des théologiens, qui fournissent beaucoup de données mais très peu de clés de compréhension. L'Église, sa structure, son fonctionnement, ses cadres, ses relations avec la société, l'État, l'économie, restent largement méconnus.

Anastasiadis nous dit que le lecteur ne devra pas y chercher l'exhaustivité en termes d'histoire factuelle mais une "histoire problématisée": une histoire qui discute constamment ses outils conceptuels. En effet, son livre se caractérise par sa perspective sociologique et la discussion extensive de concepts, idées et analyses de sociologues et d'anthropologues, tels que Weber, Bourdieu, Simmel, Halbwachs etc. C'est en même temps une œuvre impressionnante par son ampleur, sa documentation, la richesse et la diversité de ses sources: des revues ecclé-

siastiques, journaux, livres et archives, en même temps que de nombreux témoignages venant d'observateurs 'étrangers', diplomates, ecclésiastiques et de la littérature de l'époque. C'est une œuvre qui vient combler une grande lacune et former la base pour toute discussion future sur le sujet.

Le livre prend également en compte les aspects économique et géographique. Il abonde en tableaux, statistiques et cartes, alors qu'il est accompagné d'une plateforme numérique présentant des données statistiques de l'État grec et de l'Église pour la fin du XIXe siècle selon trois niveaux administratifs différents: la municipalité, le nome et le diocèse.²

De plus, le livre nous offre une perspective internationale et interreligieuse, en comparant systématiquement l'Église de la Grèce avec d'autres structures ecclésiastiques, catholiques, protestantes etc. La discussion sur la "Réforme Orthodoxe" est inscrite dans la perspective générale qui oppose la Réforme à la Contre-Réforme; une inscription que n'est pas arbitraire puisque cette corrélation est faite par les protagonistes et commentateurs de la "Réforme Orthodoxe". Une audacieuse association est faite (principalement à travers les analyses de Peter Brown) à l'Antiquité tardive: l'époque de la "première sécularisation". Cette association se justifie par les références que font à cette époque (aux pères Cappadociens) les réformateurs eux-mêmes.

Il s'agit d'ailleurs d'une approche sciemment "non-politique", c'est-à-dire, qui part de l'Église en tant que structure

² <https://geoeglise.efa.gr/oldgreece.html>.

sociale pour tenter d'interpréter le rôle que joue la politique et les conflits complexes et souvent contradictoires entre l'Église et l'État. Or, l'accent mis sur la sociologie, les structures, l'économie, les groupes sociaux, ne signifie pas que le rôle des individus soit sous-estimé. Le livre est en grande partie un vaste exposé de trajectoires individuelles qui se chevauchent, ainsi que l'exposé des réseaux de ces individus.

Mais je dirais au-delà des nombreux thématiques qu'il aborde, des histoires croisées d'institutions, de personnes, d'associations, et des perspectives multiples des sources présentées, la principale qualité du livre d'Anastassiadis est qu'il présente un schéma très clair et cohérent, qui est exposé dès le début et est davantage expliqué à chaque nouvelle étape de l'analyse et du récit. Le livre est la longue histoire d'une *Réforme* et – surtout – de ses agents: les diverses organisations, individus et réseaux qui l'ont conçue, propagée, entrepris et finalement mené à bien.

C'est en même temps une réflexion sur une série de concepts centraux interconnectés: *Réforme, confessionnalisation, sécularisation, tradition/modernité et champ religieux*. Concepts introduits et mis à l'épreuve principalement dans le cadre de l'histoire du christianisme occidental, catholique et protestant. Anastassiadis critique les approches les plus courantes concernant l'histoire de l'Église grecque du point de vue des sciences sociales. Surtout l'utilisation récurrente des modèles dualistes (tradition/modernité, orthodoxie/Europe occidentale) qui reproduisent l'image d'une orthodoxie strictement prémoderne, d'un "monolithe idéologique", d'une Église qui par sa nature est opposée à la *moder-*

nité, qui, elle, correspond à un idéal-type européen occidental prédéfini. Il veut, au contraire, retracer l'émergence d'une "modernité orthodoxe" particulière, une parmi les multiples "modernités différenciées" qui émergent à l'époque de la confessionnalisation tardive, ottomane et post-ottomane.

Le concept central autour duquel on peut dire que tout le récit est articulé est celui de sécularisation. Mais ce qui importe, c'est la manière dont ce concept est introduit et employé. Non pas dans son sens le plus familier et commun, à savoir, la sortie de la religion du monde moderne, mais, au sens de l'implication de l'Église dans les questions temporelles, de son entrée dans la société, du "passage de la transcendance à l'immanence".

Il ne s'agit pas, par ailleurs, d'une histoire structurée simplement autour d'une confrontation basique entre réformateurs et anti-réformateurs: le récit porte en effet beaucoup sur des conflits, mais multiples, entrelacés et à différentes échelles: "des antagonismes entre différentes religions, entre État et Église, entre institutions, entre laïcs et clercs, entre prophètes et clercs, entre clercs réguliers et clercs séculiers et parfois entre tous ceux-là en même temps".

Le livre est composé de deux grandes parties, qui sont séparées (et connectées) par la grande rupture de la décennie 1912–1922.

La première partie consiste principalement dans la description d'une "inertie". La caractéristique principale de cette période est que l'État refuse à l'Église toute autonomie, mais aussi le compromis de l'Église avec ce régime d'hétéronomie, et l'absence de sa part de toute activité sociale, de tout effort visant à pénétrer

dans la société. L'État contrôle l'Église, mais plutôt la hiérarchie que les ouailles. Le terme *post-ottoman* dans le titre veut souligner que malgré la création d'un nouvel État, on peut constater, à plusieurs niveaux, une continuité des pratiques du passé, notamment en ce qui concerne les minorités religieuses. L'État les traite avec une certaine tolérance, tout en offrant une protection absolue à la majorité religieuse (l'interdiction du prosélytisme). Cette tolérance ne signifie pas liberté de conscience, mais l'existence d'un marché (des biens du salut) régulé par l'État.

La première partie souligne les absences, les manques. L'Église agit comme bras spirituel de l'État en vue de discipliner la société. Mais cela est très difficile, car elle ne dispose pas d'un personnel discipliné et compétent, ni d'une organisation centralisée et rationnelle. L'Église ne contrôle pas les prêtres, qui sont élus et entretenus par les paroissiens. Ces carences sont parfois méconnues aujourd'hui, à cause de l'image intemporelle de l'Église. Le livre nous rappelle, par exemple, que l'image uniforme actuelle des prêtres, que nous prenons pour très traditionnelle, est le produit d'un processus "modernisateur" de standardisation et d'uniformisation, qui voulait différencier le clergé des laïcs par sa tenue, et contrôler son comportement. Des critiques du XIXe siècle qui peuvent aujourd'hui donner l'impression d'anticléricalisme étaient en fait dirigées contre l'incapacité de l'Église à imposer cette discipline, contrairement à ce qui se passait en Europe occidentale. La même chose valait pour la question de la discipline des moines et du contrôle des monastères et de leurs biens, une question sur laquelle les réforma-

teurs de l'Église n'étaient pas nécessairement opposés aux modernistes laïques. L'ascétisme traditionnel symbolisait la non-intervention de l'Église dans la société: le paradigme que les réformateurs voulaient changer.

Un autre manque qui est soulignée, et qui semble également étrange aujourd'hui, est l'indifférence complète de l'Église du XIXe siècle pour la charité. Ce secteur était dominé par l'évergétisme privé et l'aumône individuelle, qui pouvait être faite au nom de principes chrétiens, mais sans l'initiative organisée de l'Église. Si Basile de Césarée allait devenir un modèle au début du XXe siècle, ce n'est pas seulement en raison de l'idéologie helléno-chrétienne, mais aussi parce qu'il était considéré comme le réformateur du monachisme sous l'autorité de l'évêque, et l'organisateur de l'activité philanthropique, c'est-à-dire d'une intervention active de l'Église dans la société.

Ces manques n'apparaissent pas seulement a posteriori à l'historien, mais ils se concrétisent progressivement dans le discours des différents acteurs qui font leur apparition au sein de l'Église ou dans sa périphérie, pour préparer, à partir de positions différentes, la réforme.

Les réformateurs voulaient la sécularisation de l'Église, son engagement actif au sein d'une société en pleine mutation, mais ceci impliquait l'existence d'un appareil ecclésiastique efficace, compétent et contrôlée. Ainsi, la formation du clergé et sa rémunération (nécessaire pour son contrôle et sa bureaucratisation) deviennent une question centrale pour toute idée de réforme. Anastassiadis fait longuement référence aux projets du XIXe siècle visant à combiner le métier de prêtre avec celui d'instituteur, comme

solution au problème de la rémunération, mais il souligne que nous ne pouvons pas les comprendre à travers une analyse idéologique de réaction/progrès.

Le livre distingue deux catégories d'aspirants réformateurs. À la première appartiennent les prélats qui veulent imposer la réforme d'en haut, en se basant sur l'appui de l'État, comme Germanos Kalligas, élu archevêque d'Athènes en 1889, grâce à Charilaos Trikoupis, "probablement l'occasion manquée de réforme de l'Église de Grèce au XIXe s."

À la deuxième catégorie appartiennent les mouvements des laïcs qui tentent d'amener une réforme "par le bas". Leur figure centrale fut Apostolos Makrakis, qui, à côté d'un discours irrédentiste et messianique, a formulé une critique agressive envers l'Église: corruption, dépendance à l'égard de l'État, indifférence pour l'action dans la société et notamment pour la prédication. Makrakis a aussi attaqué violemment les francs-maçons, mais cela était dû à la "ressemblance de leurs projets de moralisation de la société grecque: prédication éthique et charité devenaient les armes d'un groupe restreint d'élus". La grande importance des makrakistes pour l'histoire de la réforme réside dans le fait que, malgré leur opposition farouche à la hiérarchie, celle-ci (notamment Germanos) finit par assimiler beaucoup de leurs idées et cadres: comme l'avocat Mihail Galanos, qui deviendra le pilier d'Anaplis, l'association para-ecclésiastique la plus influente de la fin du siècle, à travers laquelle les idées makrakistes se diffusent au sein de l'Église; comme Ierotheos Mitropoulos, autre prédicateur makrakiste, qui en 1892 fut élu archevêque d'Achaïe et Ilia et a incarné l'"apparition d'une nouvelle manière

d'être évêque"; ou encore Efsevios Matthopoulos qui, après avoir servi Anaplis, a fondé en 1907 Zoi, la plus importante organisation para-ecclésiastique du XXe siècle, qui a réinterprété le modèle de l'ascétisme, dans un projet d'engagement avec la société urbaine moderne.

Le moment charnière pour le changement de paradigme, souligne Anastassiadis, sera le lendemain de la décennie guerrière 1912-1922 et de la "catastrophe" d'Asie mineure. Dans les années précédant le "Schisme national" l'interventionnisme de l'État et l'hyperpolitisation de l'Église avaient atteint leur apogée. Mais cela contribue plutôt à la prise de conscience de la nécessité de sortir du statut d'hétéronomie. L'effondrement de l'Empire ottoman avait engendré l'idée d'une réintégration de l'Église de la Grèce au patriarcat; la Grande Idée vénizéliste rejoignait les aspirations des réformateurs (Meletios Metaxakis et Chrysostome Papadopoulos), qui promouvaient également un rapprochement avec les anglicans dans la perspective d'un partage anglo-grec de l'Orient méditerranéen. Mais la "catastrophe" a mis fin à ces projets.

L'afflux de réfugiés, et avec eux, l'émergence menaçante d'antagonistes, tels que les missionnaires catholiques et les militants communistes, la fin des visions irrédentistes et impérialistes, la stabilisation des frontières, la nécessité de l'intégration nationale et ecclésiastique des "Nouveaux Pays", tout cela a créé le besoin impératif et les conditions d'une réforme de l'appareil ecclésiastique. Son début coïncide avec la "Révolution" des militaires vénizélistes, l'introduction du calendrier grégorien et l'élection de Chrysostome

Papadopoulos comme métropolite d'Athènes en février 1923.

La seconde partie du livre présente cette victoire des réformateurs. Dans le chaos social, l'Église se lance dans un combat pour quadriller la société. Principalement par le biais d'organisations para-ecclésiastiques, qui se trouvent en lutte avec d'autres forces (missionnaires, franc-maçons, communistes) engagés dans une action sociale et philanthropique.

Mais cette accélération de la sécularisation, de l'engagement active de l'Église dans le monde moderne, se fait avec des positions idéologiques de plus en plus conservatrices. L'Église devient un allié très important de l'État dans son effort de contrôler et homogénéiser la société qui émerge d'une décennie de crise. L'Église se dote pour la première fois d'une organisation rationnelle et homogène, administrée par un personnel tendant à la professionnalisation. Le contrôle épiscopal de l'Église s'accroît, et l'Église devient de plus en plus synonyme du corps hiératique.

L'aspect le plus important de l'entrée de l'Église dans la société est le lancement, pour la première fois, d'une activité caritative organisée. Elle vise à ne pas céder du terrain aux confessions antagonistes en même temps qu'à justifier la possession de la propriété ecclésiastique. Elle s'appuie sur la systématisation de l'aumône, qui doit cesser d'être une pratique individuelle et devenir organisée, avec l'Église comme médiatrice nécessaire entre les philanthropes et les pauvres. L'autre aspect est celui de l'éducation, qui ne s'exprime pas pourtant par la création d'écoles confessionnelles, puisque, dans le cadre de son alliance avec l'État, l'Église se contente du

contrôle idéologique de l'enseignement public, mais par le développement d'un vaste réseau d'écoles de catéchèse, dans lequel le protagoniste est Ζωή. Ces actions impliquent aussi une mobilisation importante des femmes et c'est en grande partie par le biais des femmes que l'Église essaie de contrôler les hommes et la société. Dans des rôles secondaires, bien sûr, et avec un discours, là encore, très conservateur, nettement hostile aux droits des femmes.

Dans le discours de l'Église, tout cela, la charité, le catéchisme, la mobilisation des femmes, font partie d'un combat contre la *décadence morale* de la société, qui se manifeste par la criminalité, le "naufage familial", les mœurs libres modernes. Cette rhétorique de crise morale s'adressait principalement à la petite bourgeoisie que l'Église considérait comme l'ossature de la société et dans laquelle recrutaient les associations para-ecclésiastiques.

En même temps, on a la lutte, menée conjointement par l'État et l'Église, pour l'intégration nationale, voire l'hellénisation des "Nouveaux Pays", des populations non grecophones et les réfugiés. L'État dépend de l'Église et l'Église dépend de l'État. C'est une guerre commune contre ceux qui menacent la cohésion nationale-religieuse: tels que les communistes qui militaient dans les bidonvilles des réfugiés, et dont les idées étaient perçues comme étrangères au caractère national et comme un symptôme de la crise morale. Le communisme était quasiment identifié comme une religion étrangère et la loi de l'Ἰδιώτουμν de 1929 punissait le "prosélytisme en faveur du communisme".

Anastassiadis souligne le fait que c'est principalement le vénizélisme modernisateur qui, dans les années 1920, adopte et réinterprète l'idéologie de l'hellénisme (l'identification du Grec avec le Grec orthodoxe) dans un sens plus politique (vers l'anticommunisme), et il le fait en collaboration avec l'Église (réformiste), qui acquiert un rôle politique plus essentiel. État et Église forment leur alliance en persécutant des opposants comme les anciens-calendaristes (qui se sont surtout implantés parmi des populations non-grecophones), les grecs-catholiques (uniates), les témoins de Jéhovah, les communistes. Cette alliance entre État et Église "allait dériver vers l'intolérance". Dans leur brochure électorale de 1932, les libéraux se félicitaient d'avoir banni les "écoles étrangères qui étaient devenues des centres de propagande et des foyers de prosélytisme",

ayant accepté toutes les demandes de l'Église.

Le livre de Tassos Anastassiadis nous montre ainsi comment la victoire de la "Réforme Orthodoxe" et la manière historiquement spécifique dont elle a été réalisée, a finalement conduit à un durcissement idéologique, à une intolérance nettement plus forte que celle de la période précédente. Le renforcement de l'autonomie de l'Église dans l'entre-deux-guerres a entraîné sa politisation réactionnaire. Laquelle, dirions-nous, se prolonge dans le régime d'après-guerre, dans la façon dont l'Église s'implique dans la dictature de 1967, ou, une partie considérable d'elle, s'allie à l'extrême droite fasciste dans les années 2010.

Paraskevas Matalas
Université de Crète

Paraskevas Matalas,
*ΚΟΣΜΟΠΟΛΙΤΕΣ ΕΘΝΙΚΙΣΤΕΣ: Ο ΜΩΡΙΣ ΜΠΑΡΕΣ ΚΑΙ
ΟΙ ΑΝΑ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟ “ΜΑΘΗΤΕΣ” ΤΟΥ*
[Cosmopolitan nationalists: Maurice Barres
and his “disciples” around the world],
Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2021, 416 pages.

Maurice Barres, the well-known novelist, journalist and politician, holds an important place in the history of European thought. The author of the *Roman de l'energie nationale* trilogy was a central figure in French cultural and political life at the turn of the twentieth century. Due to his organic and traditionalist concept of the nation, based on the cult of the “land and the dead”, he established himself as a “theorist” of “new” nationalism. The historical and political literature on his life, his thought and his work is nowadays extensive. Scholars have thoroughly discussed his nationalist doctrine, placing it in its broader context, assessing its decisive influence on the emergence of a radical right-wing current, which ultimately contributed to the rise of European fascism.

This recent monograph by Paraskevas Matalas enriches modern studies on Barres, successfully filling a research gap in the academic output. The author investigates the bonds between the French “master” and his contacts, his followers, his admirers and his “disciples” all around the world. In his essay, Matalas adopts the current nation theories and correctly opposes any essentialist per-

ception of the nation. Such a constructivist point of view gives him the chance to undermine and deconstruct any all kinds of nationalistic stereotypes that continue to bind the collective imagination in public history. But most importantly, Matalas’ study enriches our concrete scientific knowledge on nationalist ideology in the early twentieth century.

As implied by the title of the book, nationalism is examined as an international phenomenon, closely intertwined with the concerted action of the intelligentsia. This key feature of the national idea, its formation and its international spread via political and cosmopolitan circles, could certainly be considered as something permanent in time, namely it does not constitute a distinctive difference of nationalism at the turn of the century. But certainly it should be re-examined in the light of the transformations that nationalism underwent over this specific period.

Indeed, almost all studies in the history of political ideas underline that a crucial paradigm shift occurred in the last decades of the nineteenth century: a new nationalism emerged, cut off from the liberal and rationalist elements that

characterised the age of revolutions and national movements in the early nineteenth century. Gradually, under the decisive influence of Herder, Gobineau, Bergson and Nietzsche, new nationalist doctrines moved away from the Enlightenment's legacy and the ecumenical spirit of the eighteenth century. A romantic and irrational nationalism, invested with strong antisemitic elements, appeals to the darker aspects of the collective imaginary. Embracing theories of social Darwinism, glorifying violence and "life-giving" war, nationalism now radically changed its character: from a progressive force opposed to the ancien régime, it became an ardent opponent of the democratic and egalitarian spirit of modernity. Maurice Barres, a man of his times, condenses in his work all these cultural and ideological trends that would soon turn Europe into a "Dark Continent".

In this broader context, Matalas aptly notes the intersection in the history of the nationalist phenomenon, as it is reflected in the political vocabulary of the late nineteenth century. It was Barres who introduced and popularised "nationalism" and "nationalists" as terms of political self-identity, that is, he gave the specific words a positive meaning that they had not previously (17). The situation was similar, for example, in Portugal. There, anti-parliamentary circles established "nationalism" as a distinct political self-description in the early 1900s. They founded the Centro Nacional (which published the *Correio Nacional* newspaper) and in 1903, they created the Partido Nacionalista. These intellectuals and politicians were fervent Catholics, who turned against Jacobins

and Freemasons. Some among them, for example José Fernando de Sousa, were in contact with Barres from 1916 onwards (132).

Emphasising in several parts of his book that nationalist discourse constitutes an "exportable product" whose circulation transcends borders and wider regions, Matalas rightly demonstrates that cultural and ideological exchanges constitute a fluid and two-way process. It is not only Barres who shapes, across France, what it means "to be a nation", but conversely he himself is influenced by his meetings on his travels, by his conversations with politicians, authors, institutional players and like-minded thinkers. Such an approach de facto challenges the strict distinction between "core" and "periphery" states, between the cultural environments that produce "original" political concepts and those that passively receive them, while it also refutes another fixed idea, that economically, socially and culturally the "underdeveloped South" leads the way in extreme political phenomena.

However, the main originality of Matala's project remains to be found elsewhere. The author proceeds with a systematic and thorough reconstruction of "nationalism's horizontal scale", if one could put it that way. He discusses in detail the nationalist phenomenon as a complex network of people, as a web of real relations, having Paris as its geographical and symbolic shaft. Taking the French thinker as his key reference, Matalas crafts the – sometimes contradictory and certainly heterogeneous – mosaic of "Barresists", following their footsteps in Italy, in the Iberian Peninsula, in the exotic "East" and the Ottoman Empire.

Particular attention is paid to the role of diplomats and to some “paradoxical conversions”, such as the case of Ernst Jünger (an important figure of the radical right in the “conservative revolution” in Germany), or the case of Léopold Sédar Senghor who promoted the idea of “negritude”. The last two chapters focusing on Barres’ ties with Greece and his relations with Greek intellectuals take up almost half of the book.

As all this extensive historical evidence is modularly organised in chapters that deal with a wider region or a country each time, the connecting thread that runs through the book is the nodal link between nationalism and literature. Matalas studies nationalism as a “literary phenomenon” in the widespread atmosphere of elitism, aestheticism and modernism of the period. For example, he highlights Barres’ contacts with Prezzolini, Papini, Corradini, Marinetti and D’Annunzio in Italy. He illustrates their contradictions and their political disputes on the meaning of nationalism, thoroughly explaining how most of them ended up in Mussolini’s Fascist party (51–105).

Furthermore, in his work Matalas emphasises the strong correlation between nationalism and the “individual ego” of the artist, who deeply despises the masses but, at the same time, addresses them with an aesthetic sense of superiority. In addition, for Barres himself, and for many of those who accepted his ideas, there was a crucial transition from the cult of the ego to that of the nation. From the Barresian point of view, the individual does not exist in its abstract, universal dimension but it is defined by history, by the past, by his land’s

memory. Having lost his roots, modern man must rediscover them. He must analyse his own existence, which is culturally determined, in order to become again an organic part of the national community, namely the higher collectivity that establishes his individuality as a being (20, *passim*). And once the artist has found his particular national self, it is his duty to shape the national consciousness of the multitude, keeping the role of the ideological leader for himself. This intellectual’s egoistic ambition, thirsty for fame, glory and recognition, this strong desire to be something “excellent and unique”, this passion for power, all these contributed significantly to the spread and reproduction of nationalist ideas in the literary and political salons of the time (367–68).

As far as the Greek intelligentsia is concerned, such a deeply aristocratic and hierarchical perception of the self is clearly depicted in the case of Ion Dragoumis. In one of the best chapters of the book, Matalas outlines with great mastery the ideological and psychological portrait of the novelist, illuminating his shifts and clarifying his passages from one political view to the next. At first, Dragoumis passionately embraced both Barres and the national ideal, afterwards he broke with them. In these pages, the neurotic conceit of the intellectual who is torn and wavering between his egoism and the nation becomes clearly visible. What’s more, Matalas aptly explains how Dragoumis initially was driven to nationalism through the Barresian concepts of ego and energy, supplemented by a Nietzschean will to power. In his diary for years 1904–1905, he openly confesses that he “fights because he likes

war” and he wonders what’s the point of “making nations”, just to answer that a nation serves one’s need to cultivate his self (278–84).

What’s more, one should also take into account Matala’s excellent remarks on the specific way in which nationalist discourse aestheticises both the landscape and the idea of war on behalf of the nation. Echoing Walter Benjamin’s perspective, the author shows us how, in times of deep alienation, self-destruction and death are presented as extreme aesthetic pleasures. Nikos Kazantzakis is a prime example. In 1936, Toledo, devastated by the Spanish Civil War, reveals to him his “truth”, his “warlike, brave soul”. In the footsteps of Barres, the Greek writer far surpasses the “master”, as he openly stands ecstatic against the war disaster. Now, horror itself has become the ultimate attraction (330).

Similarly, the Spanish Ignacio Zuloaga, Franco’s painter, celebrates the burning of Alcazar in Toledo. He paints a kind of anti-Guernica, a tribute to the resistance of the nationalists (331). But it’s not just Spain. It is also Sparta, which Kazantzakis approaches through the spirit of Barres. He has been obviously affected by his *Voyage de Sparte* (1906), although he has concealed his debt to the French writer. Matalas masterfully explains that Kazantzakis’ Sparta is a vision of male dominance: The peaceful feminine valley “Helen”, defeated and humiliated, is brutally raped by the male mountain Taygetos. At the same time, in this bellicose and vitalistic outbreak, Kazantzakis laments the decline of his times and he calls for the uplift of his “fallen race” (326–27). Additionally, Matalas points out that, from the 1930s

onwards, the mountain becomes the symbol of the “male spirit” and continues to cast its shadow over the aesthetic invention of “authentic Greece”. For example, Myrivilis in 1936 writes for a “return to Greece”, talks about the race and the breed, while he anticipates the advent of Metaxas’ Third Greek Civilisation (353).

Therefore, all parts of the book that refer to the central role of landscape in the ideological constructions of nationalism are of particular interest, because each time a different aspect of a truly complex issue is highlighted insightfully and subtlety. So, it is really fascinating what Matalas tells us about Barres’ successive visits to Spain (from 1892 to 1902) and the decisive influence of his writings on the formation of a nationalist Spanish identity. The author discusses thoroughly the neo-romantic, medieval, mystical and orientalist vision of both the Spanish landscape and Greco and the cultural invention of “Spanishness” by the writers of the literary Generation of ’98, some of whom (for example, Ramiro de Maeztu) would subsequently turn to the nationalist radical right (119–31).

Within this complex adventure of nationalist credos, Matalas aptly highlights the importance of the Great War as a turning point, after which the nationalist and fascist movements would spring. Although Barres himself did not go as far as those influenced by his work in glorifying military violence, between 1914 and 1918 the idea of war took on a high meaning, an additional aesthetic value, namely it became an existential goal, which contributed decisively to the strengthening and further diffusion of radical nationalism. At this juncture,

Barresian nationalism, along with the nationalism of the Action Française, in combination with Italian Fascism and German Nazism, would inspire the currents of the extreme right all over the world (360–62).

Another important virtue of the book is the careful handling of the challenging historical evidence, as regards certain difficult points. Being a well-trained and experienced historian, Matalas points out the different crossroads in Barres' intellectual path, explaining in detail how specific aspects of his thought played an important role in the diffusion of nationalism under particular circumstances. So, it is important to know that Barres' socialist and federalist views had a significant impact on the development of the Catalan separatist nationalism (110–19) or to understand various changes in the intelligentsia's social relations, due to political calculations and personal ambitions.

Generally speaking, in a book which manages to illuminate the international dimension of Barresian nationalism in all its complexity, the reader can find such a variety of interrelated topics that he could go on debating for hours. On the other hand, as far as the general synthesis of the book is concerned, Matalas seems to adopt a Marxist guideline in his hermeneutics: he relates the emergence of extreme-right nationalism to the strengthening of the socialist movement in the same decades, he emphasises the bourgeois profile and the upper social status of the intellectuals, while he stresses the class dimension of the nationalist discourse vis-à-vis the opposing discourse of social emancipation (363–64, *passim*).

Given such a perspective, which is also a theoretical commitment, the author could have taken more into account the particular political and cultural contexts that determine the reception of Barresian ideas around the world. Inasmuch as the discourse and the practices of nationalists respond to socialism, its different status in each country or region should be taken into consideration, for the ideological orientation and the organisational feature of the socialist movement display a wide variety from one situation to another. Besides that, it is not just nationalists and socialists who are in conflict, but both right and left confront bourgeois democracy in different terms, given the fact that the political controversy is not identical in each country.

In France, for example, Barres' nationalism, born out of the Dreyfus affair, was in wild conflict with republicanism, whose legacy was particularly heavy. In this case, nationalism is shaped through all these currents that fight democracy: anti-parliamentarianism, Boulangism, populism and non-Marxist socialism. In Italy, the deadlock and failures of the Risorgimento led both the left and the right to question the legitimacy of the parliament. During the Red Biennium (1919–1920), nationalism and new-born fascism gained strength through the failure of the government to deal with the factory council movement. Amadeo Bordiga, the leader of the far-left tendency, divided the Italian socialists, while the political upheaval reinforced the social stream towards Mussolini. On the other hand, in Greece, the communist party was in search of its political identity, via Moscow's interventions, so it had not yet

gained the social hegemony that would allow it to threaten the bourgeois regime. This would happen during the resistance. On the contrary, it was right-wing nationalism that demonised communism, inventing the “domestic enemy”. And it did so in a period of profound crisis for the political system, when authoritarian and dictatorial solutions were chosen even by politicians of the Venizelist centre. In this context, nationalism, seen either as anti-communism or as the ideological discourse that arrived to define anew the national identity in various ways, was closely related to the general political and social breakdown after the collapse of the Great Idea, in 1922. In this regard, co-examining such specific national aspects would enrich the study of the international nationalist network, which Matalas thoroughly and consistently reconstructs. Research on the field of ideological influences would be well supported by a stronger comparative perspective, for the benefit of our further historical understanding.

In conclusion, *Cosmopolitan Nationalists* is a valuable contribution to modern historiography, because it deals with a hitherto neglected subject and brings many new issues to light. Being

the fruit of long-term systematic work, the book promotes academic dialogue and opens up new fields of research. Undoubtedly impressive in its documentation (including rich photographic evidence) and competent in the management of the historic material, it fairly gains the appreciation of the historian community. The author definitely succeeds to illuminate the human links beneath the general history of ideas, showing the idiosyncrasies, antagonisms, calculations and personal interests that governed the doings of the intelligentsia at the turn of the twentieth century. Capturing the matrix of nationalist ideas, showing their admixtures and underlining their contradictions, Matalas offers us a really useful intellectual map, which highlights the particular impact of Maurice Barres’ political thought at a crucial time: the decades before World War II, when the conservative right, reactionary radicalism, authoritarianism and fascism were dangerously gaining in popularity everywhere, without anyone yet being able to imagine what was to follow.

Vicky Karafoulidou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Kostis Gkotsinas,
ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΟΥΣΙΑΣ: ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΝΑΡΚΩΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΑ, 1875–1950,
[In substance: A history of drugs in Greece, 1875–1950],
Athens: Crete University Press, 2021, 528 pages
POISONS SOCIAUX: HISTOIRE DES STUPÉFIANTS EN GRÈCE (1875–1950),
Athens: École française d’Athènes, 2022, 383 pages.

In this book, Kostis Gkotsinas presents the outcomes of a long-term and original research project on a subject that had not attracted much historical interest. His book provides a unique opportunity to approach “drugs”, “substances” and “addictions” in their historical context, to understand how “words and things” are connected and also to historicise the subject. This allows for a deeper understanding of the social realities, scientific knowledge, perceptions, views, social and cultural values and practices, as well as interests embedded in the world of narcotic substances.

The author systematically and methodically maps the social landscape in which drugs emerged. Starting from the late nineteenth century, around 1870, Gkotsinas takes us back to the subject’s origins, discussing how certain substances were long known, but also how morphine was used in conflicts like the Franco-Prussian War, while technologies such as the hypodermic syringe appeared and were gradually used more widely. The Great War, and conflicts more broadly, contributed to the spread of morphine and other substances used on wounded soldiers. In this period, the

concept of “addiction” (mainly of “addiction to morphine” or “morphinomania”) was coined. It is known that in Greece, for example, the cultivation of cannabis spread. The book shows how the term “narcotics” has functioned as an umbrella term since the early twentieth century and had come to include various substances that are not exclusively associated with “narcosis”: in addition to morphine, it gradually encompassed cocaine, opium, ether and barbiturates. To be sure, drug substances and related medical or chemical products also had therapeutic uses (for example, the aforementioned morphine), which were not necessarily prohibited. Nevertheless, the book demonstrates how, during the interwar period, the concept of “drug addiction” was consolidated, as well as how the processes of control, policing and prohibition were expanded. In this field, medical opinions intersected with legal dimensions and discourses.

Gkotsinas’ book frames the Greek case with international developments and the actions of organisations such as the League of Nations. In the wake of substance diffusion, mainly during World War I, state bureaucracies gradu-

ally developed mechanisms for the control and suppression of practices involving substances like cocaine, opiates or cannabis. In the Greek case in particular, exports to Egypt played an important role in the shaping of the relevant legislation, for example, in state controls.

But who participated in the drugs world in Greece at the time? Who were the drug users, how did one gain access to a given substance, how did drugs circulate? The book unfolds a whole geography of places, communities, people and substances, ranging from cocaine imported for medicinal purposes to hashish dens. These sections of the book are of a particular interest. Gkotsinas very vividly shows how drug use follows complex and diverse pathways, where people of different social and class characteristics, as well as qualities, identities and professions, meet. He points out that what makes differences or underscores existing ones (for example, a bourgeois residence is not the same thing as a hashish den) is not drug use itself, as much as the setting and the mode of consumption. And if the stereotype presenting the Asia Minor refugees as hashish consumers still lingers, the author maintains a cautious stance on the issue, arguing that the evidence does not show either that refugees introduced the substance or that they were overrepresented in controls, arrests, etc. In this field, the book also demonstrates the thin dividing lines within different communities, such as the *rebetiko* musicians, between cannabis smokers and heroin users – see the story of Anestis Delias and the songs of Yovan Tsaous, demarcating hashish-drinkers (*χασισοπότες*) and heroin

junkies (*πρεζάκηδες*) (236–37 in the Greek edition, 145–46 in the French). This part of Gkotsinas' book constitutes an alternative geography and history of urban space in twentieth-century Greece, which not only enriches our knowledge of this period's social history, but also takes us to unfamiliar places and spots (for example, hashish dens, workshops, ports, neighbourhoods) as well as to practices within hitherto little-studied familiar spaces, such as the bourgeois residence. This social dimension constitutes an important contribution of the book.

The public debate, the images of drugs and drug users are of similar interest. The author argues that the public interest in drugs and drug use was far greater than their diffusion. The logic of treating users as patients was rather declarative. But there were other aspects in the press, within academia, in the medical and legal world, etc., that the book studies and creatively unravels, seeking “buried archives” in literary representations, in media and scientific discourse. In the interwar period, drugs become a “public issue” with many facets. First, the book dissects what the author defines as “anti-drug nationalism” (292 Greek ed., 184 French ed.). It shows how the ideas of degeneration and decline, already widespread since the late nineteenth century, and the related rhetoric are intertwined with fears that national stamina and health are being undermined, but also how the “ailing nation” has its dangerous underminers. An interesting new dimension in this issue is the piecing together and updating of stereotypes, such as the Jewish drug dealer in Thessaloniki newspapers in 1934, who undermines

the country's prestige and image (260 Greek ed., 163 French ed.).

However, the book does not confine itself to a univocal and homogeneous image of "national decline" produced during this period. On the contrary, and very importantly, the concept of "social decline", which is multifaceted and linked to "moral panics", is studied in parallel. First, it is associated with shifts in the roles of social actors, for example, the "unsupervised" or "abandoned youth" (449 Greek ed., 282 French ed.), the modernisation of women, the modernisation of technologies and time (for example, intravenous injection), raising fears concerning modern society and technological civilisation. This is a most valid aspect of the analysis. Gkotsinas shows how political divides and discourses intersect in the field of drugs. For the Left, the "artificial paradises" of the bourgeoisie coexist with the rhetoric of the "contamination" of the popular by the upper classes, mainly with hitherto unknown chemical substances, which formed decadent attitudes and a tendency towards crime and marginalisation.

One of the book's merits is the thorough analysis of a wide spectrum of dis-

courses, counter-discourses and policies on the issue. Thus, the book examines a wide variety of people, attributes, subjects and ideas: social agents with different characteristics; the advent of drugs as a public issue with various facets; aspects of the social, for example, the urban space, the technologies of time, etc., that are approached through a completely different perspective; social and political divisions that produce different discourses and representations.

As a result, the history of drugs intersects with many other "big" and "little" histories. The wide range of evidence and the rich analysis allows us to see the book not just as a history of drugs, but more broadly as a history of modern Greece in the light of how narcotic substances were used, dealt with and perceived.

Kostis Gkotsinas has produced a well-documented, rich, multifaceted and well-written work on a very difficult subject. And he has succeeded, in essence, in detecting the pulse of stories that are otherwise very difficult to tell.

Effi Gazi

University of the Peloponnese

Maximilien Giraud et Claire Béchu (éds.)

LA FRANCE ET LA GRÈCE AU XXE SIÈCLE: DES ARCHIVES À L'HISTOIRE,

(Mondes Méditerranéens et Balkaniques, 15),

Athènes: École Française d'Athènes, 2021, 443 pages.

Le robuste volume inclut les contributions de chercheurs Français et Grecs qui travaillent de façon systématique dans le domaine des archives et qui représentent des institutions qui conservent des archives. Il est structuré en quatre unités intitulées "Histoire Politique, Diplomatique et Militaire", "Communautés, Individus et Surveillance", "Recherche, Enseignement, Étudiants" et "Beaux-Arts et Littérature".

La première unité s'ouvre avec la contribution du pionnier de ce volume, Maximilien Giraud, qui traite de "La Grèce dans les fonds des chefs de l'État du XXe siècle aux Archives nationales". Les archives diffèrent sur le plan de la forme (Pétain, de Gaulle) mais, en même temps, sont d'une richesse inégale.

Frédéric Guelton poursuit avec "L'Armée française en Grèce: 1915–1920", un sujet peu abordé dans l'historiographie française. L'on connaît peu de choses de cette Armée d'Orient des 400 000 soldats, dans les années 1915–1923. L'article décrit l'organisation de l'armée: une partie de l'infanterie, de divers corps d'armée qui, à certains moments, incluait également d'autres nationalités, campa à Thessalonique. Elle était soutenue par la marine. Dans

l'article, le lecteur découvre les commandants de l'Armée, son activité et ses traits particuliers ainsi que sa fin, avec la fermeture de la base, à Thessalonique, début 1921.

Mathieu René-Hubert présente "Des militaires en fouilles: traces et archives des activités archéologiques de l'Armée d'Orient". Parallèlement aux campagnes, l'Armée d'Orient menait des recherches scientifiques et, notamment, des fouilles archéologiques. Plusieurs sources sont conservées, éparses, dans les archives de différents services: documents administratifs/officiels, correspondances, notes, plans et photographies. Le Service archéologique de l'Armée d'Orient (SAAO) fut mis sur pied, encadré et opéra conformément à trois documents réglementaires. Il fut actif pendant trois ans et opéra sur 94 sites à Thessalonique, dans la vallée d'Axios et à Monastir. 1 300 objets furent conservés à Thessalonique, 25 caisses furent envoyées en deux expéditions au musée du Louvre (1917, 1932). Les travaux portaient sur trois périodes: préhistoire et protohistoire, Antiquité récente et Byzance, période ottomane contemporaine. Le Service fit preuve d'un intérêt sincère mais nourrissait également l'idée selon laquelle

l'Armée d'Orient s'intéressait au patrimoine qu'elle était tenue de défendre.

Anne Liskenne aborde "Les relations entre la Grèce et la France à la lumière des archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères et la question particulière des traités de la paix signée entre 1919 et 1923". L'auteur nous propose une histoire des relations franco-grecques pendant la 1^{ère} guerre mondiale, telles qu'elles découlent des archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères. Les archives concernant les traités sont conservées séparément des archives civiles. En outre, ayant été chargée de réunir les textes et les accords, la France détient les archives des six traités qui furent conclus. L'article présente les premières négociations du premier traité de paix, l'échec du traité de Sèvres et le traité de Lausanne, conclu trois ans plus tard.

Elli Lemonidou examine la question de "La Grèce vue par la France dans le premier après-guerre à travers les archives françaises (1919-1924)". Au vu des archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères, les contacts diplomatiques entre la France et la Grèce demeurent intenses. Ils portent principalement sur deux points: la politique grecque et les cérémonies de commémoration des soldats français morts en Grèce et l'indemnisation liée à la présence militaire des Alliés sur les territoires grecs. L'auteur analyse le rôle de la monarchie en Grèce après la Guerre et poursuit avec la question de l'indemnisation, sur la base des revendications grecques. Après un an de travaux, la commission constituée à cet effet conclut, en 1925, à des montants précis pour la France, l'Angleterre et l'Italie. Toutefois, par la

suite, avec l'accord du gouvernement grec, ces indemnisations furent traitées séparément par l'Angleterre et la France. À la suite de longues négociations, qui eurent un impact fort sur les relations franco-grecques, l'accord avec la France fut conclu en 1930.

"La politique européenne de l'État hellénique et la contribution de la France à travers les fonds archivistiques grecs" est le sujet abordé par Marietta Minotou. L'article présente le parcours de la Grèce dans le domaine de l'adhésion à la Communauté européenne, en tant que dixième membre, en deux étapes. La première porte sur la demande d'adhésion présentée en 1959 et qui aboutit à la conclusion d'un accord en 1961. La seconde commence en 1975 et s'étend jusqu'à l'adhésion, en 1981. Les sources archivistiques grecques témoignent du rôle déterminant joué par la France dans ce processus. Les documents concernés sont conservés sur support papier, électronique, audio, audiovisuel ainsi que dans des objets muséaux. Les instances qui conservent des documents sont la Fondation Constantin Caramanlis (archives C. Caramanlis, pionnier de l'adhésion, archives C. Tsaldaris), les Archives générales de l'État (Commission des négociations, Secrétariat général à la Presse et à l'information, ministère de la Présidence, ministère des Affaires étrangères, etc.). L'auteur analyse l'attitude et la contribution de la France à travers les archives grecques.

Georgios Polydorakis choisit de traiter des "Instantanés des relations diplomatiques franco-helléniques pendant la dictature en Grèce (1967-1974)". Il examine la période complexe des années

de la dictature, vue à travers les archives du ministère des affaires étrangères, avec une attention particulière portée sur deux points: la sortie de la Grèce du Conseil de l'Europe en 1969 et l'accord d'association de la Grèce à la CEE. En commençant par la représentation diplomatique de la Grèce en France, il met en avant des instantanés de l'évolution des relations diplomatiques pendant la dictature. La dernière partie explore l'attitude du gouvernement face à la presse et la vie artistique, comme par exemple Mikis Théodorakis à la radio et à la télévision, le célèbre film *Z*.

Cette unité s'achève avec "Promouvoir l'image de la Grèce en France lors des visites officielles des chefs des deux États (1956–1986): sources du Service central des Archives générales de l'État hellénique", par Yannis Glavinas. Les renseignements concernant les relations diplomatiques et politiques franco-grecques sont conservés par différentes institutions telles que le Service central des Archives générales de l'État hellénique, les archives du Palais royal, de la Présidence de la République dont les documents portent principalement sur des questions de protocole: les archives du secrétariat de la République documentent des activités visant à cultiver une image positive de la Grèce parmi l'opinion publique française, dans les années 1950–1980. Des intérêts complexes liés au colonialisme opposaient la France et la Grande-Bretagne à la Grèce qui soutenait la question chypriote. L'article présente des publications, brochures, le soutien du journal *le Monde* et d'autres médias, ainsi que celui d'Albert Camus entre autres personnalités de l'époque,

les visites officielles successives du couple royal de Grèce et des présidents de deux pays qui ont progressivement créé des relations fortes et durables.

La deuxième partie s'ouvre sur l'étude de Léna Korma "Immigrés et réfugiés grecs d'Asie Mineure en France durant la Grande Guerre et l'entre-deux guerres". Elle met en lumière des archives françaises peu connues dont l'étude croisée offre de nouvelles informations quantitatives et qualitatives. L'auteur analyse les raisons multiples et les données concernant la première vague des Grecs d'Asie Mineure, de Crète et de Thessalonique arrivés en France entre 1916 et 1919. Les migrants sont distingués en quatre sous-groupes: ceux qui souhaitaient migrer en Amérique mais s'établissent en France, alternative à ce rêve; ceux qui cherchent à échapper aux conditions de vie particulièrement pénibles et quittent la Grèce pour s'établir en France; ceux qui arrivent en France directement d'Asie Mineure avec un statut complexe et particulier et, enfin, ceux recrutés dans les années 1920 par la Société générale d'immigration, dans le cadre d'une convention de commerce conclue entre les deux pays. Il est impossible de connaître le nombre exact de ces migrants. En effet, les données fournies par les archives sont confondues (concernant aussi bien des Arméniens que des Grecs et des Hellènes). Quelles que soient les motivations de ces immigrés, le contexte historique et politique ainsi que les changements législatifs représentent un poids significatif.

Maximilien Girard prend la relève et présente les "Traces de sinistrés de l'Empire ottoman, de la Grande Guerre

à la Catastrophe de Smyrne, conservées aux Archives nationales”. De nombreux fonds d’institutions conservent des documents (originaux et copies) qui témoignent de la présence française dans l’Empire ottoman. L’auteur présente le cadre institutionnel et les juridictions compétentes, avant d’aborder la question des réparations des dommages subis à Smyrne. La difficile indemnisation des dommages de guerre de l’Empire ottoman est présentée dans le contexte historique et politique des règlements accordés selon les traités et les conventions. Si les dossiers conservés dans les archives ne peuvent restituer fidèlement l’image des sinistrés, leur étude permet néanmoins d’en esquisser une typologie. Parmi la diversité des cas, trois sont présentés: un Français de naissance, Emmanuel Barelier, menuisier; un protégé juif, Simon Souhami, et le juge du tribunal consulaire de Smyrne citoyen français, Alfred Xénopoulo. En guise de conclusion, l’auteur propose une étude comparative de l’indemnisation des dommages de guerre subis à l’étranger.

Violaine Challéat-Fonck présente les “Profils d’immigrés, de l’entre-deux-guerres à la dictature des colonels, dans les fonds du ministère de l’intérieur”. Des considérations de sécurité ont entraîné la constitution de dossiers individuels pendant l’entre-deux-guerres, la seconde Guerre mondiale et la dictature des colonels. La direction de la Sûreté nationale, composante du ministère de l’Intérieur et, ancêtre de la direction générale de la Police nationale, est à l’origine de ces archives dont l’auteur décrit les modalités d’accès ainsi que les outils de recherche. Le Fichier central contient deux millions

et demi de fiches où l’on perçoit les traces de citoyens grecs. Un dossier de police criminelle concerne des documents contre Vénizélos, Plastiras et Métaxas. 150 000 dossiers individuels des années 1941–1949, classés par ordre alphabétique, traitent de demandes diverses. La Grèce des colonels a été à l’origine de la création d’un nouveau fichier comprenant du matériel tel que des rapports et des notices individuelles, des coupures de presse, des exemplaires des journaux grecs, des publications éditées en France, des bulletins. L’auteur présente également les outils disponibles sur le site Internet des Archives nationales.

Amalia Pappa aborde “La présence grecque en France (années 1960–1970) vue à travers les fonds des Archives générales de l’État hellénique”, basée sur le fonds d’archives du secrétariat général de la Presse et de l’Information grec. Les initiatives visant à renforcer les relations culturelles franco-helléniques avant le coup d’État des colonels, ont été détruites par le régime autoritaire établi par les colonels. Plus de mille opposants grecs se rendirent en France qui vit également se créer plusieurs mouvements de résistance. Afin de corriger l’image du pays présentée par la Presse française, les services de l’ambassade de Grèce lancèrent le *Bulletin d’informations économiques et financières*. L’auteur décrit les activités de résistance des milieux grecs de Paris et leurs principaux soutiens, ainsi que ceux soutenant le régime.

S’appuyant sur des archives différentes, Pascale Étienne aborde la question des “Émigrés grecs dans les archives de la préfecture de police de Paris”, source d’une richesse exceptionnelle.

Ces archives contiennent des dossiers thématiques qui remontent à 1888 (concernant la Crète) et des dossiers individuels concernant des Grecs célèbres (par ex. Vénizélos). Les archives des renseignements généraux de la préfecture de police de Paris, créées en 1894, présentent la même structure (dossiers thématiques – dossiers individuels). Parmi les dossiers individuels l'on trouve ceux de N. Plastiras, C. Caramanlis, Thrassos Kastanakis, et C. Coulentianos. Le troisième sous-fonds se distingue en trois entités: le bureau des étrangers, le bureau des naturalisations et le bureau des associations. Enfin, les archives du service de police chargé de l'ordre public contiennent des dossiers sur la protection des visites officielles et la sécurisation des manifestations.

La deuxième partie s'achève avec la contribution d'Aline Angoustures sur "Les réfugiés grecs dans les archives de l'Office français de protection des réfugiés et apatrides". Il semble que les Grecs exilés, réfugiés et apatrides n'ont pas bénéficié de la protection des statuts internationaux afférents, pour plusieurs raisons. L'Ofpra, créé en 1952, a ouvert ses archives en 2009. Elles contiennent 234 dossiers grecs et un total de 515, si l'on inclut les personnes "d'origine" grecque. Selon les estimations, le nombre de personnes concernées s'élèverait à environ 1 500. La présente étude porte sur un échantillon aléatoire de 136 dossiers de personnes entrées en France avant la seconde guerre mondiale, entre 1945 et 1967 et après le coup d'État.

Dans la troisième partie, Despina P. Papadopoulou aborde les profils et les influences qui ont forgé la personnalité

de cet homme cosmopolite, polyglotte et maître de conférences que fut "Jean Psichari le linguiste du grec moderne: une carrière française". L'auteur présente Jean Psichari en sa qualité de maître de conférences à l'École pratique des hautes études occupant la chaire de littérature et langue byzantine et néo-hellénique nouvellement créée, mais aussi en tant qu'intellectuel intégré dans la société parisienne.

Michel Kaplan retrace en détail la "Fondation d'une chaire et développement de l'histoire byzantine à la Sorbonne au XXe siècle". La chaire sera créée après celles d'Allemagne et d'Angleterre. L'itinéraire des byzantologues français par ordre chronologique, partant de Gustave Schlumberger pour arriver à Charles Diehl qui occupa la chaire d'histoire byzantine à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris dès sa création en 1899 et pendant trente-cinq ans. Au fil de sa remarquable carrière il créa une collection composée de 130 000 clichés photographiques et se forgea une réputation mondiale de byzantiniste. Parmi les élèves de Ch. Diehl, sont cités Jean Ebersolt, Germaine Rouillard (première femme à détenir une chaire), Rodolphe Guiland (qui succèdera à Ch. Diehl dans la chaire d'histoire byzantine de la Sorbonne), Paul Lemerle, créateur du laboratoire de byzantinologie française, qui succèdera à Rodolphe Guiland suivi, en 1975, par Gilbert Dagron. George Ostrogorsky, Nicolas Oikonomidès, Nicolas Svoronos et Hélène Ahrweiler et leurs élèves marqueront le domaine de leur empreinte.

Alkistis Sofou présente ensuite "Les archives d'Hubert Pernot et la fondation de

l'Institut néo-hellénique à la Sorbonne". Ce fonds, conservé à l'Institut néo-hellénique de la Sorbonne, est constitué de cinq ensembles qui démontrent clairement son philhellénisme inconditionnel. Dès 1912, il fit de la Grèce moderne sa priorité, lorsqu'il entama son cours de langue et de littérature grecques modernes. En 1920, il fut le premier directeur de l'Institut néo-hellénique de la faculté des lettres. Avec son programme d'études il essaya de diminuer l'influence allemande dans le domaine de la philologie grecque. En 1931, il jouissait d'une notoriété dans les cercles académiques en tant que maître de conférences de phonétique, directeur de l'Institut de phonétique ainsi que du musée de la Parole et du Geste, fonctions qu'il cumulait avec celle de professeur de grec moderne et de littérature néo-hellénique.

Sophia Vassilaki porte son attention sur "André Mirambel à travers ses archives: à propos de l'enseignement du grec moderne à l'Inaico". A. Mirambel (1900-1970) occupe une place exceptionnelle dans le domaine des études grecques modernes en France. Ses archives sont conservées à l'Institut néo-hellénique de la Sorbonne et sont une mine d'information sur les matières et l'organisation des cours, les étudiants, les sujets d'examens et l'évaluation des compétences linguistiques. L'histoire de l'enseignement du grec moderne en France est présentée et l'importance de Psihari est soulignée. L'auteur analyse la continuité du monde grec, entre conservation et adaptation, et les racines profondes des études qui y sont liées.

Méropi Anastassiadou propose une rétrospective intitulée "L'histoire de la

Grèce moderne à Paris depuis la Seconde Guerre mondiale: recherche et enseignement". Les principaux lieux d'accueil de l'histoire de la Grèce moderne en France, les groupes d'historiens grecs et leur œuvre sont décrits pour former une image d'ensemble. Le bilan révèle que les chercheurs non-Grecs restent très peu nombreux, les personnes engagées proviennent d'un milieu marxiste ou bien mettent l'accent sur le "gréco-centrisme". Les thèmes étudiés relèvent principalement de l'histoire économique et ainsi que de l'histoire sociale et politique; le XIXe siècle se trouve au centre des travaux. Plusieurs chercheurs ont notamment contribué au développement de nouvelles orientations. Le schéma braudélien a offert de nouvelles perspectives à la Grèce, en la situant dans le cadre méditerranéen en tant que région "intermédiaire".

La contribution de Lucile Arnoux-Farnoux porte sur l'École française d'Athènes et Institut de Grèce: destins croisés", deux institutions voisines sur le plan spatial mais chargées de missions différentes. La première est dédiée à la recherche et à la formation scientifique. La seconde est chargée d'une mission culturelle. Leurs fonds d'archives permettent de suivre leur évolution au fil du temps, depuis leur établissement, mais aussi celle des relations franco-grecques pendant deux siècles: le rôle des directeurs et des enseignants, leurs stratégies et priorités, de l'école Giffard à l'Institut Français d'Athènes, la question de l'étude de la Grèce moderne. En conclusion, l'auteur propose l'étude comparative avec d'autres Instituts français créés en Europe mais aussi avec les instituts

d'autres pays établis à Athènes, tels que ceux de l'Allemagne (Goethe Institut) et de l'Angleterre (British School at Athens, British Council).

Ensuite, Nicolas Manidakis aborde la question de "La politique des bourses de la France en Grèce (1922-1939)" soulignant l'influence profonde et durable de cette politique dans plusieurs domaines. Le cas des boursiers du *Mataroa* étant exceptionnel, la pratique des bourses commença en 1922 avec un boursier, trois en 1925 et, à partir 1929, elle acquiert un caractère régulier bien que, jusqu'en 1937, le nombre de boursiers est inférieur à la dizaine. Par la suite, il passe à la vingtaine et, après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, il atteint la quarantaine. Cette hausse entraîne une réorganisation du mode d'attribution et à la définition de critères, telle que la bonne maîtrise de la langue.

"La Fondation hellénique de la Cité internationale universitaire de Paris: lieu de mémoire de la Grèce en France", illustre bâtiment qui signale les relations franco-grecques écrit Maria Gravari-Barbas. La première partie présente les conditions de construction et le contexte de création de la Fondation hellénique; la deuxième son architecture achevée par N. Zachos et les projets de restauration en 2016 entre modernisation et sa patrimonialisation.

"Au départ du voyage du *Mataroa*: documents du fonds Octave Merlier du Centre d'études d'Asie Mineure", découvre Stavros Anestidis. Point commun était l'Institut français d'Athènes, resté ouvert pendant toute la guerre. Le 1945, 145 bourses sont effectuées: 45 existantes 25 s'ajoutent 40 supplémentaires "de

personnalités" 59 "étudiants partant à leurs frais". Le but final était de retourner en Grèce apportant leur précieuse expérience, leur intellectuel enrichi.

Le volume s'achève sur l'unité la plus brève où Vassilios Kolonas présente les "Architectes français et grecs formés en France dans la Thessalonique de l'entre-deux-guerres"; fruit d'une recherche de 2013 pour démontrer le haut pourcentage des étudiants grecs formés dans les écoles parisiennes les années 1880 et 1960 de carrière autour de la construction en général (architectes, ingénieurs, constructeurs, géomètres, architectes d'intérieur; décorateurs), soit sujets Egyptiens et ottomans en majorité. Point crucial fut l'incendie du mois d'août 1917 qui obligea un nouveau plan pour la ville détruite. Ce plan connu comme "plan Hébrard" introduit des éléments et qualitatifs nouveaux. Les styles des années 1930 apportent des formes plus linéaires du mouvement moderne.

Geneviève Profit aborde "La Grèce à travers les archives de l'exposition universelle de 1937: le fonds des Archives nationales". Les archives de la Commission sont de nature technique et pratique, concernant l' "Exposition internationale des Arts et des Techniques appliqués à la Vie moderne" qui s'est tenue à Paris (25 mai-25 novembre 1937). Plus de 11 000 producteurs participèrent à l'exposition où 40 pays construisirent leur propre pavillon et accueillirent 31 millions de visiteurs. La Grèce répondit favorablement à l'invitation. Elle réalisa son pavillon original, d'une superficie de 512 m², où elle présenta des photographies touristiques et un diorama cinématographique. L'on y donna deux représentations des

Choéphores d'Eschyle. Nicolas Politis expliqua que le but était de montrer l'art néo-hellénique (céramique, broderie, tissages, tapis, meubles) composant un foyer harmonieux.

Ensuite Maria Tsoutsoura examine la "Présence et audience des poètes grecs en France dans l'entre-deux guerres". La littérature néo grecque acquies l'expression individuelle représentée d'un Etat national européen. Le poète Palamas et ses compositions épico-lyriques, tout à fait opposées à celle de Moréas, apprécié internationalement, se tenu actif pendant 70 ans. Avec Cavafy, ils éprouvent une reconnaissance internationale.

Polina Kosmadaki pose la question "Peut-on être moderne et classique? Christian Zervos et les artistes grecs à travers les fonds d'archives *Cahiers d'art* (bibliothèque Kadinsky, Paris) et les archives de la pinacothèque Ghika (musée Benaki, Athènes)". Christian Zervos (1889–1970), critique d'art et éditeur, joua un rôle déterminant à la réévalu-

ation de l'art grec ancien dans un contexte international avec sa revue *Cahiers d'art* (1926–1960). Via les fonds de ses archives on trace le redéfinirent de la culture des civilisations du passé vers le rajeunissement de l'approche de l'art grec et le soutien des artistes grecs.

La Conclusion appartient à Maximilien Girard, présence distinguée dans ce volume collective ouvrant des nouvelles avenues entre les relations franco-grecs et l'étude de l'histoire croissante entre les deux pays, comme d'ailleurs les sources sont abondantes. Il pose des questions de nature politique et propose des sujets de recherche.

Chaque contribution souligne l'importance pesante des archives et en même temps articule les possibilités d'autres nombreuses recherches et des future programmes commun entre ces deux pays européens.

Ellie Droulia

*Ancienne directrice de la Bibliothèque
du Parlement*

C. TH. DIMARAS ANNUAL LECTURE, 2022

ELISABETH DÉCULTOT

“Do the People Benefit from
Being Deceived?” A Debate on
the Politics of the Enlightenment

SECTION OF NEOHELLENIC RESEARCH
INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH / NHRF

“DO THE PEOPLE BENEFIT FROM BEING DECEIVED?”
A DEBATE ON THE POLITICS OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Elisabeth Décultot

ABSTRACT: In 1777, the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences published its prize question for the year 1780: “Est-il utile au Peuple d’être trompé, soit qu’on l’induisse dans de nouvelles erreurs, ou qu’on l’entretienne dans celles où il est?” Whether the people drew benefit from being deceived, either by being induced into new errors, or by being maintained in existing ones: the question attracted 42 essays, the largest number ever received for a Prussian Academy contest in the eighteenth century. This paper analyses the genesis and the course of this contest. To this end, it will begin by tracing the evolution of Frederick the Great’s political thought regarding the interrelation of people, the art of governing and deceit; it will then examine the status of this contest in the history of the Academy, before lastly focusing on one of the two winning entries and its relationship to the idea of enlightenment.

In 1777, the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences published its prize question for the year 1780: “Est-il utile au Peuple d’être trompé, soit qu’on l’induisse dans de nouvelles erreurs, ou qu’on l’entretienne dans celles où il est?”¹ Whether the people drew benefit from being deceived, either by being induced into new errors, or by being maintained in existing ones: the question, formulated in French, attracted 42 essays, the largest number ever received for a Prussian Academy contest in the eighteenth century.² Thanks to Hans Adler, we have a complete edition of these memoirs, published in two volumes in 2007.³

This question was bound to arouse attention for many reasons. First of all, it brought together in a single sentence two terms which seemed to have nothing in common: utility and deceit. How could deception be useful, especially if, as the question suggests, utility is considered from the point of view of the deceived

¹ *Nouveaux Mémoires de l’Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles-Lettres. Année 1777. Avec l’histoire de la même année* (Berlin: Georges Jacques Decker, 1779), 14.

² *Est-il utile de tromper le peuple? Ist der Volksbetrug von Nutzen? Concours de la classe de philosophie spéculative de l’Académie des Sciences et des Belles-Lettres de Berlin pour l’année 1780*, ed. Werner Krauss (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966), 5.

³ Hans Adler, ed., *Nützt es dem Volke, betrogen zu werden? Est-il utile au peuple d’être trompé? Die Preisfrage der Preußischen Akademie für 1780*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2007).

party? Secondly, the question was remarkable for the provocative nature of its connotations. Though the sentence is apparently focused on the people as the object of deception, the impersonal turn of phrase suggests another party: the deceiver, who may “induce” the people “into new errors”, or “maintain them in existing ones”. It implied that some instances of power, either political, religious or of some other nature, may have an interest in maintaining such errors. The sentence thus established a close yet unstable relation between the concepts of people, truth, deceit and the art of governing, which it invited the contestants to examine. Thirdly, the political and institutional circumstances surrounding the genesis of this question are quite unusual. The Academy’s archives show that the academicians did not conceive of the prize question themselves. That topic was forcibly imposed on them by Frederick the Great, who had been king of Prussia for nearly 40 years and had written in his younger years *Anti-Machiavel, ou Essai de critique sur le Prince de Machiavel*.⁴ In other words and paradoxically enough, political power here imposed on science to examine a theoretical issue which could undermine its very hold on power. We are therefore dealing here with a complex constellation, as much from the theoretical point of view as from the institutional and political one. The prize question, which might be read first as an act of scholarly emancipation by an academy publicly calling for power-challenging debates, results in fact from the sovereign’s bidding itself, who imposes his power on academia. Last but not least, one may wonder at the surprising rules devised for the contest: the academicians stated that the prize money was to be divided between two entries, one vindicating the question and the other refuting it.

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the genesis and the course of this contest, seen by some as a breakthrough in the transition from *Aufklärung* to *Spätaufklärung*.⁵ To this end, we will begin by tracing the evolution of Frederick’s political thought regarding the interrelation of people, the art of governing and deceit; we will then examine the status of this contest in the history of the Academy, before lastly focusing on one of the two winning entries and its relationship to the idea of enlightenment.⁶

⁴ [Frederick II], *Anti-Machiavel, ou Essai de critique sur le Prince de Machiavel, publié par Mr. de Voltaire, Nouvelle Edition où l’on a ajouté les variations de celle de Londres* (Amsterdam: Jacques La Caze, 1741).

⁵ Werner Schneiders, *Aufklärung und Vorurteilstheorie: Studien zur Geschichte der Vorurteilstheorie* (Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1983), 260.

⁶ The prize question, most of the entries and the debates were originally in French, as well as the correspondence between Frederick the Great and French philosophers. Some entries are

The Evolution of Frederick the Great's Political Thought

The prize question of 1780 should be read in relation to the history of Frederick's political thinking. This story begins, as briefly mentioned, with the *Anti-Machiavel*, a political essay written by Frederick in 1739–1740, shortly before his accession to the throne, and conceived as a strict refutation of Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Like many of Frederick's essays, this text is politically ambiguous. The future Prussian monarch may have tried to win over famous European philosopher – a successful enterprise, with the help of Voltaire. But it could also be seen a rigorous philosophical reflection on the art of governing, as suggested by the very form of the essay, which consists partly of a linear commentary on Machiavelli's text. The future Frederick the Great insists on the need to govern according to reason and proffers a strong opposition to wars of conquest. He describes several instances of bad despotic governments, such as that of Ferdinand of Aragon, who “did not simply wage war” but “used Religion as a veil to cover his designs. He abused the faith of oaths, he spoke only of justice, & committed only injustices”.⁷ Although Frederick's essay provides several examples of manipulation and deception in the exercise of despotic power, the general question of the relationship between the art of governing, deceit and the people is not directly addressed.

His correspondence with d'Alembert was the driving force behind Frederick's interest in the relations between the people, truth, deceit and statecraft.⁸ Frederick has a deep admiration for d'Alembert, the French mathematician and philosopher who took over with Diderot the publication of the *Encyclopédie* from 1751. D'Alembert became a member of the Prussian Academy in 1746 and a regular correspondent of the king of Prussia from 1754. They started discussing the topic of the relations between the people, truth, deceit and statecraft in 1769–1770, at Frederick's own initiative. In November 1769, after ranting against the pope, whom he compared to a “miserable quack” (*miserable charlatan*), Frederick wondered “whether it is possible for people in a religious system to do without fables” (*s'il se peut que le peuple se passe de fables dans un système religieux*), to which he replied firmly:

in German. All English translations of these sources are our own; the original text is indicated in notes or (when short) in the body of the text.

⁷ [Frederick II], *Anti-Machiavel*, pt. 3, chap. 21, 3: “Ferdinand d'Arragon ne se contentoit pas toujours de faire simplement la guerre; mais il se servoit de la Religion, comme d'un voile pour couvrir ses desseins. Il abusoit de la foi des sermens, il ne parloit que de justice, & ne commettoit que des injustices.”

⁸ Adler, *Nützt es dem Volke*, 1:xxx–xxxiii.

I do not think so, because there is little reason in those animals that Aristotle has deigned to call reasonable. Indeed, what are a few enlightened professors, a few wise academics, compared to the vast mass of people who form a great State? The voice of these preceptors of the human race is little heard, and does not extend beyond a narrow sphere. How can we overcome so many preconceptions sucked from the milk of the mother? How can we fight against custom, which is the reason of fools, and how can we uproot from the hearts of men the germs of superstition which nature has placed there, and which the feeling of their own weakness nourishes? All this leads me to believe that there is nothing to be gained from this beautiful two-footed and featherless species, which will probably always be the plaything of the rascals who want to deceive it.⁹

This first development by Frederick is marked by a simple and strong dichotomy: on the one hand, the people, “the plaything of the rascals who want to deceive [them]” (*jouet des fripons qui voudront [le] tromper*), because they are by nature locked up in “preconceptions” (*préjugés*), “custom” (*coutume*) or “superstition” (*superstition*); on the other hand, “a few enlightened professors, a few wise academicians” (*quelques professeurs éclairés, quelques académiciens sages*), a small elite circumscribed to a “narrow sphere” (*sphère resserrée*). This dichotomy stems from a pessimistic vision of mankind, who is portrayed as easy prey for all kinds of subterfuge. No question here of the art of governing, nor of the third party whose intervention might shift position lines, that is, the ruler.

Frederick first addressed the issue of statecraft in a letter dated from April 1770, in which he dialectically comments on the use of deceit in the exercise of power:

Should this be the first day of the world, and should you ask me whether it is useful to deceive the people, I would answer no, because error and superstition would still be unknown and should not therefore be introduced, and must even be prevented from blossoming. Sifting

⁹ Letter from Frederick II to d’Alembert, 25 November 1769, in *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, ed. Johann D.E. Preuss, 30 vols. (Berlin: Imprimerie Royale R. Decker [= Rudolph Ludwig Decker], 1848–1856), here vol. 24 (1854), 514: “Je ne le crois pas, à cause que ces animaux que l’école a daigné nommer raisonnables ont peu de raison. En effet, qu’est-ce que quelques professeurs éclairés, quelques académiciens sages, en comparaison d’un peuple immense qui forme un grand État? La voix de ces précepteurs du genre humain est peu entendue, et ne s’étend pas hors d’une sphère resserrée. Comment vaincre tant de préjugés sucés avec le lait de la nourrice? Comment lutter contre la coutume, qui est la raison des sots, et comment déraciner du cœur des hommes un germe de superstition que la nature y a mis, et que le sentiment de leur propre faiblesse y nourrit? Tout cela me fait croire qu’il n’y a rien à gagner sur cette belle espèce à deux pieds et sans plumes, qui probablement sera toujours le jouet des fripons qui voudront la tromper.”

through history, I have found two kinds of impostures: one founded on superstition, and one which, with the help of a few preconceptions, may have been used to manipulate the minds of the people to their own advantage. The first of these impostors are the bonzes, the Zoroasters, the Numatics, the Mohammedans, etc.; I would not have anything to do with them. The other kind are the politicians who have striven to foster compliance in men to lead them towards the common wealth. A most marvellous system! I count among these the Roman augurs who were often instrumental in stopping or calming popular seditions stirred up by enterprising tribunes. I would not condemn Scipio the African for his dealings with a nymph, a trick by which he gained the confidence of his troops, and which enabled him to carry out remarkable feats; I do not blame Marius for his old lady, nor Sertorius for the hind he kept with him. Those aiming to lead large numbers of men towards one purpose will be forced at times to harness illusions, and I do not believe them at fault if they impose them on the public, by the reasons I have just given. The same is not true of gross superstition. It is one of the evil drugs which nature has sown in this universe, rooted in the very character of mankind; and I am morally persuaded that superstitions will arise even in a numerous colony of unbelievers, some years after its establishment.¹⁰

On the one hand, therefore, Frederick condemns religious “impostors” (imposteurs) such as Zoroaster, Numa and Mohammed, whose subterfuges he

¹⁰ Letter from Frederick II to d’Alembert, 3 April 1770, in *ibid.*, vol. 24 (1854), 529–30: “Si nous nous plaçons au premier jour du monde, et que vous me demandiez s’il est utile de tromper le peuple, je vous répondrai que non, parce que, l’erreur et la superstition étant inconnues, on ne doit pas les introduire, on doit même les empêcher d’éclorre. En parcourant l’histoire, je trouve deux sortes d’impostures, les unes à la fortune desquelles la superstition a servi de marchepied, et celles qui, à l’aide de quelques préjugés, ont pu servir à manier l’esprit du peuple pour son propre avantage. Les premiers de ces imposteurs, ce sont les bonzes, les Zoroastre, les Numa, les Mahomet, etc.; pour ceux-là, je vous les abandonne. L’autre espèce sont les politiques qui, pour le plus grand bien du gouvernement, ont eu recours au système merveilleux, afin de mener les hommes, de les rendre dociles. Je compte de ce nombre l’usage qu’on faisait à Rome des augures, dont le secours a souvent été si utile pour arrêter ou calmer des séditions populaires que des tribuns entreprenants voulaient exciter. Je ne saurais condamner Scipion l’Africain de son commerce avec une nymphe, par lequel il acquit la confiance de ses troupes, et fut en état d’exécuter de brillantes entreprises; je ne blâme point Marius de sa vieille, ni Sertorius de ce qu’il menait une biche avec lui. Tous ceux qui auront à traiter avec un grand ramas d’hommes qu’il faut conduire au même but seront contraints d’avoir quelquefois recours aux illusions, et je ne les crois pas condamnables, s’ils en imposent au public, par les raisons que je viens d’alléguer. Il n’en est pas de même de la superstition grossière. C’est une des mauvaises drogues que la nature a semées dans cet univers, et qui tient même au caractère de l’homme;

denounces; but on the other hand, he is sympathetic to “the other kind” (l’autre espèce), that of “politicians” (politiques) who, by virtue of statesmanship, resort to the subterfuges of the “marvellous” (système merveilleux), that is, to deceit, “to foster compliance in men to lead them” (afin de mener les hommes, de les rendre dociles) – like Marius or Sertorius.¹¹

It should be noted, however, that Frederick’s position on religious superstition is more dialectical than previously. In the letter of November 1769, he condemned superstition per se in the name of reason, which was to his eyes the province of an enlightened elite; yet he recognised it may be useful and necessary for the people:

This marvellous system seems made for the people. As a ridiculous religion is abolished, a more extravagant one is introduced; one may see revolutions in opinions, but only to the extent that one cult succeeds another. I believe that enlightening men is good and very useful. To fight fanaticism is to disarm the most cruel and bloodthirsty monster; to cry out against the abuse of monks, against those vows so opposed to the designs of nature, so contrary to multiplication, is a great service to one’s country. But I believe that it would be clumsy, dangerous even, to suppress the meals of superstition which are distributed publicly to children, whom the fathers want to be fed in this way.¹²

And what about d’Alembert? D’Alembert plays a central role in the correspondence that paved the way for the prize question. He encouraged the king to turn into a

et je suis moralement persuadé que si l’on établissait une colonie nombreuse d’incrédules, au bout d’un certain nombre d’années on y verrait naître des superstitions.”

¹¹ Letter of Frederick II to d’Alembert, 3 April 1770, in *ibid.*, vol. 24 (1854), 529–30: “Ce système merveilleux semble fait pour le peuple. On abolit une religion ridicule, et l’on en introduit une plus extravagante; on voit des révolutions dans les opinions, mais c’est toujours un culte qui succède à quelque autre. Je crois qu’il est bon et très-utile d’éclairer les hommes. Combattre le fanatisme, c’est désarmer le monstre le plus cruel et le plus sanguinaire; crier contre l’abus des moines, contre ces vœux si opposés aux desseins de la nature, si contraires à la multiplication, c’est véritablement servir sa patrie. Mais je crois qu’il y aurait de la maladresse et même du danger à vouloir supprimer ces aliments de la superstition qui se distribuent publiquement aux enfants, que les pères veulent qu’on nourrisse de la sorte.”

¹² *Ibid.*: “Ce système merveilleux semble fait pour le peuple. On abolit une religion ridicule, et l’on en introduit une plus extravagante; on voit des révolutions dans les opinions, mais c’est toujours un culte qui succède à quelque autre. Je crois qu’il est bon et très-utile d’éclairer les hommes. Combattre le fanatisme, c’est désarmer le monstre le plus cruel et le plus sanguinaire; crier contre l’abus des moines, contre ces vœux si opposés aux desseins de la nature, si contraires à la multiplication, c’est véritablement servir sa patrie. Mais je crois qu’il y aurait de la maladresse et même du danger à vouloir supprimer ces aliments de la superstition qui se distribuent publiquement aux enfants, que les pères veulent qu’on nourrisse de la sorte.”

public tender their joint reflections on “whether it is possible for the people to do without fables in a religious system” (s’il se peut faire que le peuple se passe de fables dans un système religieux) and pointed out the Prussian Royal Academy would distinguish itself “from other literary companies, which still have only too many preconceptions” (des autres compagnies littéraires, qui n’ont encore que trop de préjugés).¹³ On the topic at hand, d’Alembert himself states unambiguously: “I myself think that the truth should always be taught, and that deception never yields any real advantage.”¹⁴ D’Alembert again, in March 1770, was the one who placed the notion of power into the relation between the people and preconceptions (or superstition), by introducing a third party, the government. He thought the action of government may turn people away from their preconceptions, severing a connection Frederick thought stable and inevitable:

I beg your Majesty to allow me to reflect on another question which I had the honour of discussing with him, and upon which I received such a beautiful and philosophical letter, namely: whether in matters of religion, or even in any matter whatsoever, it is useful to deceive the people. I agree with your Majesty that the multitude feeds on superstition; but it seems to me that they would not feed on it if they were presented with something better. Superstition, when taught since childhood and entrenched, undoubtedly resists reason when the latter comes to the fore; reason arrives too late, and the place is taken. But what if the ignorant multitude was presented, at the same time and for the first time, on the one hand such absurdities as we know, and on the other hand, reason and common sense? Doesn’t your Majesty think that reason would prevail? I would add: reason, even if it arrives too late, only has to persevere in order to triumph eventually and drive out its rival. One should not, like Fontenelle, keep one’s hand closed when certain of holding the truth; opening the fingers one after the other, cautiously, will lead, little by little, to the hand been fully extended, and truth will out. Philosophers who open their hands too suddenly are fools: their fists are cut off, and that is all they gain. But those who keep their fists tightly closed are failing mankind.¹⁵

¹³ Letter from d’Alembert to Frederick II, 18 December 1769, in *ibid.*, vol. 24 (1854), 517.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: “Je pense, pour moi, qu’il faut toujours enseigner la vérité aux hommes, et qu’il n’y a jamais d’avantage réel à les tromper.”

¹⁵ Letter from d’Alembert to Frederick II, 9 March 1770, in *ibid.*, vol. 24 (1854), 527: “Je prie V. M. de me permettre aussi quelques réflexions sur une autre question dont j’ai eu l’honneur de l’entretenir, et qui m’a valu de sa part une lettre si belle et si philosophique, savoir: si en matière de religion, ou même en quelque matière que ce puisse être, il est utile de tromper le peuple. Je conviens avec V. M. que la superstition est l’aliment de la multitude; mais elle ne doit, ce me semble, se jeter sur cet aliment que dans le cas où on ne lui en présentera pas un

D'Alembert refers here to one of Fontenelle's quips, reported by La Porte: "M. de Fontenelle often said, that if he held all the truths in his hand, he would be careful not to open it and show them to men. The discovery of a single truth led Galileo to the prisons of the Inquisition."¹⁶

By refuting Fontenelle, d'Alembert shared some of the views expressed in the *Essai sur les préjugés*, published anonymously in 1770 and attributed to d'Holbach.¹⁷ This work contrasted the people, "credulous" (crédules) by dint of the ignorance in which they are kept, with the rulers who are "always tempted to abuse their credulity" (toujours tentés d'abuser de leur crédulité),¹⁸ and will use the instrument of religion to this end. It depicts the pernicious and conflictual relationship between power, people and superstition:

Men who have put themselves in a position to regulate the destinies of others ... usually find momentary advantages in deceiving them [i.e., the people]; they believe themselves interested in perpetuating their errors or their inexperience; they make it their duty to dazzle them, to embarrass them, to frighten them about the danger of thinking for themselves & of consulting reason ...

Governments, everywhere shamefully allied with superstition, support such sinister projects with all their might. Seduced by the

meilleur. La superstition, bien inculquée et enracinée dès l'enfance, cède sans doute à la raison lorsqu'elle vient à se présenter; elle arrive trop tard, et la place est prise. Mais qu'on présente en même temps et pour la première fois, même à la multitude ignorante, des absurdités, d'un côté, telles que nous en connaissons, et, de l'autre, la raison et le bon sens; V. M. pense-t-elle que la raison n'eût pas la préférence? Je dirai plus; la raison, lors même qu'elle arrive trop tard, n'a qu'à persévérer pour triompher un jour, et chasser sa rivale. Il me semble qu'il ne faut pas, comme Fontenelle, tenir la main fermée quand on est sûr d'y avoir la vérité; il faut seulement ouvrir avec sagesse et avec précaution les doigts de la main l'un après l'autre, et petit à petit la main est ouverte tout à fait, et la vérité en sort tout entière. Les philosophes qui ouvrent la main trop brusquement sont des fous; on leur coupe le poing, et voilà tout ce qu'ils y gagnent; mais ceux qui la tiennent fermée absolument ne font pas pour l'humanité ce qu'ils doivent."

¹⁶ Joseph de La Porte, *Ressources contre l'ennui*, 2 vols. (The Hague: s.n.; Paris: Veuve Duchesne, 1766), 2:48: "M. de Fontenelle disoit souvent, que s'il tenoit toutes les vérités dans sa main, il se garderoit bien de l'ouvrir pour les montrer aux hommes. La découverte d'une seule vérité a fait conduire Galilée dans les prisons de l'Inquisition." Werner Krauss was the first to note Fontenelle's quip to La Porte. Werner Krauss: "Eine politische Preisfrage im Jahre 1780," in *Studien zur deutschen und französischen Aufklärung* (Berlin: Rütten und Loening, 1963), 63–70, here 67.

¹⁷ [Paul Henri Dietrich baron d'Holbach], *Essai sur les préjugés, ou De l'influence des opinions sur les mœurs et sur le bonheur des hommes, ouvrage contenant l'apologie de la philosophie* (London: s.n., 1770). Whether this text was written by d'Holbach or by du Marsais is discussed in Schneiders, *Aufklärung und Vorurteilkritik*, 257.

¹⁸ [d'Holbach], *Essai sur les préjugés*, 8.

transient interests wherein lies its greatness and power, the Political order feels it must deceive the people, holding them to their sad preconceptions, destroying in all hearts the desire to learn and the love of truth. Political order, itself blind and unreasonable, wants only blind and unreasonable subjects; it hates those who seek to enlighten themselves and cruelly punishes anyone who dares to tear or lift the veil of error.¹⁹

But for d'Holbach the art of governing does not always coincide with the art of deceiving. On the contrary, d'Holbach strives to prove that "truth" (vérité) is "equally necessary for the Sovereign to secure his power, and for the subjects to be happy, submissive and tranquil" (également nécessaire & au Souverain pour assurer son pouvoir, & aux sujets pour être heureux, soumis et tranquilles).²⁰ He argues that "philosophy" (philosophie), defined as the "search for truth" (recherche de la vérité),²¹ will lead to a mutual understanding whereby the individual and collective happiness of the subjects is guaranteed as well as the power of the sovereign.

Frederick published a staunch rebuttal of d'Holbach's essay, which he described as "a mixture of truths and false reasonings, bitter criticisms and chimerical projects, professed by an enthusiastic and fanatical philosopher".²² Frederick pointed out from the outset that the author of the *Essai sur les préjugés* "masterfully asserts that truth is made for mankind, and that he must speak

¹⁹ Ibid., 8–11: "Les hommes qui se sont mis en possession de régler les destinées des autres ... trouvent pour l'ordinaire des avantages momentanés a les [i.e., les peuples] tromper; ils se croient intéressés à perpétuer leur erreurs ou leur inexpérience; ils se font un devoir de les éblouir, de les embarrasser, de les effrayer sur le danger de penser par eux-mêmes & de consulter la raison ... Le gouvernement, partout honteusement ligué avec la superstition, appuie de tout son pouvoir ses sinistres projets. Séduite par des intérêts passagers dans lesquelles elle fait consister sa grandeur et sa puissance, la Politique se croit obligée de tromper les peuples, de les retenir dans leurs tristes préjugés, d'anéantir dans tous les cœurs le désir de s'instruire et l'amour de la vérité. Cette Politique, aveugle et déraisonnable elle-même, ne veut que des sujets aveugles et privés de raison; elle hait ceux qui cherchent à s'éclairer eux-mêmes et punit cruellement quiconque ose déchirer ou lever le voile de l'erreur."

²⁰ Ibid., 142.

²¹ Ibid., 135.

²² Frédéric le Grand, *Examen de l'Essai sur les préjugés* (London: Nourse, libraire [actually: Berlin: Voss], 1770). For a reprint, here used for references: Frédéric II, *Examen de l'Essai sur les préjugés*, in Preuss, *Cœuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, vol. 9 (1848), 149–75, here 151: "mélange de vérités et de faux raisonnements, de critiques amères et de projets chimériques, débités par un philosophe enthousiaste et fanatique".

it on all occasions”.²³ But this axiom is questionable on two accounts. Firstly, people “are drawn to the marvellous”,²⁴ an inclination in which Frederick sees a constant feature of mankind: “it is common lore that one is naturally drawn to supernatural tales.”²⁵ Secondly, “a reasonable man must not abuse anything, not even the truth”;²⁶ in other words, not all truths need to be voiced. “What gain would there be in setting a man right when illusions make him happy?”²⁷ No doubt the king of Prussia saw in the *Essai sur les préjugés* the seeds of a radical political challenge that might lead to dangerous upheaval:

Let us forgive the author his enthusiasm for the truth, and admire the skill with which he achieves his goals. He set upon a powerful enemy, the established religion, its priesthood and the superstitious people marching under its banners. But to face such a formidable enemy still appears insufficient to illustrate his triumph. To make his victory more striking he excites yet another; he assaults the government, maligning it with coarseness and indecency, and such contempt as revolts sensible readers. The government, holding a neutral ground, may have remained the peaceful spectator of the battles which such an advocate of truth would have waged against the apostles of falsehood; but he himself forces the government to take up the cause of the Church to oppose a common enemy. If we did not respect this great philosopher, we would have thought this some careless schoolboy’s sally, rightly earning him a rigorous correction from his teachers.²⁸

²³ Ibid., 151: “affirme magistralement que la vérité est faite pour l’homme, et qu’il la lui faut dire en toutes les occasions”.

²⁴ Ibid., 152: “a un penchant irrésistible pour le merveilleux”.

²⁵ Ibid., 153: “Tout le monde le sent, on ne peut s’empêcher de prêter attention aux choses surnaturelles qu’on entend débiter.”

²⁶ Ibid., 154: “un homme raisonnable ne doit abuser de rien, pas même de la vérité”.

²⁷ Ibid., 155: “Que gagnerait-on à détromper un homme que les illusions rendent heureux?”

²⁸ Ibid., 158: “Passons à l’auteur son enthousiasme pour la vérité, et admirons l’adresse dont il se sert pour arriver à ses fins. Nous avons vu qu’il attaque un puissant adversaire, la religion dominante, le sacerdoce qui la défend, et le peuple superstitieux rangé sous ses étendards. Mais comme si ce n’en était pas assez pour son courage d’un ennemi aussi redoutable, pour illustrer son triomphe et rendre sa victoire plus éclatante il en excite encore un autre; il fait une vigoureuse sortie sur le gouvernement, il l’outrage avec autant de grossièreté que d’indécence, le mépris qu’il en témoigne révolte les lecteurs sensés. Peut-être que le gouvernement, neutre, aurait été le spectateur paisible des batailles qu’aurait livrées ce héros de la vérité aux apôtres du mensonge; mais lui-même il force le gouvernement de prendre fait et cause avec l’Église pour s’opposer à l’ennemi commun. Si nous ne respectons

The 1780 Prize and the Academy

The topic of the 1780 Academy prize stands in line with the evolution of Frederick's reflections on the exercise of power, starting with the *Anti-Machiavel* of 1740 and extending from the 1770s onwards to his exchanges with d'Alembert and his appraisal of the *Essai sur les préjugés*.

The 1780 setting of the prize also reveals important aspects of Frederick's relations to "his" Academy. Indeed, the king had worked on recasting the founding principles of this institution shortly after his accession to the throne in 1740, and often used the possessive pronoun to refer to his Academy.²⁹ According to the statutes of 1746, each of the four sections of the Academy (experimental philosophy, mathematics, speculative philosophy, and literature) had to issue a prize in the form of a question. The formulation of these questions was largely left to the guidance of the academicians, provided they met the conditions of usefulness set out in the statutes.

In 1777, the speculative philosophy section, under the direction of Johann Georg Sulzer since 1775, issued a question inspired by the "gnoseological" concerns of many of its members. Sulzer had been admitted to the Academy in 1750 and had devoted numerous essays to questions of gnoseology, a scientific field that partakes of psychology and metaphysics. No doubt he was familiar with the formulation of this question, the wording of which was rather obscure:

The Speculative Philosophy Class proposed the following Question:

In all of nature Effects are observed: there are therefore Forces.
But these forces, in order to act, must be determined; this presupposes that there is something real & durable, capable of being determined; & it is this real & durable that we call primitive & substantial force.

pas ce grand philosophe, nous aurions pris ce trait pour une saillie de quelque écolier étourdi, qui lui mériterait une correction rigoureuse de ses maîtres.

Mais ne peut-on faire du bien à sa patrie qu'en renversant, qu'en bouleversant tout l'ordre établi? et n'y a-t-il pas des moyens plus doux qui doivent, par prédilection, être choisis, employés, et préférés aux autres, si on veut la servir utilement? Notre philosophe me paraît tenir de ces médecins qui ne connaissent de remèdes que l'émétique, et de ces chirurgiens qui ne savent faire que des amputations."

²⁹ Cf. e.g. Letter from Frederick II to d'Alembert, 25 November 1769, in Preuss, *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, vol. 24 (1854), 514: "For our Academy, without being very brilliant, it is slowly making its way" (Pour notre Académie, sans être bien brillante, elle va doucement son chemin).

The Academy therefore requests:

What is the distinct notion of that primitive & substantial force, which when determined produces the effect? Or in other words: what is the FUNDAMENTUM VIRIUM?

Now, to conceive how this force can be determined, it is necessary either to prove that one substance acts on another; or to demonstrate that primitive forces determine themselves.

In the first case, we also ask:

What is the distinct notion of the primitive passive power? How can one substance act on another? And finally, how can the latter suffer from the former?

In the second case, it will be necessary to explain separately:

How are the frames that limit the activity of such forces established? And why can the same force sometimes produce an effect, & sometimes not? How, for example, can one conceive distinctly what another instructs him of, & could not conceive of it himself? Why can't we readily reproduce ideas that we have forgotten, even though we were able to produce them in the past & that the axiom always remains, that from will & power united, action must follow? And finally, what real difference is there, if the primitive force draws everything from its own strength, between been able to distinctly represent a learned music by a great Composer, or the solution a remarkable Geometrician proposes for a difficult problem; & being oneself the author of this music, of this solution; or at least being able to compose music, to solve mathematical problem, at the same level, if one really sets to it.³⁰

Clearly the singularly abstruse nature of this prize question prompted d'Alembert to pick up the thread of a previous epistolary conversation with

³⁰ *Nouveaux Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles-Lettres. Année 1778. Avec l'histoire de la même année* (Berlin: George Jacques Decker, 1780), 27–28: “La Classe de Philosophie spéculative a proposé la Question suivante:

Dans toute la nature on observe des Effets: il y a donc des Forces.

Mais ces forces, pour agir, doivent être déterminées; cela suppose qu'il y a quelque chose de réel & de durable, susceptible d'être déterminé; & c'est ce réel & durable qu'on nomme force primitive & substantielle.

En conséquence l'Académie demande:

Quelle est la notion distincte de cette force primitive & substantielle, qui lorsqu'elle est déterminée produit l'effet? Ou en d'autres termes: quel est le FUNDAMENTUM VIRIUM?

Frederick on the relationship between people, deceit and the art of governing. To spare the Academy the “ridicule” (ridicule) of a “very strange” question “since unintelligible” (bien étrange par son inintelligibilité), d’Alembert suggested to the king that the following “very interesting and very useful” (très-intéressante[] et très-utile[]) question be imposed for the prize set by the philosophy section: “Can it be useful to deceive the people?” (S’il peut être utile de tromper le peuple).³¹ The

Or, pour concevoir comment cette force peut être déterminée, il faut ou prouver qu’une substance agit sur l’autre; ou démontrer que les forces primitives se déterminent elles-mêmes.

Dans le premier cas on demande en outre:

Quelle est la notion distincte de la puissance passive primitive? Comment une substance peut agir sur l’autre? Et enfin comment celle-ci peut pâtir de la première?

Dans le second cas, il faudra expliquer distinctement:

D’où viennent à ces forces les bornes qui limitent leur activité? Et pourquoi la même force peut tantôt produire un effet, & tantôt ne le peut pas? Comment, par exemple, quelqu’un peut concevoir distinctement ce dont un autre l’instruit, & n’a pas pû l’inventer lui-même? Pourquoi on ne peut pas reproduire, dès que qu’on le veut, les idées qu’on a oubliées, quoiqu’on ait pu les produire autrefois & que l’axiome subsiste toujours, que du vouloir & du pouvoir réunis l’action doit suivre? Ou enfin, quelle différence réelle il y a, si la force primitive tire tout de son propre fond, entre se représenter distinctement une musique savante d’un grand Compositeur à laquelle on assiste, la solution d’un problème difficile, trouvée par un Géometre du premier ordre; & être soi-même l’auteur de cette musique, de cette solution; ou du moins être capable de composer une musique, de résoudre un problème, de la même force, dès qu’on le voudra bien sérieusement.”

³¹ Letter from d’Alembert to Frederick II, 22 September 1777, in Preuss, *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, vol. 25 (1854), 95–96: “I shall take the liberty on this occasion of making a representation to your Majesty; its object is the progress of philosophical enlightenment, which is proceeding so slowly in spite of your efforts and especially your example. You have, Sire, in your Academy, a section of speculative philosophy, which could, being directed by your Majesty, propose for the subjects of its prizes some very interesting and very useful questions, this one, for example: Can it be useful to deceive the people? We have never dared, at the Académie française, to propose this beautiful subject, because the speeches sent for the prize must have, for the misfortune of reason, two Sorbonne doctors as censors, and it is not possible, with such people, to write anything reasonable. But your Majesty has neither prejudice nor Sorbonne, and a question like that would be worthy of being proposed by him to all the philosophers of Europe, who would be delighted to deal with it. Such subjects would be better, it seems to me, than most of those that have been proposed so far by this metaphysical section. The last one especially seemed to me very

king visibly appeared to have been piqued by d'Alembert's criticism of such an abstruse topic: he then came back to the academicians, who, after some back and forth and several rewordings, finally accepted the question he imposed on them.

The difference between d'Alembert's approach and that of the Berlin academicians points to two distinct meanings of the term philosophy – both in form and content. The Prussian question on the “*fundamentum virium*” was aimed at professional philosophers, familiar with the fields of metaphysics or gnoseology. Their understanding of philosophy was primarily scholarly, disciplinary and academic. D'Alembert, on the other hand, conceived his question for a broader group of enlightened writers. For him, the scope of “philosophy” is vast, extending well beyond the academic sphere, encompassing the whole of intellectual commerce and addressed to a “public”, this social body which precisely lacks determinacy, corresponding neither to a specific trade, nor to a given discipline or class of society.

There was undeniably some political risk in putting forth such a question, of which Frederick and the academicians were well aware. Two measures were taken to prevent this risk. First of all, the king ordered that any entry attacking any government should be excluded from the competition.³² This was tantamount to annulling or at least circumventing the 1749 edict on censorship, which stipulated

strange in its unintelligibility; I have seen no one who did not think as I do about it, and I am quite sure that my friend la Grange was not consulted; he would certainly have spared the Academy the inconvenience of seeing its questions ridiculed.” (“Je prendrai, à cette occasion, la liberté de faire une représentation à V. M.; elle a pour objet le progrès des lumières philosophiques, qui va si lentement malgré vos efforts et surtout votre exemple. Vous avez, Sire, dans votre Académie, une classe de philosophie spéculative, qui pourrait, étant dirigée par V. M., proposer pour sujets de ses prix des questions très-intéressantes et très-utiles, celle-ci, par exemple: S'il peut être utile de tromper le peuple? Nous n'avons jamais osé, à l'Académie française, proposer ce beau sujet, parce que les discours envoyés pour le prix doivent avoir, pour le malheur de la raison, deux docteurs de Sorbonne pour censeurs, et qu'il n'est pas possible, avec de pareilles gens, d'écrire rien de raisonnable. Mais V. M. n'a ni préjugés, ni Sorbonne, et une question comme celle-là serait bien digne d'être proposée par elle à tous les philosophes de l'Europe, qui se feraient un plaisir de la traiter. De pareils sujets vaudraient mieux, ce me semble, que la plupart de ceux qui ont été proposés jusqu'ici par cette classe métaphysique. Le dernier surtout m'a paru bien étrange par son inintelligibilité; je n'ai vu personne qui ne pensât comme moi là-dessus, et je suis bien sûr que mon ami la Grange n'a pas été consulté; il aurait certainement épargné à l'Académie le désagrément de voir ses questions tournées en ridicule.”)

³² Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Archive, I-VI-10, fol. 40r. See Hans Adler, “Ist Aufklärung teilbar? Die Preisfrage der Preußischen Akademie für 1780” in Adler, *Nützt es dem Volke*, 1:xiii–lxx, here xlv; Dieter Breuer, *Geschichte der literarischen Zensur in Deutschland* (Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1982).

that the entries to the Academy would not be subject to the censor's control.³³ Second and most importantly, the academicians set out to reduce the political risk by choosing from the outset to split the prize – a gold medal worth 50 ducats – in two: two entries, one answering the question in the affirmative and the other in the negative, were to be awarded.³⁴ The Academy awarded half of the prize to Rudolf Zacharias Becker's dissertation, which answered the question in the negative, thus rejecting the use of deceit; the other half went to Frédéric de Castillon, who answered in the affirmative. Nine runners-up were additionally awarded. Both dissertations were published together in French by Georges Jacques Decker in 1780.³⁵ German translations were separately published in 1781 (Becker) and 1788 (Castillon).³⁶

Becker's Dissertation

Becker's rigorous definition of concepts is remarkable.³⁷ The author began his dissertation by defining judgment and preconceptions: "[To judge] is to perceive the relations of things to one other and to us, and to issue propositions

³³ Heinrich Hubert Houben, *Der ewige Zensor*, with an afterword by Claus Richter and Wolfgang Labuhn (Kronberg im Taunus: Athenäum, 1978), 149.

³⁴ This decision was taken at the meeting of the speculative philosophy section on 25 May 1780, on the initiative of Nicolas Béguelin. See Adler, "Ist Aufklärung teilbar?," lii. Here are the key figures about the contest as presented by Adler: 42 entries were received; 6 were excluded because they arrived too late; 4 were excluded from the competition for formal reasons (because they were signed by name, which was prohibited); one entry appears twice (I-M 743, which is an earlier version of I-M 744); one entry withdrew from the competition (I-M 740); 30 entries were therefore taken into account.

³⁵ Rudolf Zacharias Becker, "Dissertation sur la question: Est-il utile au Peuple d'être trompé, soit qu'on l'induisse dans de nouvelles erreurs, ou qu'on l'entretienne dans celles où il est?" in *Dissertation sur la Question extraordinaire proposée par L'Academie Royale des Sciences Et Belles-Lettres, qui a partagé le Prix adjugé le 1. Juin MDCCLXXX* (Berlin: Decker, 1780) (76 pages); Frédéric de Castillon, "Dissertation sur la question: Est-il utile au peuple d'être trompé, soit qu'on l'induisse dans de nouvelles erreurs, ou qu'on l'entretienne dans celles où il est?" in *ibid.* (42 pages).

³⁶ Rudolf Zacharias Becker, *Beantwortung der Frage: Kann irgend eine Art von Täuschung dem Volke zuträglich sein, sie bestehe nun darinn, daß man es zu neuen Irrthümern verleitet, oder die alten eingewurzelten fort dauern läßt? Eine von der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin gekrönte Preisschrift, mit einer Zueignungsschrift an das menschliche Geschlecht* (Leipzig: Crusius, 1781); Moritz Adolph von Winterfeld, *Prüfung der Castillonschen Preisschrift ueber Irtum und Volkstäuschung* (Berlin: Unger, 1788).

³⁷ On Becker, see in particular Reinhart Siegert, *Aufklärung und Volkslektüre: Exemplarisch dargestellt an Rudolph Zacharias Becker und seinem "Noth- und Hülfsbüchlein"; mit einer Bibliographie zum Gesamtthema* (Frankfurt am Main: Buchhändler-Vereinigung, 1978), cols. 626-38 (for Becker and his participation in the 1780 competition).

that express these relations. We are said to judge when we feel the resemblance or the difference, the suitability or the unsuitability of two objects of our attention.”³⁸ As for preconceived opinions, they are as much “a judgement as a true judgement; it is the statement of a relation of things to one other or to us; but it is a false judgement, stating a relation which does not exist”.³⁹ Becker was also precise in his definition of the people, which he understood in a very specific sense. For him, the people are all the “inhabitants who do not study”: a very broad social group which includes “a large part of the Aristocracy, the bourgeoisie from the Artist and the Merchant, with few exceptions, down to the Labourer, and all Farmers without exception”.⁴⁰

After these introductory philosophical remarks, Becker developed a vast overview of the history of empires since the origins of mankind. He then went on to list the causes of a nation’s preconceptions, falling into two types: first physical causes, which have to do with “the limits which Nature itself has ascribed to the human mind” (les bornes que la Nature même a prescrites à l’esprit humain), such as “the natural laziness of body and mind” (paresse naturelle du corps et de l’esprit), “passions” (passions), the “climate, the situation, the quality of soil in a country” (climat, la situation, la qualité du sol d’un pays); second, political causes, including “the oppression produced by despotism” (l’oppression que produit le despotisme), the “lack of attention of the Legislators to the intellectual needs of the nation” (défaut d’attention des Législateurs aux besoins intellectuels de la nation) and the hold of “a class of citizens who are charged with presiding over divine worship” (une classe de citoyen qui est chargée de présider au culte divin) and have “seized the reins of government” (s’est emparé[e] des rênes du gouvernement), in other words the clergy.⁴¹

³⁸ Rudolf Zacharias Becker, “Dissertation sur la question: Est-il utile au Peuple d’être trompé, soit qu’on l’induisse dans de nouvelles erreurs, ou qu’on l’entretienne dans celles où il est?” in Adler, *Nützt es dem Volke*, xiii–lxx, 4–64, here 4: “Car qu’est-ce que juger? C’est appercevoir les rapports des choses entr’elles et avec nous, et former des propositions qui expriment ces rapports. On dit que nous jugeons, lorsque nous sentons la ressemblance ou la différence, la convenance ou la disconvenance de deux objets de notre attention.”

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 5: “Le *préjugé* n’est pas moins un jugement que le jugement vrai; c’est l’énoncé d’un rapport des choses entr’elles ou avec nous; mais c’est un jugement faux, c’est l’énoncé d’un rapport qui n’existe pas.”

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 10–11: “Je comprends donc sous ce mot toutes les classes des habitans qui ne font pas profession des études, c’est-à-dire une grande partie de la Noblesse, la Bourgeoisie depuis l’Artiste et le Marchand, à peu d’exceptions près, jusqu’au Journalier, et tous les Cultivateurs sans exception.”

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 21–24.

Becker's main argument rests on the central notion of perfectibility, that "active faculty" (*faculté active*),⁴² "that natural instinct" (*cet instinct naturel*) which continually incites men to "improve their situation" (*rendre sa situation plus favorable*)⁴³ and which is universal, unmoved by differences in class and education.⁴⁴ Such a universal feature in mankind bears upon statecraft: in a world truly in accordance with man's nature, "every ordinance of government" (*ordonnance du gouvernement*) should aim at "human perfection" (*la perfection humaine*).⁴⁵ In other words, only those actions and laws that are likely to perfect human beings are politically useful. Becker suggests several concrete measures to reach this goal, such as the abolition of inheritance, an unfair right to "succeed to the paternal rank and property ... without personal merit" (*succéder dans le rang et dans les biens paternels ... sans un mérite personnel*). "The more limited this right, as when it extends only to males or elders, the more it harms the nation and those who appear to benefit from it."⁴⁶

In this line of thinking, preconceptions hinder the improvement of man and the "happiness of nations" (*bonheur des nations*).⁴⁷ "Only bad government are interested in deluding the nation, lest their exactions should raise anger."⁴⁸ As for religious opinions, they do not foster "pleasant sensations" (*sensations agréables*), but "bring down courage, diminish industry and patriotism, and detach man from society" (*abattent le courage, diminuent l'industrie et le patriotisme, détachent l'homme de la société*).⁴⁹ Thus, "a government which lulls the people into a chimerical prosperity and blinds them as to their real state, would betray the sacred rights of humanity, and harm itself by weakening nature, which is its strength."⁵⁰ Freedom of thought, to which Becker devotes a chapter, is presented as the central prerogative of a good government – as opposed to despotic regimes, ignoring "the very ground of a sound Politics, which teaches us that the State derives its strength from that of all its members,

⁴² *Ibid.*, 31.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 47–48.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 44: "Plus ce droit est limité, comme lorsqu'il ne s'étend qu'à des mâles ou à des aînés, plus il nuit à la nation et à ceux mêmes qui paroissent en profiter."

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 53: "Il n'y a que le mauvais gouvernement qui soit intéressé à faire illusion à la nation, de crainte que ses exactions ne soulevent ses esprits."

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 55–56.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 56: "Cela étant, le gouvernement qui prétendrait bercer le peuple d'une prospérité chimérique et l'aveugler sur son état réel, trahiroit les droits sacrés de l'humanité, et se nuirait à lui-même en affoiblissant la nature, qui fait sa force."

and that battles cannot be won nor money made from abroad with ignorant and dimmed down subjects.”⁵¹

The dissertation ends on a description of “good government” (bon gouvernement), whose duty is to “enlighten the people, and lead them to the temple of happiness by the path that Nature herself has made” (se servir des moyens propres à éclairer les peuples, et de les conduire au temple du bonheur par le chemin que la Nature elle-même a frayé).⁵² One of the core tenets of this “good government” is the preservation of the freedom of the press, which is the strong point of the dissertation:

A good government will regard its subjects as its children; it will use all possible means to improve education; it will attach public esteem and its pleasures to such actions and discoveries that are truly useful; it will ensure that the greatest perfection in every kind of work and effort should be awarded the highest reward. It will remove the obstacles that prevent the progress of the mind; it will give those who seek truth complete freedom to pursue it everywhere, and to share their successes with their fellow citizens, shielding them from the cruel hands of a spiritual or temporal Inquisition. To this effect freedom of the press should be unlimited, because the good government will not fear that unbound writings may stir up trouble or seduce the citizen; it knows that, by dint of its enlightened care, any action prejudicial to the general happiness naturally results in harm for the individual who is guilty of it, that the nation is educated enough to despise writings contrary to good sense and virtue, and that a thankful subject is an obedient subject.⁵³

As pointed out in the beginning of this article, the 1780 prize question was a breakthrough in the history of the *Aufklärung* in Germany and of the Enlightenment in Europe. Because the candidates were asked to answer either in the affirmative or

⁵¹ Ibid., 63: “Si de tels procédés ne sentent pas le despotisme et la tyrannie, du moins, du moins décelent-ils l’ignorance des premiers éléments d’une saine Politique, qui nous apprend que la force de l’Etat consiste dans celle de tous ses membres, et qu’avec des sujets stupides et abâtardis on ne gagne ni des batailles, ni l’argent de l’étranger.”

⁵² Ibid., 64.

⁵³ Ibid.: “Le bon gouvernement regardera ses sujets comme des enfants; il emploiera tous les moyens possibles de perfectionner l’éducation; il attachera l’estime publique et les plaisirs qui l’accompagnent, aux actions et aux découvertes vraiment utiles; il aura soin qu’en tout genre de travaux et d’efforts la plus grande perfection remporte la plus grande récompense; il levera les obstacles qui empêchent les progrès de l’esprit; il donnera à l’ami de la vérité une entière liberté de la suivre par-tout, et de communiquer ses succès à ses contemporains, sans l’exposer à tomber entre les mains cruelles d’une Inquisition spirituelle ou temporelle. Pour cet effet la liberté de la presse sera illimitée, parce qu’il ne sera jamais dans le cas de craindre que des écrits trop libres excitent des troubles ou séduisent le citoyen; il sait que, par une suite de ses soins éclairés, toute action préjudiciable au bonheur général produit naturellement un mal pour le particulier qui

in the negative, the contest brought out in a very plastic way two major schools of thought on the relation between statecraft and the Enlightenment. Castillon, who was in line with the king's own positions, represents the party intent on protecting religion, largely sceptical about the universality of reason and its benefits for the happiness of humanity. Becker, on the other hand, and a number of writers in the tradition of d'Alembert, placed "truth" above everything else and thought it the only possible basis for good government. In choosing to divide the prize in two, the 1780 contest highlights both the gap between these two positions and their proximity, since both parties equally claim to be "enlightened".

The reception of this debate was significant, especially in the German-speaking world, as evidenced by the exceptionally high number of memoirs received, but also by the numerous references to this question long after the prize attribution. Traces of it can be found in Hamann's correspondence from 1781,⁵⁴ in a satire by Jean Paul in 1786⁵⁵ and even in an epigram by Goethe in 1790,⁵⁶ as Hans Adler has shown. The French reception seems to have been more limited. But it should be noted that Mirabeau devotes several pages to the prize in his description of Prussian monarchy of 1788.⁵⁷

Generally speaking, contemporaries noted the gap between the audacity of the question and the caution of the Academy. For example, Hamann regrets in a letter to Herder the ambiguous judgment of the Academy, which he qualifies as "two-headed" (zweyköpfig) or even "specious" (spitzfindig), because of its bipartition.⁵⁸ In this register, it is Mirabeau who formulates the most elaborate criticism. He first expresses his admiration for Frederick's audacity: "What a

s'en rend coupable, que la nation est assez instruite pour mépriser tout écrit contraire au bon sens et à la vertu, et que l'attachement des sujets assure leur obéissance."

⁵⁴ Johann Georg Hamann, Letter to Johann Gottfried Herder, 1 January 1781, in J.G. Hamann, *Briefwechsel*, 4 vols., ed. Arthur Henkel (Wiesbaden: Insel, 1959), 4:260; see Adler, "Ist Aufklärung teilbar?", xlix.

⁵⁵ Jean Paul, "Dumheit schickt sich auf alle Weise für das gemeine Volk [1786]," in Jean Paul, *Jugendwerke I*, ed. Norbert Miller and Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann (Jean Paul, *Sämtliche Werke*, section 2, vol. 1) (Frankfurt am Main: Zweitausendeins, 1996), 1108–10.

⁵⁶ Johann Wolfgang Goethe, "Epigramme, Venedig, 1790", in J.W. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke nach Epochen seines Schaffens*, ed. Karl Richter, 20 vols. and 1 index vol. (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1985–1998) (Münchener Ausgabe), vol. 3.2 (1990), ed. Hans J. Becker, Hans-Georg Dewitz, Norbert Miller, Gerhard H. Müller, John Neubauer, Hartmut Reinhardt and Irmtraut Schmid, 83–153, here 137 (No. 55).

⁵⁷ Comte de Mirabeau, *De la monarchie prussienne sous Frédéric le Grand; avec un appendice contenant des recherches sur la situation actuelle des principales contrées de l'Allemagne*, 8 vols. (London: s.n., 1788), here 5:200–202.

⁵⁸ Hamann, Letter to Herder, 1 January 1781, *Briefwechsel*, 4:260.

man the king was who instructed his academy to propose this question.”⁵⁹ But he immediately underlines the mediocrity of the results achieved, a phenomenon due to two parameters according to him: the poor quality of the received entries and the lack of courage of the Academy, which “made its decision like a congregation of Capuchins, and not like an assembly of philosophers.”⁶⁰

One thing is striking in all these evocations of the 1780 competition: the multiplicity of reformulations of the original question. Hamann paraphrases the question of the Academy by adding a plural that profoundly modifies the notion of people by giving it a national connotation: “If it is useful for peoples to be deceived” (S’il est utile aux peuples d’être trompé [sic]).⁶¹ The “peoples” here can be understood as the different nations of Europe, conceived as distinct national political entities. As for Mirabeau, he completely evacuates the notion of people to focus the question on the central notions of error and utility: “Are there useful errors that should be prevented from being revealed?” (Est-il des erreurs utiles qu’il faille empêcher de dévoiler?).⁶² Mirabeau’s analysis also shows the extreme plurality of interpretations that contemporaries were able to associate with this enterprise. For Mirabeau, the 1780 competition can both be interpreted as the mark of an enlightened king and, in the execution, as the gesture of a “despot” (despote)⁶³ who, through censorship, directly or indirectly curbs the “freedom of thinking” (liberté de penser).⁶⁴ This plurality of interpretation still dominates the research on this prize: does the question of 1780, inspired by d’Alembert, imposed by Frederick and reformulated in an exchange with the Academy, inaugurate the transition to the late Enlightenment (*Spätaufklärung*), in accordance to the interpretation by Werner Schneiders?⁶⁵ or even to the “*Volksaufklärung*”?⁶⁶ Or could it even be a weapon of the “counter-Enlightenment”? The genesis, organisation and reception of the 1780 competition provide arguments for each of these interpretations.

Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg

⁵⁹ Mirabeau, *De la monarchie prussienne*, 5:200: “Quel homme que le roi qui chargea son académie de proposer cette question.”

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 201–202: “L’Académie de Berlin prononça comme une congrégation de capucins, et non comme un congrès de philosophes.”

⁶¹ Hamann, Letter to Herder, 1 January 1781, *Briefwechsel*, 260.

⁶² Mirabeau, *De la monarchie prussienne*, 5:200.


⁶³ *Ibid.*, 200.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 201.

⁶⁵ Schneiders, *Aufklärung und Vorurteilkritik*, 260.

⁶⁶ Holger Böning and Reinhart Siegert, *Volksaufklärung: Biobibliographisches Handbuch zur Popularisierung aufklärerischen Denkens im deutschen Sprachraum von den Anfängen bis 1850*, vol. 2.1 (Bad Cannstatt, Frommann-Holzboog, 2001), xxii (see also xiv).

Recent Titles / Titres Récents 2022



Katerina Dede, Leonidas Kallivretakis, Ilias Nikolakopoulos and Sotiris Rizas, eds., *Ιστορικό λεξικό ελληνικών κοινοβουλευτικών κομμάτων 1844–1967* [Historical lexicon of Greek parliamentary parties, 1844–1967] (Athens: Hellenic Parliament Foundation for Parliamentarism and Democracy; Institute of Historical Research / NHRF, 2022), 422 pages.

Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>

Recent Titles / Titres Récents 2022

ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ / 160
ΠΗΓΕΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΠΡΙΑΚΗΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ


ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ
ΚΥΠΡΙΑΚΗ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ
ΑΝΑΓΕΝΝΗΣΙΑΚΩΝ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΩΝ



Επιμέλεια
Μαρίνα Ροδοσθένους-Μπαλάφα

Marina Rodosthenous-Balafa, ed., *Μελέτες για την κυπριακή Συλλογή αναγεννησιακών ποιημάτων* [Studies on the collection of Cypriot renaissance poetry] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRE, 2022), 153 pages.

Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>



ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ

ΣΟΦΙΑ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΥ

**ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΚΕΣ ΣΠΟΥΔΕΣ
ΚΑΙ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑ
ΣΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΑ
ΤΟΥ 19ου ΑΙΩΝΑ.
ΜΙΑ ΕΘΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ**

Sophia Matthaiou, *Φιλολογικές σπουδές και κλασική φιλολογία στην Ελλάδα του 19ου αιώνα: Μία εθνική επιστήμη* [Philological studies and classical philology in 19th-century Greece: A national discipline] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRF, 2022), 454 pages.


Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>



Dimitris Dimitropoulos and Vangelis Karamanolakis, eds., *Μηχανισμοί ελέγχου και πειθάρχησης 19ος-20ός αιώνας* [Mechanisms of discipline and control, 19th-20th centuries] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRF, 2022), 215 pages.


Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>

Recent Titles / Titres Récents 2022




Sophia Matthaiou, Alexandra Sfoini and Maria Christina Chatziioannou, eds., *Εθνικά κινήματα και φιλελληνισμός* [Nationalist movements and philhellenism] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRE, 2022), 533 pages.

Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>



Eri Stavroulou, *Η Νεοελληνική ποίηση και το Εικοσιένα: Διάλογος με την Ιστορία* [Modern Greek poetry and the 1821 Revolution: A conversation with history] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRE, 2022), 361 pages.

Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>



Sophia Matthaiou and Athina Chatzidimitriou, *Οι αρχαιότητες στα χρόνια της επανάστασης* [Greek antiquities during the Greek Revolution] (Athens: Institute of Historical Research / NHRE, 2022), 360 pages.

Orders: bookstore@eie.gr
IHR Publications: <https://history-bookstore.eie.gr>

history-bookstore.eie.gr

history-bookstore.eie.gr

IIE
EIE

Contents / Table des matières

SPECIAL SECTION I / SECTION SPÉCIALE I

CONFLICT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

A Concise Introduction to Greek Environmental History: Research Hubs, Threads, Themes and Projections into the Future
George L. Vlachos

“At the mercy of a miserable ditch named the Kifisos”: The Changing Perceptions of the Natural Environment and the Contest with Nature through the History of Athens’ Main River
Dimitris Glistras

The “War on the Goat”: Forestry, Husbandry and Politics in Early Modern Greece
Giorgos Kostopoulos and Iosif Botetzagias

Is There Oil in Greece? Oil Exploration and Scientific Conflict during the First Years of the Greek Geological Survey (1917–1925)
Christos Karampatos, Spyros Tzokas, Giorgos Velegrakis and Gelina Harlaftis

SPECIAL SECTION II / SECTION SPÉCIALE II

Atlas1821.com. A DIGITAL ATLAS OF THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE CREATION OF THE GREEK STATE, 1821–1852

Presentation
George Tolia

Reconstructing the Map: ‘Deep Mapping’ Greece, 1821–1852
George Tolia, Eleni Gkadoulou and Panagiotis El Gedi

Military Mapping, Philhellenic Geography, and the Making of Greece, 1811–1827
George Tolia

Alternative Narratives of the Greek Revolution: An Intellectual Map of Messolonghi (1821–1880)
Panagiotis El Gedi

ARTICLES

From the Greek Medical Manuscripts of the Ottoman Empire to the Pharmacopoeia I of the Greek State: Pharmacy and Political Change in Southeastern Europe
Athanasios Barlagiannis, Penelope Seriatou and Vaso Seirinidou

The University as a Punisher: Control Mechanisms and Disciplinary Practices. The Disciplinary Board of the University of Athens (1911–1940)
Angeliki Christodoulou, Vassilis Gkonis and Vangelis Karamanolakis

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES / APPROCHES CRITIQUES

C. TH. DIMARAS ANNUAL LECTURE, 2022

“Do the People Benefit from Being Deceived?” A Debate on the Politics of the Enlightenment
Elisabeth Décultot

