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Welcome to *Diogenes*, the online journal edited by the postgraduate students at the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham. After the launch of Gate to the Eastern Mediterranean (GEM) last year, the need for a different platform for discussion of current research by postgraduate students in these fields has become ever more apparent. The diversity of research interests in these three distinct, yet interconnected, fields of study encourages active discussions among the students at the Centre as well as with a wider audience. An online journal thus serves as a channel through which the postgraduate community could communicate its research ideas to such an audience. With *Diogenes*, the postgraduate community at the Centre now enjoys three different platforms that facilitate the exchange of ideas: GEM as the general platform, Annual Postgraduate Colloquium as the platform with the academic community and *Diogenes*.

This issue consists of articles of very different interests, yet they all address how human mind perceives, represents, approaches and is being influenced by elements of history. Zuzana Černáková examines the role played by prejudices and emotions during the Second Crusade. Elli Evangelidou looks at how two novels represent the Greek Civil War. Alexandros Siapkas provides a synopsis of the different academic approaches to the issue of foreign intervention in Greece during the Second World War. Yannis Stamos investigates how Epicureanism affected two modern Greek poets. Niki Touriki analyses how Anna Komnene described characters in her *Alexiad*. Finally, Gemma Norman provides a general overview of Ottoman Studies while reviewing *The Ottoman World*.

For this first issue, it would not have been possible to put together the collection of articles on various topics without the assistance and wide-ranging expertise of the specialist editors: Annika Asp-Talwar and Jeffrey Brubaker for Byzantine Studies, Evangelia Yfantidi for archaeology, Yannis Stamos for Modern Greek Studies. I would like to express gratitude to Mr. George Dardanos, owner of Gutenberg and Τυπωθήτω, John Mamais, the designer at Gutenberg and Τυπωθήτω, and Niki Touriki for their contributions to the aesthetical aspect of the journal. The work of Carlo Virgilio, the initial General Editor, who was unable to finish editing due to other commitments, is deeply appreciated. The unwavering support from Gemma Norman, the current president of GEM, and Annika Asp-Talwar, the founding president, has been immensely encouraging for all of us involved.
The editorial team is also grateful that the staff members at the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies showed much support for GEM in its first year and for the editing of this journal. We would like to dedicate this first issue to Professor Emeritus of Byzantine Studies Anthony Bryer, who was the founder and the first director of the Centre.

We are planning to include any future contributions in forms other than articles and reviews, presenting the diversity of postgraduate research activities in their diverse forms. Because this is a journal edited by the postgraduate students for the postgraduate students, it belongs to everyone who takes part in it. And I hope this is a gateway to the Eastern Mediterranean for you. Enjoy reading.

Wei-sheng Lin
General Editor
Prejudices, Emotions and Power of Political Restraint:

A Study in the Second Crusade

Zuzana Černáková
PhD Candidate
Department of General History, Comenius University, Bratislava

Regardless of historical era or geographical region, the human mind has always embraced certain stereotypes with respect to other nationalities, religions and cultures. These stereotypes are products of miscellaneous influences ranging from personal experiences and misunderstandings, through contrasting values, to literature and propaganda. The recent dispute over the European Stability Mechanism and a bailout loan for Greece that created – with sufficient help of a politically motivated campaign – a caricature of lazy and pampered Greeks living in luxury at the expense of European citizens is a perfect illustration of such a process. It might be more suitable, however, to speak of revival instead of creation, since the notion of Greek laziness has been present in Western Latin writings since the Middle Ages.

Historical research of the relations between the Byzantine and Latin spheres in the medieval era, especially during the crusading period, often leads to questions of mutual perceptions and prejudiced images of the other part of the Christian world. Based on the testimony of contemporary chronicles, two basic stereotypical images of the Byzantines and the Latins can be defined. The most exhaustive analysis of the Western view of the Eastern Empire was done by Marc Carrier in his excellent dissertation; the image he extracted from Latin narratives is that of a perfidious, effeminate, greedy, indolent Greek who is also characterized by his excessive flattery and lack of honour.\(^1\) Secondly, as summarized by Alexander Kazhdan, the Byzantine literature produced a model of an arrogant, cruel, untrustworthy and greedy Latin barbarian who wished

\(^1\) The term Latin is employed in its broader cultural sense referring to the peoples of the European West and standing in opposition to the Byzantine East. Such an understanding was established in Byzantium by the twelfth century and surpasses a purely linguistic or religious meaning. Alexander Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century,” in The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parvitz Mottahedeh (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), 86-87.

\(^2\) Marc Carrier, “L’image des Byzantins et les systèmes de représentation selon les chroniqueurs occidentaux des croisades 1096-1261” (PhD diss., Université Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2006), 73-74, 83-85
nothing else than to conquer the empire and its capital.  

The negative influence of the prejudices is sometimes used as an argument in the interpretation of crusades and East-West relations in general. The present case study of French-Byzantine relations during the Second Crusade (1147 – 1149), which examines ties between the stereotypes, emotions and the course of the campaign, aims to question such an argumentation as well as to oppose the idea that stereotypical images had the power to affect historical events.

When treating such sensitive subjects as emotions, prejudices or perceptions, one is always confronted with the limits of contemporary sources. The quantitative and qualitative disproportion between Byzantine and French materials, the disproportion between descriptions of attitudes of different social and political groups, and, most importantly, the relevance of authorial bias must be taken into account in the present case. For instance, the famous anti-Byzantine remarks of Odo of Deuil, the chaplain of the French King Louis VII, whose chronicle *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem* is the main source for the expedition, could be seen as a partial reflection of the French attitude at the time close to the chronicle’s creation (summer 1148). As for earlier

3 Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks,” 87-88. The list of the Byzantine and Latin stereotypes is far from complete. The present selection is based upon frequency of epithets in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources that have been part of my past researches. For more complete bibliography related to the topic see Carrier, “L’image,” 6-18.

4 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione* (cited hereafter as Odo). At the time of final corrections of the present essay I gained access to the formerly unattainable work of Henry Mayr-Harting “Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis” that prompted me to reassess certain premises and conclusions of my research, especially with regard to the extent to which *De profectione* mirrors real feelings of the French towards Byzantium. Despite Odo’s obvious anti-Byzantine purpose, his recount of the crusade’s events is considered very accurate (Virginia G. Berry, introduction to *De profectione*, xxi-xxii.); it was exactly his account of events in Asia Minor (cf. Odo, books 5-7) that have led me to believe that exclusively during this last phase of the French journey through Byzantine territory, Odo’s anti-Greek feelings were shared by majority. No less important arguments were the chronological closeness to the time of the source’s creation and a letter sent from Antioch immediately after the march through Asia Minor, in which the king, formerly of pro-Byzantine position, finally assumed the opposite stance (see below). Louis VII to Suger, 1148, RHGF 15, 496.

Although I do not find Mayr-Harting’s suggested dating of the chronicle to 1150, intriguing as it is, conclusive, I must accept his argument that Louis’s letter mentions the Byzantine deceit only “in passing and amidst other problems.” Mayr-Harting, “Odo of Deuil,” 229. Odo’s anti-Byzantine attitude truly cannot be viewed as dominant, not even during the last phase in Asia Minor. This does not, however, deny the existence of the feelings expressed by the chronicler among the French army. He might have been only the representative of a single group, but our evidence indicates that this group
phases of the crusaders’ march, implications about emotional development are drawn
from events described, but the author’s comments must be ignored. Therefore, source
criticism and a profound historical reconstruction of the crusade have been a
prerequisite for this research.

Out of two Western armies heading to Syria in 1147 led by the German king Conrad
III and the French king Louis VII, only the latter one is of concern here. The period of
known contacts between the French and the Byzantines extended to the end of February
1148, when Louis’ men sailed from the Byzantine port Antalya to Antioch. It is
convenient to provisionally divide the period into several smaller parts to observe the
development over time.

The role of prejudices and emotions at the beginning of the crusade

The first, preparatory phase is marked by the calls for the crusade in December 1145
and the arrival of the French army to Regensburg in mid-July 1147. There is really no
evidence for the application of the prejudiced characteristics or any manifestation of
emotions towards the French or the Byzantines during this time. The only exception
might be the case of a council of French elites in Étampes in February 1147 that was
meant to decide about a route to the Holy land. There were two possibilities: an
overland path through Byzantine territory, or a sea-way with assistance from the
Kingdom of Sicily. Odo of Deuil was an eyewitness of the whole campaign and took
part in the council. He recorded that “There were men in the assembly who said that the
Greeks, as they had learned either by reading or by experience, were deceitful.”
Despite appearances, the extract cannot be regarded as persuasive evidence for
anti-Byzantine feelings of the French party. Firstly, we do not have a proof supporting
Virginia G. Berry’s assumption that it was the French who accused Greeks of treachery.
According to the same source, a Sicilian embassy was present at the meeting and tried
grew stronger, if not prevailing, at the end of the researched period and it is this development that is of
concern to the present paper. Therefore, if we bear these limits in mind and avoid generalization, Odo’s
biased comments are a relevant primary source for the French moods at a certain point of time.

5 This and all future date references correspond with those in Phillips, *The Second Crusade; or with
the results of my own research: Zuzana Černáková, “Byzantsko-francúzske vzťahy počas druhej
križiackej výpravy” (MA thesis., Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2012).

6 ‘Interfuere congregatis qui Graecos dicerent sicut lectione at experientia noverant fraudulentos.’
Odo, 12.

to discourage Louis from taking the land route.\textsuperscript{8} Considering the notorious animosity between Byzantium and Sicily, it seems more probable that it was these foreign envoys, and not the French participants, who warned against Greek perfidy. Secondly, although the French court was aware of the Byzantine clichés mediated by authors who wrote about the First Crusade or by other means, the silence of our sources in this matter indicates that the information was not of much importance at the time of the preparations for the second expedition.\textsuperscript{9} Therefore, it is adequate to say that prejudice against Greeks did not stir up a substantial commotion and definitely did not influence crucial decisions at the beginning of the crusade. After all, the result of the conference in Étampes was clearly in favour of the land route and cooperation with Byzantium. Moreover, if prejudiced dislike were to play a part, why would Louis even ask the Byzantine emperor for assistance as he did in 1146\textsuperscript{10}

Byzantine sources that are considerably briefer than Odo’s account allow only few, general conclusions about Byzantine moods during the crusade. They concentrate on the activities of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos and tell about several preventive measures taken as a reaction to the news of the expedition, namely a demand of sworn promise for the safety of the empire,\textsuperscript{11} renovations of Constantinople’s fortification\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{8} Odo, 14.


\textsuperscript{10} It must be stressed that this had happened before the German king took the cross and before his friendship with Byzantium could influence Louis’s plans. Although Louis’s own letter did not survive, its content is known from the emperor’s preserved response. Manuel I to Louis VII, 1146, RHGF 16, 9-10. The king’s request is mentioned also in Odo, 10.

\textsuperscript{11} Manuel I to Eugene III, March [1147], in Ohsorge,” 408; Niketas Choniates, Nicatae Choniatae Historia, edited by I. A. Van Dieten. CFHB. Vol. 11/1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 61 (cited hereafter as Choniates). This request was repeated (and granted) later at a meeting with the emperor’s embassy in Regensburg. It seems that some confirmation of the promise was made also during crusader’s march through the Balkans. Ioannes Kinnamos, Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum, edited by A. Meineke. CSHB (Bonn: Weber, 1836), 67, 82 (cited hereafter as Kinnamos); Odo, 26.

\textsuperscript{12} Choniates, 61. The repairs are mentioned also in a poem of so called Manganeios Prodromos, an anonymous Byzantine eulogist, whose works are still waiting for a modern edition. Extracts of the poem on crusader’s passage of Bosphorus (no. 24 according to the Jeffreys’ numbering) are quoted in Elizabeth Jeffreys and Michael Jeffreys, “Wild Beast from the West;” and in RHC Grec 2. Hereafter cited as Manganeios, in Jeffreys or as Manganeios, in RHC. For the fortification repairs see Manganeios, in Elizabeth Jeffreys and Michael Jeffreys, “The ‘Wild Beast from the West’: Immediate
and a truce with Sultan Masud of Konya. All these precautions imply mistrust on the Byzantine side. There were many rational reasons for caution: the launch of the crusade contrary to Byzantine interests, Louis’s suspicious negotiations with Sicily, and the experience of plunder during the First Crusade. Therefore it is difficult to say if the emperor acted also out of some irrational prejudice.

Whatever the case, in his letters to France and Rome, Manuel restrained his displeasure behind a veil of an accommodating attitude, expressions of joy, and promises of market and free passage for the crusaders.

The calm atmosphere changed during the second phase (July – October 1147) due to the first personal contacts between the Western armies, imperial embassies and the Byzantine population of the Balkans. Our knowledge of emotions on the Byzantine side remains vague. Manuel’s suspicion of the crusaders’ true intentions must have increased after Roger II of Sicily in the meantime attacked the western parts of Byzantium. Jonathan Phillips suitably pointed out that the Sicilian invasion “formed a constant backdrop to the progress of both the German and the French crusaders,” who were suspected of collaboration with enemies. Independently of the court’s


13 Kinnamos, 45, 59. The twelve-year truce formally terminated Manuel’s punitive expedition of 1146, which had reached as far as Konya, the capital of the Sultanate of Rum. Paul Magdalino, The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143 – 1180 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 42.

14 This question forms part of a much more complicated problem to which my attention was drawn by helpful remarks of Professor Michael Jeffreys, for which I am very thankful. Where do we draw a line between rational and irrational? Could Manuel’s prejudice still be called irrational in context of the above mentioned factors? This problem cannot be solved here in all its complexity, but at least with regard to Manuel’s precautions I am inclined to believe that these were perfectly logical practical actions stemming from actual geopolitical situation and experience. Objectively, passage of such a great foreign army was bound to cause problems, thus the caution was neither extreme nor groundless.


15 Manuel I to Eugene III, August 1146, RHGF 15, 440; Manuel I to Louis VII, 1146, RHGF 16, 9; Manuel I to Eugene III, March [1147], in Ohnsorge, 408.

16 Phillips, The Second Crusade, 170. Sicilian fleet was attacking Byzantine islands and coast since the end of summer 1147, gradually seizing among others Corfu, Corinth and Thebes. Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, 53–54; Choniates, 62, 72-76; Kinnamos. 92.
concerns, an emotional turmoil is well documented at the level of the crowds by contemporary accounts of the crusaders’ plunder and the flight of local inhabitants in the Balkans.¹⁷ Manuel did not, however, let the fear and aversion of his subjects break out into an open conflict, which he could not afford and which would thwart other plans he might have had with the crusaders.¹⁸ Instead, he maintained frequent friendly correspondence with King Louis and reinforced Constantinople’s defences.¹⁹ According to Niketas Choniates writing in the first decades of the thirteenth century, the emperor also sent his troops to control crusader’s violence, but this was to be done “in a pacific manner and not by engaging in combat.”²⁰

Obviously, the French attitude underwent some changes as well. The first meeting with an imperial embassy in Regensburg passed quite peacefully, but the subsequent march through the Byzantine Balkans had a much worse effect. There were several factors that emerge from the sources as triggers of ill feelings: high exchange rates; refusal on behalf of the fearful local inhabitants to cooperate and provide goods for sale; criminal activities of certain Byzantines who enriched themselves with crusaders’ possessions; and the activity of the emperor’s troops.²¹ The behaviour of the Byzantines towards the French is often excused by the economic situation and wild looting of the preceding German army that had caused great fear and mistrust.²² It is unlikely, though, that all the French realised this. What they could perceive at the first sight was that the same Greeks who had promised them easy passage actually withdrew

¹⁷ Odo, 40, 44, 56, 66.
¹⁸ Manuel clearly stated his desire for an oath concerning restoration of former imperial territories recovered from the Turks. Manuel I to Eugene III, August 1146, RHGF 15, 440; Manuel I to Louis VII, 1146, RHGF 16, 9; Manuel I to Eugene III, March [1147], in Ohnsorge, 408-409. Manuel might have already thought of a French-Byzantine anti-Sicilian alliance, which later became one of the topics of a conference in Chalcedon. Odo, 82.
¹⁹ Odo, 56; Kinnamos, 72, 82; Choniates, 62.
²⁰ ‘...τοῖς δ’ ἐπισκήπτει τῇ στρατιᾷ παρέπεσθαι τῶν Ἀλαμανῶν, μὴ ἀφισταμένοις ἐπὶ πολύ, κὰκ τοῦτο εἴργειν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀλαμανῶν ἐς ἄρπαγάς παρεξίοντας καὶ προνομάς, εἰρηνικῶς μέντοι καὶ μὴ πολεμικῶς.’ Choniates, 62. The author mentions dispatch of the troops to control German looting. Undoubtedly, the Germans were the main target of this preventive measure, but the French encountered the Byzantine forces as well. Odo, 46, 54. Dispatch of forces with the police-like function under generals Prosuch and Basileios Tzikandyles is recorded also at Kinnamos, 72-3.
²¹ Odo, 40, 44, 46, 54.
their goods, hid inside their cities, exchanged money at an unfair rate and sent their soldiers against them. A contrast between the crusaders’ expectations and reality must have been evident and I assume that it was already at this point that disappointment revived the stereotype of the treacherous Greek.

Odo of Deuil’s accounts of several Byzantine embassies to Louis VII may imply the revival of another traditional prejudice, that of Greek double-faced flattery, though these passages bear strong signs of the author’s bias stemming from later experiences that obscure real reactions towards the envoys’ conduct. On the other hand, the chronicler also expressed curiosity and interest in the foreign country with its beautiful chapels, distinct fashion and specific customs. Similar positive feelings were certainly shared by other crusaders who for the first time encountered the exotic eastern culture. Their emotions towards Byzantium cannot be interpreted one-sidedly all the more that we know of the existence of two factions among the French, Odo being a supporter only of the radical one, which was more sensitive to the problems with the Greeks.

To summarize, during the emotionally strained situation in the Balkans one can trace the first hints of re-emerging stereotypical images, although the evidence is not persuasive enough to pronounce a definitive verdict. Undoubtedly, French-Byzantine relations deteriorated once masses came into contact, but these problems were still minor. Louis himself – always the decisive figure – did not utter a single critical word on account of the Greeks when describing the Balkan journey in his letter to abbot Suger from October 1147. He kept frequent correspondence with Manuel and nothing suggests that his intention to continue their cooperation faltered; thus pragmatic thinking and practical interest of decisive circles around the emperor and the king managed to overcome the first wave of growing antipathies.

23 Odo, 26, 56.
24 Ibid., 24-26, 54-56.
Constantinople and beyond: evolution of a conflict

Louis’s stay in Constantinople and Chalcedon in October 1147, which was an important accelerator of development, forms another distinct part. Following Odo of Deuil’s narrative, as soon as Louis approached the capital, French emotions were stirred up by two pieces of news concerning Manuel’s truce with sultan Masud of Konya, and a skirmish between the Byzantine army and a French vanguard. Consequently, at least a part of the crusaders interpreted Byzantine actions in accord with the negative clichés and repeatedly used Greek treachery as an argument for a proposed attack against Constantinople. The immediate outburst of violence in Chalcedon after the French crossed the Bosphorus proves further that under the guise of friendly gestures, banquets and entertainments, the atmosphere during the visit in Constantinople must already have been tense and filled with mistrust.

Nevertheless, the situation was not as bad as the chronicler wanted us to believe. In fact, a conciliatory faction of Louis’s council held majority against the radicals and enjoyed the king’s support. Another one of his letters to Suger praised the emperor for due welcome and care; French appreciation of the visit in Constantinople was recorded also by William, archbishop of Tyre, and, to some extent, even by Odo of Deuil; and even he had to admit that many crusaders excused the later Byzantine hostility in Chalcedon as a result of French pillaging.

As far as the Byzantine sentiment is concerned, two late twelfth and early thirteenth century Greek authors, Ioannes Kinnamos and Niketas Choniates, commented on the French passage of the Bosphorus in neutral or, in Kinnamos’s case, even in a positive

---

28 Odo, 58, 58-70, 78. We share the editor’s opinion that the passage on page 58: rumores de imperatore quos iam ex parte retulimus reportantes. Tunc fuere qui consulerent retrocedere et terram opulentissimam cum castellis et urbis capere et ... ipsam Constantinopolim expugnaret.’ is an unmistakable allusion to the above mentioned events described on pages 50-54.

29 In Chalcedon the French caused havoc at a market and robbed Greek merchants. During the subsequent diplomatic clash the emperor stopped a flow of provisions. Odo, 74.


31 Odo, 72.
way, which implies that any frictions were not serious enough for a long-term remembrance. Fortunately, a eulogy of so-called Manganeios Prodromos written shortly after the French visit of Constantinople and Chalcedon reflected Byzantine moods in their proper time. Manganeios confirmed the application of Latin stereotypes when he compared the crusaders (French and German likewise) to “beasts” that “came as if to capture and devour” the capital. An analysis of events such as the Byzantine carefully measured efforts to relieve a potential threat by transporting the crusaders to the other side of Bosphorus and a harsh reaction to the violent incident in Chalcedon reveals two main aspects determining the fluctuating attitude of the imperial court towards the French: the violence of their army and the willingness, or rather unwillingness, of Louis’s barons to accept Manuel’s demand of homage. All in all, the crusaders were viewed as beasts, as a threat of which Byzantines wanted to rid themselves as soon as possible, but not before the emperor secured his political interests.

As discussed above, the stereotypes of Greek perfidy and Latin violence were definitely revived in this situation. But neither Manuel nor Louis let these antipathies intervene with their practical needs. Manuel had to concentrate his imperial forces against the Sicilian invasion and wanted the homage that would guarantee safety of his realm from crusaders’ attack as well as future control over potentially re-conquered imperial territories, whereas Louis needed Byzantine help during a difficult journey through Asia Minor. The behaviour of both rulers in Constantinople and Chalcedon shows that there was a will to compromise. Finally, on October 26 they concluded an agreement with the following conditions: provisions and guides in exchange for the safety of the empire and the homage of French barons. The fact that they were able to

32 The poem was an official assignment intended to public audience of eyewitnesses; therefore, although it is a piece of propaganda, its credibility should not be contested. Jeffreys and Jeffreys, “Wild Beast from the West,” 104. On the contrary, its bias has a great importance for the present subject.


34 Odo, 72-78; Choniates, 66. Epistolary evidence together with conditions of a final French-Byzantine agreement displays an obvious link between the ‘homagium’ (sic) of the French barons and the oath of the first crusaders to Emperor Alexios I. See above, note 18.

35 The emperor took a great care of his visitors in Constantinople and strategically withheld his demands until the crusaders crossed Bosphorus to safer distance from the city. Louis, on the other hand, was ready to compensate Greek victims for crimes of his own men and was eventually willing to accept Manuel’s controversial conditions. Odo, 58-60, 66-68, 80-82; Louis VII to Suger, 1148, RHGF 15, 496; William of Tyre, Historia, 665. To rich imperial gifts bestowed upon the crusading elites alludes also Manganeios, in RHC, 758.
conclude such an alliance in spite of emotionally strained relations is the best proof of political restraint on both sides.

Shortly after the French left the Bosphorus setting out for the last phase of their journey through Byzantium, they were once again confronted with the lack of market for subsidies, stealing and high prices. The locals refused to cooperate, the crusaders plundered and the Byzantines answered by the evacuation of their cities and punitive assaults. Moreover, Manuel supposedly never provided the guides he had promised, while the Byzantines in Asia Minor were said to have cooperated with the Turks against the westerners.\(^\text{36}\) Louis’ chaplain wrote his chronicle having fresh in his memory all the hardships of the difficult march through Asia Minor; thus we can finally take Odo’s anti-Byzantine remarks as a primary reflection of moods among the radical part of the French in this last stage.\(^\text{37}\) As such, the chronicle proves the application of all the Greek stereotypes mentioned before - treachery, weakness, indolence, etc.\(^\text{38}\) Furthermore, in contrast with the previous phases, there are neither even small hints of excuses for the Byzantine behaviour, nor any further discussions about the morality of an attack against other Christians. This disappearance of pro-Byzantine voices from our source might be indicative of greater unity of the French with regard to Greeks, but such interpretation is uncertain and explanations may vary.

A crucial piece of evidence for changes in the sentiments is Louis’ letter sent to Suger after his arrival to Antioch. The king complained in the following words: “In these parts [Asia Minor] we suffered not a few injuries both because of a fraud of the emperor and because of our fault.”\(^\text{39}\) He also accused the emperor of having given permission to the Turks to attack the crusaders.\(^\text{40}\) Regardless of the questionable righteousness of the accusations, they demonstrate Louis’s eventual inclination to the anti-Byzantine attitude although expressed in milder words than those of his chaplain. I believe that the change of the king’s stance can be viewed as an evidence for discontent

\(^{36}\) Odo, 82, 96, 104-112.  
\(^{37}\) See note 4.  
\(^{38}\) Examples are scattered throughout the whole chronicle and too numerous to cite.  
\(^{39}\) ‘In quibus sane partibus, tum pro fraude Imperatoris tum pro culpa nostrorum, non paucá damna pertulimus...’ Louis VII to Suger, 1148, RHGF 15, 496.  
\(^{40}\) Louis VII to Suger, 1148, RHGF 15, 496. For further discussion of these allegations and balance of power in Asia Minor that prevented Manuel from helping the crusaders see: Černáková, “Byzantsko-francúzske vzťahy,” 72-75; Magdalino, Empire, 124-126; Phillips, The Second Crusade, 178, 206; Jason T. Roche, “Conrad III and the Second Crusade in the Byzantine Empire and Anatolia, 1147” (PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 2008), 138; Berry, “The Second Crusade,” 465, 498; Bernhard Kugler, Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges (Stuttgart: Ebner & Seubert, 1866), 146-147.
spreading beyond the borders of Odo’s radical group. Dissatisfaction of the ruler as an authority figure together with overall animosity of the crowd, clearly visible in its violent actions against local population, would strengthen and confirm this trend.

If we give some credit to the French description (partially confirmed by Choniates) of Greek hostility, it seems that the emotions of the locals in Asia Minor were a mixture of fear and thirst for vengeance. From a certain point onwards, the situation resembled an open war.

The locals fled leaving no provisions behind and, most probably, cooperated with the Turks who harassed the pilgrims.\textsuperscript{41} When Louis’s decimated army reached the Byzantine port Antalya in late January 1148, Manuel’s embassy forced Louis’s barons to renew their oath from October 1147.\textsuperscript{42} If the oath had to be renewed, it is obvious that at some point of the journey the alliance with Manuel broke up and mutual aversion was no longer restrained by politics.

The key moment must have been the king’s meeting with Manuel’s envoys in Ephesus. It is indicated not only by the subsequent intensification of conflicts but also by the course of the meeting itself. First of all, Louis refused Manuel’s advice to take refuge from the Turks in Byzantine coastal cities. Subsequently, the emperor accused the crusaders of many injuries proclaiming his inability to stop Byzantine revenge. Without any response, the king took a route through the hinterland. There are no more records of communication or cooperation with the imperial court afterwards, not until the French reached Antalya.\textsuperscript{43} It would normally have been easier to continue from Ephesus along the coast under the protection of Byzantine strongholds, but the general impression is that Louis did not believe in the effectiveness of such an arrangement anymore. My conclusion therefore is that after all the negative experiences that had stirred up emotions on both sides he deemed any cooperation with Byzantines futile and feared that the mutual hostility combined with Greek untrustworthiness would make this path more dangerous than Turkish raids in the hinterland.

The way to this final breach was long. The traditional prejudices between Greeks and Latins did not emerge right at the beginning of the Second Crusade and without a foundation of concrete experience they were unable to provoke powerful emotions that would influence historical events. On the contrary, it was only after certain emotionally strained situations (e.g. French plunder or Byzantine attacks in Asia Minor) that people began to associate present problems with the known clichés. We must also remember


\textsuperscript{42} Odo, 128.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 106-108.
that the French and the Byzantines consisted of many smaller divisions (court, commons, conciliatory party, radicals), which had unequal shares of bellicose attitude. Finally, it is noteworthy that in spite of these boiling emotions, the two rulers were able to make practical political decisions and to cooperate as long as it was possible and profitable. Thus the Second Crusade serves an example against the generalization and overestimation of the influence of mutual prejudices, which must be perceived as a predisposition rather than as a reason, on the relations between Byzantium and the Latin West.
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The Representation of the Greek Civil War in *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age*

Elli Evangelidou
MA student in Modern Greek Studies
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This paper examines comparatively the way in which the Greek Civil War is represented in the novels *Eleni* by Nicholas Gage and *The Heroic Age* by Stratis Haviaras. Due to the limited studies on the aforementioned novels my approach is based on close reading and critical comparison. In the first part of the paper I refer briefly to the reception of *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* by the Greek and American readership as well as to the debate that emerged among the critics when *Eleni* was translated into Greek. In the second part I examine comparatively two topics indicative of the different stances that the aforesaid narratives take on the Greek Civil War. The first one explores the narrative representation of the ideological opponent, to whom I will refer as the “Other”. The second part discusses the representation of spaces associated with the narrator’s Civil War experiences which I have classified into two categories: utopian and dystopian spaces. In the third part of the paper, in order to illustrate the reasons why *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* take different ideological viewpoints on the Civil War, I attempt to establish the correlation between trauma and narration.

In *The Heroic Age*¹ a group of young boys decided to leave Greece in order to escape from the atrocities committed during the Civil War. In their attempt to cross the borders the companions were captured by the communist guerrillas and fought on their side in Grammos. In the second part of the novel, the young fighters who survived the defeat of the communist Democratic Army² were transferred to a concentration camp on an uninhabited island of the Aegean Sea and were sent afterwards to the island of Kalamos.

In Gage’s novel³ the largest part of the narration describes Eleni’s struggles to

¹ Stratis Haviaras’s novel was published in 1984 in the U.S.A. and translated into Greek in 1985.
² Henceforth as D.S.E. (Democratic Army of Greece).
³ Nicholas Gage’s *Eleni* was published in 1983 in the U.S.A. and translated the same year into Greek by Alexandros Kotzias.
plan the escape of her children from the guerrillas-occupied village and send them to their father in the U.S.A. Through his efforts to find the persecutors of his mother and by narrating Eleni’s life, Gage wishes to heal the trauma of his mother’s death and perpetuate her memory.

The first question one has to tackle is whether *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* can be considered Greek narratives. It is generally admitted that language is perhaps the most determinant factor for a text to be included into or excluded from what is perceived as national literature,⁴ while some further critical questions one has to answer before drawing any conclusions are the following ones: To what extent can the nexus between national language and national literature be challenged and re-defined?⁵ Which are the factors that determine the choice of a Greek author to write in the lingua franca of his time? Does this choice have to do exclusively with the degree of “Greekness” of the narrative or is it also driven by other factors such as publishing policies and target-audience?⁶

Both *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* won rave reviews from the American critics at the time when the anti-communist sentiment in the U.S.A. during Reagan’s presidency was highly sharpened.⁷ Scholars have analysed extensively the way in which *Eleni*

---

⁴ Yiorgos Kalogeras, “Ζώνες επαφής και μαρτυρίες μετάβασης: οι λογοτεχνικοί “κύκλοι” της ελληνικής μετανάστευσης,” in Σύγχρονη ελληνική πεζογραφία. Διεθνείς προσανατολισμοί και διασταυρώσεις, ed. A. Spyropoulou and Th. Tsimbouki (Athens: Alexandreia, 2002), 77. Kalogeras has argued that *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* are “transitional” narratives since they were written in English and published in the U.S.A., while the plot takes place in Greece.

⁵ Some further questions that arise are the following ones: To what extent and under which conditions can *Eleni* and *The Heroic Age* be perceived as narratives of the Greek diaspora? What is the relationship between the diasporic periphery and the metropolitan centre as far as the intellectual production is concerned? How can the relationship between national language and national literature be defined and how strict are these definitions? Since the scope of this paper does not permit an extensive discussion on these topics, I shall confine myself to make reference to some studies that address these issues. See Dimitris Tziovas, ed., *Greek Diaspora and Migration since 1700: society, politics and culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009); Yiorgos Veloudis, *Γραμματολογία: θεωρία λογοτεχνίας* (Athens: Dodoni, 1994), 276-95 and Kalogeras, “Ζώνες επαφής,” 69-85.

⁶ Haviaras for instance wonders whether he would have been able to find an American publisher had he written his novels in Greek. See Stratis Haviaras, “Το ελληνικό μυθιστόρημα και οι προοπτικές του στο εξωτερικό,” in Σύγχρονη ελληνική πεζογραφία. Διεθνείς προσανατολισμοί και διασταυρώσεις, ed. A. Spyropoulou and Th. Tsimbouki (Athens: Alexandreia, 2002), 331.

has contributed to the fabrication of ethnic and ideological identities for the Greek-American community and they have pointed out that *Eleni* was utilised by Reagan’s regime in order to legitimise the governmental foreign policy in Nicaragua and El Salvador.

In Greece during the ’80s the Civil War was still ongoing in terms of manipulation and exploitation of the collective memory by the political parties. In the early ’80s the socialist party PA.SO.K rose to power bringing to the political forefront the historical events of the ’40s. The party’s electoral victories in the ’80s are attributed by political scientists to the fact that PA.SO.K manipulated the collective memory of the ’40s equating the Right with those who had collaborated with the occupier.

On its part, the right-wing party opposed the request of oblivion in the name of national reconciliation and the Greek Civil War was perceived as a result of the Anglo-American involvement in the country. This polarisation between the Left and the Right resulted in what some scholars define as “divided memory”: the supporters of the political parties adopted different versions regarding the causes and events of the Civil War according to the interpretation given by the political faction with which one had aligned.

Within this ideological and political context the translation of *Eleni* caused a storm of reactions. Few months after *Eleni* was published in Greece, *The Heroic Age* was also translated from English. Haviaras’s novel though went almost unnoticed by the Greek critics. It is not without interest that the few critics who wrote reviews on *The Heroic Age* hailed the novel as the “Left answer” to *Eleni*.

---


9 Kalogeras, “Ζώνες επαφής,” 75.

10 Lambrini Rori, “Ἀπό το “δωσίλογο” Μητσοτάκη στη “νέα Βάρκιζα του ’89”: η μνήμη της δεκαετίας του ’40 στον πολιτικό λόγο,” in *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, eds. Riki Van Bouschoten et al. (Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 2008), 309.


13 Kalogeras, “Ζώνες επαφής,” 75.
The representation of the “Other”

Before I proceed to the comparative examination of the representation of the “Other” in The Heroic Age and Eleni, it would be worth commenting upon the terms Andartes and communist guerrillas that Haviaras and Gage respectively adopted to refer to the fighters of the communist D.S.E., for this linguistic choice is indicative of the ideological disparities between the two novels. Haviaras refers to the fighters of the D.S.E. using almost exclusively the term Andartes which is mostly attributed to the partisans that fought against the foreign invaders who occupied Greece during World War II. Gage uses the word guerrillas and occasionally the term bandits. Given the above, one could argue that the term Andartes that Haviaras adopts vindicates in the consciousness of the reader the fight of the partisans of the D.S.E. as fair resistance against the right-wing royalist and foreign forces that, after their victory in the Civil War, determined the political fate of Greece for many decades. On the contrary, the term guerrillas and especially the term bandits used by Gage suggest that the communist partisans fought against the interests of their own country.

The first appearance of the “Other” in The Heroic Age takes place when Jim, Panagis’s uncle who had immigrated to the U.S.A., returned to Greece as a member of an American charity mission to distribute flour to the Greeks affected by the Civil War. Jim, following the suggestions of the American mission, discriminated against the left-wing civilians, giving to the sympathisers of the Left adulterated rye and saving the flour for the supporters of the “right” side: ‘the left side is the wrong side-always the wrong side’.14 In my opinion this scene constitutes an implicit comment on the involvement of the U.S.A. in the Greek Civil War anticipating the beneficial treatment of the loyalists and the subsequent persecution of the leftists by the post-Civil War regimes: ‘[Americans came] to save Greece from the Greeks’.15

At the concentration camp Ensign Tsakalos and Petty Officer Palioras wreak terror and fear among the young prisoners:

Palioras was a type that I had seen before: pretentious because

---

15 The diametrically opposed ideological stances that the two narratives take on the Anglo-American involvement in the Greek Civil War can be further designated when the narrator’s words ‘the Americans came to save Greece from the Greeks’ in The Heroic Age are read in comparison with Eleni’s thoughts for the departure of the British soldiers from Lia: ‘She hoped that the British might curb the brutality and internecine fighting off the guerrillas, and now she feared their departure would mean that more Greeks would die at Greek hands’. Nicholas Gage, Eleni (London: Collins, 1983), 110.
Ignorant, vicious because pretentious, he trusted neither his words nor the sound of his own voice, and he ended up using silence to solicit respect, if not fear.\(^\text{16}\)

Shortly afterwards, Lieutenant Muller was appointed commander of the concentration camp. Although royalist and ideologically opposed to Panagis’s companions, Muller is portrayed as more compassionate. When Fotis, one of the young prisoners, admitted to Lieutenant Muller that he has espoused the communist ideology, Muller responded with understanding by respecting Fotis’s political opinions. Furthermore, not only did Lieutenant Muller not coerce Fotis to recant his ideology but he also arranged the boys’ transferring to the island of Kalamos giving them back their much desired freedom.

In contrast to \textit{Eleni}, in \textit{The Heroic Age} the “Other” is presented with a more humane aspect. The reasons for this can be elucidated through the examination of the correlation between healing the Civil-War trauma and narrating a Civil-War story which shall be discussed further on.

In \textit{Eleni} the “Other” is represented by the communist guerrillas who are depicted as ‘satanic, dirt-streaked, bearded faces’.\(^\text{17}\) Gage ascribes an almost metaphysical dimension to the behavioural change of the villagers who embraced the communist ideology and aligned themselves with the rebels: “‘He used to be a polite, shy boy,” Eleni said. “Blushing every time someone spoke to him. Now he’s like a wild man!'”.\(^\text{18}\) The author does not present the “Other” as the class enemy of Eleni who, according to the indictment drawn up by the communist judge Katis: ‘[…] is the daughter of a known fascist and the wife of an American capitalist’.\(^\text{19}\) In the narrative the “Other” is portrayed as a vicious individual who derives pleasure from others’ suffering. The following example is characteristic: the children in Lia are divided into communist guerrillas and national soldiers while playing. Gage, who at first wanted to join the group of the children who pretended to be the guerrillas, realised that:

To be thought like Niko Mitros and the guerillas he impersonated meant taking pleasures in the sufferings of someone weaker, but Nikola [Gage] could not make himself stop feeling the pain of the victim. One thing was clear- his chances of being chosen for the guerilla team were ruined. He

\(^\text{16}\) Haviaras, \textit{Heroic Age}, 195.

\(^\text{17}\) Gage, \textit{Eleni}, 256.

\(^\text{18}\) Gage, \textit{Eleni}, 74.

\(^\text{19}\) Gage, \textit{Eleni}, 368.
wasn’t sure he was sorry.  

The description of Sotiris, Gage’s co-villager who was a victim of the *pedomasoma*, could also be interpreted as an aspect of the representation of the “Other self”, what Gage would have become had it not been for his mother’s sacrifice: ‘[Sotiris] appeared years older than I did, and as I studied him I realized that I was looking at what my fate would have been if my mother hadn’t saved us from the *pedomasoma*’.  

From what discussed above it can be asserted that in Haviaras’s novel the “Other” is represented by the loyalist soldiers and the foreign forces that got involved in the Greek Civil War. Contrary to the description of the guerrillas as malicious and dogmatic communists in *Eleni*, in *The Heroic Age* they are portrayed as young and valiant rebels who fight for a just cause. The impression that the leader of the partisans made to the narrator when they first met is indicative: ‘I wondered what he might look like in the daylight. Herakles? Ajax? Cyclops?’.

In *Eleni* the “Other” has a clear ideological, political and ethnic identity. The “Other” is the communist guerrillas who brought the Civil War to Lia and condemned Eleni Gatzoyianni to death. It would be legitimate to argue that in *Eleni* the “Other” also represents the political ideology of communism as this was implemented in Lia and the socialist countries of the former Eastern Bloc, in juxtaposition to the capitalist U.S.A. where Gage was culturally and ideologically naturalised.

**Utopian and dystopian spaces**

In *The Heroic Age* the boundaries between utopian and dystopian spaces are often indiscernible and in some cases a utopian space turns gradually into a dystopian and vice versa. As such example one could consider the mountain of Grammos where the narrator fought with his companions on the side of the guerrillas. As Panagis climbs the mountain, the surrounding landscape as well as the vibrancy of the rebels enraptures him and he exclaims: ‘People were so free on the mountains, they could be gods’. At the guerrilla camp in Grammos life is difficult for the young fighters and the narrator wonders whether it would have been better if they had transferred into

---

20 Gage, *Eleni*, 228.

21 *Pedomasoma* is a term that refers to the recruitment of young boys by the Ottoman Empire and is also used in reference to the recruitment of child-soldiers by the guerrillas of the D.S.E. during the Greek Civil War.


24 Haviaras, *Heroic Age*, 113.
one of the Queen’s child cities. Despite the adversities Panagis falls in love with a young comrade, strong friendships are developed among the guerrillas and shortly before the last battle of Grammos, Panagis and his companions, confident that the rebels fight for a just cause, ask to fight on their side: “‘We’ll fight to the end,’” they said, and they mean it.  

The ship that carries Panagis and his friends to the island of exile could be considered as an example of a dystopian space. The prisoners were travelling for days under adverse circumstances without knowing where they were going or what would happen to them.

On the barren island of Antikalamos, where Panagis and his friends were exiled after the defeat of the D.S.E, the detention conditions were inhuman. It could be argued that the barbed wires around the concentration camp divided the island into two spaces: the dystopian space where the political prisoners were restricted to and the utopian, which is depicted to be surrounded by the boundless sea, the endless sky and the infinite horizon.

Furthermore, it could be suggested that even the narrator’s memory constitutes a dystopian space. Panagis’s memory of the last battles in Grammos as well as his memories of the months he spent hiding along with other guerrillas in a cave is gradually and painfully retrieved. His comrades refuse to answer his questions and help him fill in his memory gaps, as the process of remembering is particularly afflicting: ‘Avramakis may well have known something about remembering that I did not’.  

In Eleni the description of Gage’s house, the village Lia in Epirus, Greece and the village Beloyiannis in Hungary in which the fighters of the D.S.E took refuge after they were defeated in the Civil War could be interpreted as examples of dystopian spaces. On the contrary, the U.S.A. seems to represent the utopian space par excellence.

More specifically, when Gage visited his house in Lia, three decades after the Civil War was over, he found himself unable to recall any happy moments of his childhood. Although Gage did not witness his mother being tortured, in his consciousness his family house had turned from a utopian space highly associated with the maternal figure into a dystopian space in which Eleni was imprisoned, tortured and condemned to death by the guerrillas.  

The village of Lia is depicted as a primitive place, isolated from the civilised urban society. Its inhabitants are superstitious and envious of their fellow villagers’
prosperity while the value of the woman is dependent on her dowry and the number of males she gives birth to. Lia becomes nightmarish when the guerrillas occupy it and put communism into practice: ‘The dream of revolution and freedom painted by the Skevis brothers had turned into a nightmare, and fear settled over the village’.  

The communist partisans commandeered the houses of the civilians, tortured many of them on suspicion alone that someone sympathised with the Right and recruited their children. In sharp contrast with the guerrillas-occupied Lia, Gage’s father was living in the capitalist and conservative U.S.A. which is described as a ‘sane and logical world’.  

Another space whose description has dystopian qualities is Greece in the ’70s. During his visit to the country, Gage was indignant to find that the fall of the Junta and the legalisation of the Communist Party led to the resurgence of the communist ideology in Greece.  

In his efforts to discover Eleni’s persecutors Gage visited the village Beloyiannis in which many of his fellow villagers had taken refuge. Gage realised that the dream of the communist utopia had turned into a dystopian nightmare for the supporters of communism; a dystopian nightmare from which he managed to escape thanks to his immigrating to the country of utopia.  

America is depicted as a utopian space in which the dreams of economic prosperity, educational and professional excellence and social recognition can be realised. After immigrating to the U.S.A. Gage’s family as well as the rest of the members of the Greek community in the U.S.A. renounced their peasant habits and embraced virtues that the author identifies as American:

He quickly assimilated the American virtues of cleanliness, honesty and industry.  

The Greeks seemed to absorb the Calvinistic work ethic with their first step on American soil. They abandoned afternoon siestas and long, lay hours in the coffee shops to work fourteen-hour days [...].  

It has been pointed out the way in which Gage through his books managed to fabricate
an American ethnic identity by portraying himself as a politically conservative and loyalist citizen, in a time when ideological allegiance with the Reagan regime was much appreciated.\textsuperscript{34} In \textit{Eleni}, the capitalist and politically conservative U.S.A. is presented as a utopian space whilst the guerrillas-occupied Lia, Greece and the socialist countries of the former Eastern Bloc are presented as dystopias, as the ideological “Other”.

**Trauma and narration**

From what I discussed above it can be argued that \textit{The Heroic Age} and \textit{Eleni} take diametrically different stances as far as the representation of the Greek Civil War is concerned. There is, however, one last question to be answered: to what extent could the correlation between trauma and narration be associated with the different viewpoints on the Greek Civil War?

According to Venetia Apostolidou, the narrative treatment of the trauma is completed only when the trauma of the “Other” is acknowledged and the representation of the “Self” as victim is exceeded.\textsuperscript{35} As I have illustrated, in Haviaras’s novel the “Other” is represented with a more humane touch, something that could be interpreted as a step towards the acknowledgment of the trauma of the “Other”. In the last pages of \textit{The Heroic Age} Panagis has reconciled with the traumatic past:

\begin{quote}
I saw everything clearly now. It made sense to me that we had lost the war, that we had fed the fire, that our bodies had fertilized the cracks in the bedrock. It made sense that the enemy had triumphed. Better that way. Had we won, we’d be the enemy now.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

Few pages later, Panagis’s painful memories of the Civil War and the figures of his dead comrades ‘drifted off as light as a breath of air, leaving no sense of sadness’.\textsuperscript{37}

For Gage the trauma of Eleni’s death is still fresh. Gage seeks to avenge his mother’s execution, he is surprised to see the villagers of Lia discussing peacefully despite having been enemies during the civil-war years and he is disappointed to find

\textsuperscript{34} Kalogeras, “Eleni,” 77-89 and Danforth, “Συλλογική μνήμη,” 257-268.

\textsuperscript{35} Venetia Apostolidou, \textit{Τραύμα και μνήμη. Η πεζογραφία των πολιτικών προσφύγων} (Athens: Polis, 2010), 134.

\textsuperscript{36} Haviaras, \textit{Heroic Age}, 346.

\textsuperscript{37} Haviaras, \textit{Heroic Age}, 350.
that the relatives of those who had been condemned by the guerillas do not share his desire for revenge.\(^{38}\) When he is finally given the opportunity to kill the former guerrilla Katis who condemned Eleni to death, Gage decides to let him live not because he has overcome the past hatreds of the Civil War, but mainly because of ‘the understanding of my mother that I had gained in my examination of her life’.\(^{39}\)
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Different academic approaches towards the British intervention in Greece (1941-1944). A synopsis

Alexandros Siapkas
MRes student in Modern Greek Studies
Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham

The Anglo–Hellenic diplomatic and military relations during this period have been the main focus for professional historians and produced a great dispute amongst them, thus leading to different conclusions about the British role and the Greek reaction to it. As a result, in order to form a clearer picture about the British intervention in Greece during this period, it is crucial to bear in mind that many British liaisons were sent to Greece to every major guerrilla group, irrespective of their beliefs and political goals concerning the post–war political status quo, that was to be created in the country, to organize sabotage operations against the Axis forces that were stationed in Greece and also that SOE (Special Operations Executive) was sent for exactly the same reason.

The resistance movement in Greece (which took the form of active military action on the mountains of the mainland) was one of the largest in Europe, especially the one led by the Communists (EAM-ELAS), a fact that resulted in disagreements between the SOE responsible for Greece and the Foreign Office. This happened because SOE had only strategic goals, for the realisation of which they cooperated with all guerrilla groups without taking into consideration their political views or aims, whereas the Foreign Office had only political ones, which were opposed to the imposition of any Soviet-friendly regime after the liberation of the country.

None of the academic studies that have dealt with this period challenge the fact that there was a significant interference of Britain in the Greek affairs. The main point of differentiation is whether the British had predetermined their stand towards Greece or it was formed, as the war was raging. In any case, it becomes clear that they wanted

---

1 During the Nazi occupation of Greece, following the great famine of winter 1941-1942 and the spread of black market, guerilla troops were formed in the mountains of Greece. The biggest ones were EAM-ELAS, which was led by the communists, EDES and EKKA, which declared themselves as social democrats. Each one of them had a British liaison with the task to attack enemy targets and inform SOE of Cairo, which in turn informed the Foreign Office.

2 A British organisation formed in 1940 to conduct espionage, sabotage and to aid resistance movements in occupied Europe.

3 EAM: National Liberation Front, ELAS: Revolutionary Popular Liberation Army.
it to remain under their influence.

Gerolymatos argues in favour of the view that Britain had no previous plans concerning Greece and they only decided to aid the King’s cause after the fall of Crete in May 1941\(^4\) and, since they would not tolerate any political change during the war,\(^5\) they only decided to move against EAM and ELAS in late 1944 to assist the Greek government.\(^6\) Furthermore, he points out that in order to achieve its military goals and not in accordance to the Foreign Office that supported the royalist cause, SOE was backing left-wing clandestine networks, a situation that contributed unwillingly to right-left polarisation of Greek resistance.\(^7\) Nevertheless, he maintains that Britain’s policy in Greece was attempting to balance short-term military gains with long-term political objectives.\(^8\) Papastratis’ study is also of the same view and includes that it was in a War Cabinet meeting in 1943 that England decided to fully aid the Greek King and his government, despite the fact that ‘patriotic elements in Greece were of a different political complexion’.\(^9\)

G. M. Alexander follows the same line of argument. According to him, it was since April 1944 that Britain focused its objectives concerning Greece towards the latter being a non-communist state in order to safeguard Britain’s strategic interests in the region.\(^10\)

Alternatively, Heinz Richter argues that Britain focused its efforts from an early stage (October 1940) on reinstating King George II to the Greek throne and left its protégé King as a sole master of his country’s destiny.\(^11\) In another study, he states that the December 1944 events in Athens were the result of an intervention that aimed to crush all resistance in order to restore the semi–colonial dependence of the past, something that had been decided by Churchill since 1943, because of the country’s


\(^5\) Ibid., 160.

\(^6\) Ibid., 332.


\(^8\) Gerolymatos, *Guerilla Warfare*, 164.


location that helped the ends of British policy.\textsuperscript{12}

Another advocate of the early British intervention theory about the country’s post–war political status is Richard Clogg. In his book, \textit{Anglo–Greek Attitudes}, he writes that it appears that the Foreign Office was trying to ‘sell’ King George II to the Greek population as early as November 1941, so as to achieve political stability and create a post-war Greece that would be favourable to British interests.\textsuperscript{13}

A more raw criticism against Britain’s foreign policy is expressed by Kedros. According to him, Churchill was obsessed with keeping Russia out of the Mediterranean and preserving the imperial road to India and to the oil reserves located in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{14} He reaches the conclusion that the allies sacrificed the Greek people to their Great Power politics and the leaders of EAM-ELAS fell into the traps set for them due to their political myopia, thus bearing their share of responsibility.\textsuperscript{15}

Lastly, Sfikas has a very interesting approach to the subject. He says that, although academic historiography rejects terms such as ‘imperialistic’ for the reason that they relate to overly simplistic explanations, it is useful to remember that Britain’s basic mistake was that it acted as a 19\textsuperscript{th} century colonial power instead of a modern state.\textsuperscript{16} He characterises Churchill as a supporter of British racial supremacy, who was claiming that Britain had to subdue smaller countries for the latters’ own protection. Moreover, according to Sfikas, he believed that monarchy suited best to Greek idiosyncrasy, which is not ideal for democracy in its developed forms.\textsuperscript{17}

As can be seen, there are different perspectives among scholars about England’s plans and the point of their finalisation, in connection with Greece. Nonetheless, whatever the means or whenever employed, a common conclusion permeates academic historiography on this issue: Britain sought - and in the end achieved, at least for some years – to keep Greece under its political and financial influence.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 59.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 77-78.
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This paper aims to explore the topic of philosophical influences, and more specifically the one of Epicureanism, on Modern Greek poetry, taking as study cases two leading Modern Greek authors: Cavafy and Vizyinos. It also intends to outline the different pathways through which the doctrines and beliefs of Epicurus reached these particular poets (and many others along with them). Another aim of my paper is to discuss a possible influence of Vizyinos on Cavafy. The poems under consideration are Vizyinos’s ‘Επικούρειον’ and Cavafy’s early (and later on recanted) poem ‘Βακχικόν’. The paper includes a discussion of the reception of Epicureanism through the Phanariot tradition and a close reading of the two poems (especially of the less known ‘Επικούρειον’, which could be seen as a possible source for Cavafy’s poem) relying mainly on the teachings of Epicurus.

As far as the first, recanted poems of Cavafy are concerned, the eclectic affinities with exponents of the Phanariot tradition of the late 18th and the early 19th century have already been detected.1 I believe, however, that what still has not been sufficiently highlighted is the possible relations between the early Cavafian work and a major author, who also began his poetic career from the area of Phanar (besides, he studied at the Theological School of Halki, where, in addition, Ilias Tantalidis was his professor),2 who was later, in the 1880s, advertised as the new national poet of

---


2 With regard to Vizyinos’s relation with Phanarism see Yeoryios M. Vizyinos, Νεοελληνικά διηγήματα, ed. Panos Moullas (Athens: Estia, 1980), ξ’-οα’. It is worth quoting the most characteristic phrase in this section, which is entitled ‘Η “φαναριώτικη μικρολογία του”’: ‘ο Βιζηνός δεν
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Greece, and is nowadays known to every Modern Greek scholar and student (and almost to everyone in Greece), but not so much as a poet anymore, as he is as a short story writer. I mean, of course, Yeoryios Vizyinos.

Vizyinos’s poetry collection Ατθίδες Αύραι, which witnessed three publications (as a matter of fact, the first one was in London) from December 1883 to spring 1884, is composed of various poems; varied with regard to the content, the form, the date of writing and the group of poems in which they had been subsumed by the poet prior to their publication. Inter alia, this collection also contains the poem ‘Επικούρειον’, whose first form appears in Vizyinos’s manuscript Λυρικά, bearing the date July 17 1882. I quote it here for the needs of the examination that is to follow:

Σ’ αυτή την πρόσκαιρη ζωή μας, διατί
να μη χαρή το ζωντανό το σώμα;
Ως κ’ οι μωροί το λέν, πως είμεθα θνητοί,
πως θα μας βάλουν μια φορά στο χώμα.
Μα ούτ’ οι Δεσποτόδες μας οι κορδοτοί,
ούτε οι πλέον διαβασμέν’ ανθρώποι,
γνωρίζουν τι θα γείνοιμε κατόπι
αυτού που θε να ’πάμε. –
Βάλτε να φάμε!
Βάλτε να πιούμε!
Γιατί αυτό κανείς δεν το αμφισβητεί:
Φαγεί’ και πιεί’ αλλού δεν θα τα ’βρούμε.

Ανέλπιστα γυρνά της Τύχης ο τροχός,
κι ο Χρόνος που περνά, δεν στρέφ’ οπίσω.
Της χθες ο Κρόις ο είναι σήμερα φτωχός,
κ’ εγώ, ο νέος, αύριον θ’ ασπρίσω.
Αυτά τα ’ξεύρουν όλοι πλέον ευτυχός’
κι όμως πολλοί στερούνται και νηστεύουν!
Θα ελαφρύνουν τάχα, για ν’ αναίβουν

κατόρθωσε παρά σε ελάχιστες μόνο προνομιακές στιγμές να σπάσει τα δεσμά που τον έδεναν χειροπόδαρα με το φαναριωτισμό’ (Vizyinos, Διηγήματα, ξ’).

3 A prime role towards the projection of this image was played by the publisher of the newspaper Νέα Εφημερίς, Ioannis Kambouroglou. See Lambros Varelas, “Ο μεγαλοϊδεάτης Γ. Μ. Βιζυηνός,” Nea Estia 1830 (2010).

4 Marinos Ksireas, Άγνωστα βιογραφικά στοιχεία και κατάλοιπα του Βιζυηνού (Nicosia: n.p., 1949), 82 (No. 234, ‘Άσμα Επικούρειον’).
αυτού που θένα ’πάμε;
Βάλτε να φάμε!
Βάλτε να πιούμε!
Γιατί ’ως κ’ οι τρελοί το ’ξεύρουν δυστυχώς:
Φαγεί’ και πιεί’ αλλού δεν θα τα ’βρούμε.

Κι όποιος μια κόρη, μιαν ωραίαν αγαπά,
ας της χαρή τα πρώτα πρότα κάλλη.
Λύπαις κι αρρώστιαις θα της πάρουν τα λουπά,
και θα του μείνη μόν’ η παραξάλη.
Αυτό στ’ αυτί καλά βεβαιώς δεν χτυπά.
Μα πλην αυτού, ’ξάφεινον προβάλλ’ ο Χάρος
κ’ ειδοποιεί: «Αφέντη, μη προς βάρος –
Κοπιάστενε να ’πάμε!..»
Βάλτε να φάμε!
Βάλτε να πιούμε!
Γιατί φαγεί’ και πιεί’ και κάλλη χαρωπά
στου Χάρου το κελλί δεν θα τα ’βρούμε!5

A few years later, in early 1886, Constantine Cavafy published his first poem, ‘Βακχικόν’, which was later on tacitly recanted, in the Greek periodical of Leipzig Έσπερος (issue 5/118, 15/27.3.1886):

Από του κόσμου κεκμηκώς την πλάνον αστασίαν
εντός του ποτηρίου μου εύρον την ησυχίαν
ζωήν κ’ ελπίδα εν αυτώ και πόθους εσωκλείου’
δότε να πίω.

Μακράν εδώ των συμφορών, των θυελλών του βίου,
αισθάνομ’ ως διασωθείς ναύτης εκ ναυαγίου
κ’ εν ασφαλεί ευρισκόμενος εντός λιμένος πλοίω.
Δός μοι να πίω.

Ω! ψηθής του οίνου μου ζέσις, απομακρύνεις
πάσαν ψυχράν επιρροήν. Φθόνου ή καταισχύνης,

5 Yeoryios Vizyinos, Τα ποιήματα, ed. Elena Koutrianou (Athens: Idryma Kosta kai Elenis Ourani, 2003), 1:500-501. Both poems are transcribed according to the monotonic orthography, but all other orthographic aspects of the texts are kept the same as in the prototype.
The chronological proximity of the two poems, in other words the sequence of the Cavafian poem at a time not very remote from Vizyinos’s poem, as well as Vizyinos’s reputation as a poet and some obvious (albeit superficial) analogies between the two poems would probably suggest the existence of a case of latent imitation of Vizyinos’s poem by Cavafy. But things are perhaps more complex.

Taking into consideration that both Vizyinos and Cavafy were ‘systematic readers’, one could first of all seek after the causes of whichever similarity and analogy among their common readings; especially seeing that both poems seem to be part of a poetic category systematically cultivated within the frames of Classicism: the anacreontea (ανακρεόντεια).\(^7\) This would take us back firstly to the Phanariot versification around the late 18\(^{th}\) century, next principally to Christopoulos (but also to Vilaras), and thereafter it would navigate us towards some other literary figures that act during the so-called ‘romantic’ (in reality ‘classic-romantic’) 50-year period (1830-1880) mostly in Athens.\(^8\) It is quite known that nostalgists of Neoclassicism

---


\(^8\) About the coexistence of elements stemming from both the movements of Neoclassicism and Romanticism in the cultural centre of Greece, Athens, see Yiorgos Veloudis, “Ο επτανησιακός, ο αθηναϊκός και ο ευρωπαϊκός Ρομαντισμός,” Μονά-Ζυγά: Δέκα νεοελληνικά μελέτημα (Athens: GnoSi, 1992), especially p. 106 where he eloquently describes the phenomenon as a ‘cultural Athenian dualism’ (‘πολιτισμικός [. . .] αθηναϊκός δυαδισμός’); see also the chapter about the same period in Georg Veloudis, Germanograecia: Deutsche Einflüsse auf die neugriechische Literatur (1750-1944)
and of Enlightenment values, but also many members of the Athenian romantic school, largely descending from Phanariot families, have included such poems, completely compatible with the graceful and playful Phanariot spirit, in their oeuvre.

Be that as it may, what Frantzi mentions with regard to the Phanariot verse anthologies, that ‘ανταποκρίνονται σε μια ηθική καινούργια, που εισηγείται αξίες κοσμικές και υπερβαίνει τη θεολογική αρετή’, could be applied to some extent to the poems under consideration here. It is fairly clear that neither poem corresponds to the Christian ethics. Forbearance and moral behaviour that call for the denial of any form of worldly indulgence and for adherence to the utmost goal of posthumous bliss, are components alien to these poems’ spirit. Besides, the message they convey, which is incompatible to Christianity, is not presented as the author’s personal position, but an effort is made for it to be integrated into an acceptable frame; indeed, a frame relevant to pre-Christian worldviews.

Mimesis is most certainly a classicist principle, and poems of this kind (as mentioned above) pertain to the broader Classicist movement. Someone could wonder how the classicist element survived and reached these litterateurs, that grew up in a period when Romanticism had erst predominated, and they wrote during another period, when the latter was already outmoded and, even in Greece, had started being cast aside by new trends and movements (laographism, ethnography, naturalism etc). In fact, in Vizyinos’s case one can see that Romanticism is surpassed in terms of language, since the kathearevousa, which constituted the bastion of the romantic school of Athens, is not used.

However, should one observe the characteristics of the Romantic Movement in other countries, for instance in Germany, they will realise that what prevails is nostalgia for the Middle Ages; the medieval element is thus rendered an aspect of Romanticism and contrasts with the ancient one, which is identified with Classicism.

(Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert, 1983), 122-237, bearing the title ‘Romantik und Neoklassizismus (1830-1880)’ and most specifically the section ‘Athener Romantik und Neoklassizismus’ (ibid., 201-237).


10 Perhaps the most formal component of the poem is its title with the use of the puristic type ‘Επικούρειον’ instead of the demotic one ‘Επικούρειο’ (without –ν). Composing peritexts in an archaistic language and using the demotic (at times interlarded even with dialectal words) for the text itself constitutes one of Vizyinos’s frequent tactics, something that becomes more easily discernible in poems with lengthier titles, e.g. in ‘Ελεγείον εις την μικράν Ξάνθην’ (Vizyinos, Ποιήματα, 450-451); this particular poem is not just in demotic, but it also echoes Solomos’s poetry, especially his early poem (of the so-called ‘Zakynthian period’) ‘Η ψυχόλα’.  
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Besides, Romanticism is related to the emergence and formation of national identity and nationalism, and the ancient Greek and Latin element are not national for the Germans. For the Modern Greek state, however, which begins its history having in essence recanted the Greek Middle Ages and striving to prove real the ideologeme of direct descent from the Ancient Greeks, the classic element eventually survives, indeed it asserts itself, as an aspect of Romanticism. And more specifically, as far as Anacreontism is concerned, it continues to influence Greek poetry for several years even after the entrenchment of Romanticism, while bacchic and sympotic poems have been written by the majority of the literary figures of the period 1830-1880.

Apart from that, in Greek areas outside the Greek state (especially in Constantinople and Smyrna), where the needs satisfied within the Greek borders by Romanticism either do not exist or cannot be expressed, classicist echoes live on without necessarily passing through the channel of Romanticism. In these cases the classic element remains classicist. Moreover, in the 1870s, when Greek

---

11 The first Greek scholars who started giving prominence to Byzantium, along with the tripartite schema of the uninterrupted continuity of Hellenism (Ancient Greece, Byzantine Empire, Modern Greece), are Spyridon Zambelios and Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, from the 1850s onward.

12 See Roderick Beaton, An introduction to modern Greek literature (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 48. I quote the most characteristic passage: ‘Paradoxically, in a Greek context “neoclassicism” should be understood as the local manifestation of the Romantic impulse which in other parts of Europe gave rise to the gothic revival’. Frantzi (Μισμαγιά, 42) observes phenomena of cultural syncretism with some analogies to that in antecedent times.


14 This group is composed so much of poets that stay true to the spirit of Enlightenment, such as Iakovos Rizos Rangavis and Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, as by romantic poets, like Panayotis Soutsos, Alexandros Rizos Rangavis, Dimitrios Paparrigopoulos, Achilleas Paraschos et al. Even Emmanouil Roidis has written a poem of similar content (see Yeorganta, Οίνος στην ποίηση, 111). As a matter of fact, according to Yeorganta (Οίνος στην ποίηση, 111, 149) this poem constitutes a possible source of the Cavafic poem under examination here.

15 ‘Στην Πόλη, ώς το θάνατο του Τανταλίδη πάντως, ἐμεινε ακαίμα τη παράδοση του ελαφρού λυρισμοῦ, ἡ οποία συνόδευ τα γράμματα μας με τον δέκατο ὁγδοο δυτικόν αἰώνα’ [Konstantinos Τh. Dimaras, “Περί Φαναριωτών,” in Ο ελληνικός ρεμαντισμός (Athens: Ermis, 1982), 232]. That is to say, that some Phanariots living outside the borders of the Greek state continued being near Classicism and the milieu of Enlightenment.
Romanticism goes through its last days, a so-to-say ‘antiromantic’ stance emerges among the new prospective poets and a landing to the earthly reality is attempted, away from the reveries and whimpers of the Romanticists. In this context a short-lived revival of Anacreontism is observed in the cultural life of the Greek state, mainly within the frames of the poetic contests, which, besides, constitute a constant pole of attraction, mostly for the new generation of authors.\(^{16}\)

I have already mentioned that the eclectic affinities, both thematic and formal, of the two poems create reasonable suspicion that Cavafy had possibly read and been influenced by Vizyinos’s poem. However, the fate of Cavafy’s library does not allow this thought to be treated as anything more than a speculation, since there is no palpable evidence that the Alexandrian poet had this particular poetry collection in his possession.\(^{17}\) Nonetheless, even if a library has not been kept intact, the contingent absence of a book does not constitute proof that its owner had not read it (the same could be said with regard to exactly the opposite: tracing a book as part of a library does not mean that its owner had read it, let alone that he had been influenced by it); especially in this particular case, it is rather a common knowledge in the area of Modern Greek Studies that Cavafy had a passion for reading and had made a habit of visiting public libraries and borrowing books.

Moving now to the analysis and comparison of the poems, one can see first of all that their differences are quite a few, despite their similarity that is imposed mostly through the imperative which functions as a chorus\(^{18}\) and in spite of their spirit, which is alien to Christianity. First, the lyrical subject’s resort to drinking proceeds from causes that are different in each poem. Secondly, these causes indicate a different stance of the subject towards itself, the world, and libation. Thirdly, the fact that the epicurean philosophy is really at a short distance from the content of Vizyinos’s poem, whereas the bacchic spirit seems to be at a rather notable distance from the melancholic emotions contained in and triggered by Cavafy’s poem, demonstrates a different degree of appropriation of the sources, a different degree of fidelity during the mimetic process.

\(^{16}\) This revival manifests itself mostly in the Voutsinaios poetry contest of 1873. See Moullas, *Concours poétiques*, 307-321.

\(^{17}\) See Michaila Karambini-Iatrou, ed., *Η βιβλιοθήκη Κ. Π. Καβάφη* (Athens: Archeio Kavafi & Ermis, 2003), where no extant books of Vizyinos’s are recorded apart from *Το αμάρτημα της μητρός μου* (ibid., 16-17).

\(^{18}\) In ‘Επικούρειον’ the phrases ‘Βάλτε να φάμε / Βάλτε να πιούμε!’ are repeated in the 9\(^{th}\) and 10\(^{th}\) verse of each stanza. In ‘Βακχικόν’ the last verse of every stanza is an order of similar nature: ‘δότε να πίω’, ‘Δος μοι να πίω’, ‘δότε να πίω’, ‘δος, δος να πίω!, ‘δότε να πίω!’.
On the basis of this third observation, one can speak of a superficial poetry, since neither one of these authors had such an attitude to life as the one they propose here, and the same applies to the bacchic poems of Christopoulos and Tantalidis for instance. Nevertheless, as far as Cavafy is concerned, Stratis Tsirkas’s analysis could prompt the following slant: the spirit expressed by the poem not only is not contrived, but emanates from real experiences. Nonetheless, the same studier’s account of Cavafy’s resort to drinking during the period of the second edit of the poem (November 1892) proves, I think, that in the first writing, apart from some experiences which functioned as triggering events for a few individual verses, the adoption of the bacchic Weltanschauung from Cavafy’s part was fairly surface.

I have already touched upon the relation of Anacreontism to the earthly reality and, of course, a comparative analysis of the two poems could not but take into account that Epicureanism is a materialistic philosophy being in many ways on the other extreme of the idealistic perceptions that nourished and conserved the romanticists. Besides, Epicurus dealt also with subjects that nowadays fall within the scope of the so-called natural sciences and drew mostly on Democritus’ atomic theory (someone could argue that in many cases he simply repeated it). Apart from that, the fact that Materialism functions as a general basis of his philosophy becomes quite clear even if someone only bears in mind the epicurean, so-to-say, ‘credo’, the Tetrapharmakos: ‘Ἄφοβον ὁ θεός, ἀνύποπτον ὁ θάνατος καὶ τἀγαθὸν μὲν εὔκτητον, τὸ δὲ δεινὸν εὖκαρτέρητον’. Hereunder I am going to proceed to a close reading of the two poems starting with ‘Επικούρειον’ and I am going to focus mostly on that, since it is less known than Cavafy’s poem. In its first stanza the Epicurean belief about the finitude of existence is projected, not with much lucidity though. Nothing exists post mortem, while the quality of ‘real’ can only be attributed to something ‘corporal’, material. Naturally, this does not beget only utter abandonment of every faith in and hope for the rewards of posthumous life, but also confrontation of the fear caused by death itself, since, as soon as death befalls, consciousness, and hence existence, comes to an end and one

---

19 Stratis Tsirkas, Ο Καβάφης και η εποχή του (Athens: Kedros, 1973), 152.
20 Ibid., 222.
cannot feel anything. This ostensibly contradicts line 8 (‘ὑπὸ τοῦ που θε νῦ ‘πάμε’), since, for the Epicureans, after death we simply are not to go anywhere at all – except, of course, for the particles we are made of; these atoms will not perish, but, according to the principle of matter conservation (an epicurean principle very similar to the law of conservation of mass and energy of modern-day physics) will be once more combined in order to form another physical object or entity. In the middle of verse 5, however, that is at the beginning of the sentence which ends with verse 8, there is the word ‘Δεσποτάδες’; this indicates that at this point it is the Christian Weltansicht that is being presented (and nullified) and not the subject’s own view (and this is why the contradiction is only ostensible).

The whole poem is permeated with the feeling that the Christian expectation of a posthumous life does not function after all liberatingly or as a focalisation point for faith, but as an additional cause of guilt. Yet this is how the teachings of Jesus ended up being presented and, of course, the lyrical subject does not inveigh against him or his apostles, but against (and again only indirectly) the ‘Δεσποτάδες’: they, as spokespeople of the church (and to the minds of many people, as representatives of Christianity or even God himself), impose guiltiness as an attitude to life and inject people with the fear of death – which, this way, amounts in essence with the fear of life. It could be claimed that ‘Επικούρειον’ in general expresses an attachment to

---

22 2nd principal doctrine: ‘ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ, τὸ δ’ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς’.

23 At this point it should be noted that ‘Επικούρειον’ could be linked with another poem of Vizyinos’s, called ‘Μεταμέλεια’. The poem, which demonstrates a mild anticlericalism combined with the subject’s desire to enjoy the pleasures of life without inhibitions, and seems in fact to be based on autobiographical data, can be considered a precursor of the concept that will condense (there are various untitled ‘άσματα’ that seem to revolve around the axis of ‘Μεταμέλεια’) and will be ‘theoretically’ advocated later, with the help of the Epicurean philosophy, in the poem under consideration. Moreover, the title functions ironically, being thus parallel to some elements of ‘Επικούρειον’: repentance has religious connotations and perhaps one would expect in the text a statement of repentance on behalf of the lyrical subject for some ‘sin’ of his (even in the ancient meaning of the word ‘αμαρτία’). Here happens the opposite: the speaker complains, because he considers it wrong that he was oppressed and was not given the chance to sin.

24 See Anthony Kenny, A new history of Western Philosophy, vol. 1, Ancient Philosophy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 94: ‘It is religion that causes us to fear death, by holding out the prospect of suffering after death. But this is an illusion. The terrors held out by religion are fairy tales, which we must give up in favour of a scientific account of the world’, and George Sidney Brett, The philosophy of Gassendi (London: Macmillan, 1908), 195: ‘it was Church that had divorced virtue and the best life’.
earthly things and no less than an uninterested stance as far as the hereafter is concerned. By the word ‘κανείς’ in verse 11 someone could infer some more specific groups of people: (1) the Epicureans, of course, that did not believe in afterlife; (2) the Christians, who view the hereafter as unrelated to material needs; (3) perhaps even the exponents of idealistic philosophies.

The second stanza begins with an implicit recognition of the impingement of Phanariot poetry on the poem. Apart from the recurring motifs of the wheel of fortune and the passing time, the usage of capital letters is an indication of the classicist resonance; ‘Τύχη’ and ‘Χρόνος’ are personified abstract notions. In verses 19-20 there is another rebuttal of the Christian credendum concerning posthumous life and paradise. The diction this time is rather mocking.

In the third stanza it is worth focusing on the 29th verse, where the poetic subject refers in principle to social conventions, in order to demonstrate right after that – as well as with what precedes – that they are de facto refuted. It should be noted at this point that the Epicureans, along with other philosophers of the Hellenistic Era, were in a way nonconformists, something logical at a historical period when the time-honoured values seemed hollow and unable to cover the fundamental human needs.

In general terms, the poem is in line with the Epicurean teachings, since the things proposed conduce to the conquest of pleasure. Even though the epicurean position that pleasure can be attained through the abatement of desires, the exhortations of the

---

25 See Brett, Gassendi, 195: ‘better to be worldly than other-worldly’. An analogous stance is featured in the first part of Nietzsche’s Also sprach Zarathustra, that saw the light that very same year: ‘bleibt der Erde treu und glaubt Denen nicht, welche euch von überirdischen Hoffnungen reden!’ [Friedrich Nietzsche, Also Sprach Zarathustra: Ein Buch für Alle und Keinen, Vol. 1 (Chemnitz: Verlag von Ernst Schmeitzner, 1883), 9]. Besides, it is no coincidence that Nietzsche is considered one of the main precursors of modern existential psychotherapy; see Schneider’s presentation “Nietzsche and Rank: Precursors of Existential Humanistic Psychology”, accessed October 20, 2013, http://laingsociety.org/colloquia/philosophy/laingnietzscherank.htm, Steen Halling & Judy Dearborn Nill, “A brief history of Existential-Phenomenological Psychiatry and Psychotherapy,” Journal of Phenomenological Psychology 26:1 (Spring 1995): 1-45. See also here, footnote 32.

26 About the recurring motifs of Phanariot poetry see Frantzis, Μισμαγιά, 13. In parallel with verses 13-16 see for instance the following poems in Frantzis’s book: ‘[Κάθε κυριώ μεταβολή...]’ (ibid., 130-131), ‘[Στοχάσου ότι ο τροχός...]’ (ibid., 138-139), ‘[Την ακατάστατον ροπήν...]’ (ibid., 143-144), ‘[Ο κύκλος των πραγμάτων...]’ (ibid., 148-149), ‘[Εις το άστατον της τύχης αενάος αποφή...]’ (ibid., 155) et al.
poetic subject are only associated with natural and necessary desires. To my mind, a great part of the epicurean philosophy, as well as of the message that 'Επικούρειον attempts to convey, is summarised in the 21st Principal Doctrine (21η Κύρια Δόξα): 'Ο τὰ πέρατα τοῦ βίου κατειδός οἶδεν, ὡς εὐπόριστόν ἐστι τὸ <τὸ> ἁλγοῦν κατ’ ἐνδειαν ἐξαιροῦν καὶ τὸ τὸν ὀλον βίον παντελῆ καθιστάν· ὡστε οὐδὲν προσδεῖται πραγμάτων ἁγὸνας κεκτημένων'.

It should nonetheless be stressed that for Epicureans the desires that must not be fulfilled are the ones leading to bad results. However, no negative consequences ensue from eating, drinking or sexual intercourse (as long as everything is done in moderation, of course), for these are natural needs, and whatever is according to the natural law (φύσει) cannot be bad. Besides, in the opinion of Epicurus, pleasure is sua natura bonum. Other than that, given that there is no life after death, even if pleasure was a bad thing, this would have no posthumous repercussions.

It is thus rather unambiguous that this philosophical trend of the Hellenistic Epoch suggests an ‘anti-ascetic’ attitude to life, but without the excesses of the Hedonists. What is aspired to is ‘the body’s being free from disturbance’. Every ‘anti-ascetic’ worldview is not automatically amoralistic. Quite the contrary, it can propose its own

27 Sharples, Hellenistic philosophy, 86-87.
28 ‘We need to be discriminating to ensure our course of action will not bring us more pain in the long run’ (Sharples, Hellenistic philosophy, 86), and ‘The reason why a pleasure is rejected is generally some anticipated evil consequence’ (Brett, Gassendi, 189).
29 Brett, Gassendi, 188.
30 In other respects, however, Epicureanism is rather closer to Hedonism than other philosophical trends of its time. See for example José Ferrater Mora, Diccionario de Filosofía, s.v. “Epicuro,” (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1964), 537: ‘Epicuro —que se opuso a las concepciones fundamentales de los estoicos, platónicos y peripatéticos, acercándose, en cambio, a las de los cirenaicos— partió de una doble necesidad: la de eliminar el temor a los dioses (que había engendrado el tipo del δεισιδαίμων, o individuo excesivamente piadoso — casi el supersticioso) y la de desprenderse del temor a la muerte’. Others, rather overemphasising the importance of the differentiation between the two schools on the issue of the nature of pleasure, attempt to demonstrate the contrast between the two schools. For instance, Brett argues that ‘Plutarch points out this difference between Epicurus and Aristippus: the pleasure which Epicurus means is of the mind, that which Aristippus praises is of the body. Laertius points out other differences. Aristippus confines the term to pleasure in motu, Epicurus lays more stress on pleasure in statu or tranquility’ (Brett, Gassendi, 185). Cf. Sharples, Hellenistic philosophy, 92, where, dealing with the same matter, the author speaks of ‘the rival Cyrenaic hedonist school’ (emphasis added).
31 Sharples, Hellenistic philosophy, 87.
morality, seemingly somewhat peculiar for the Christian world, at times though more honest, more solid and less prone to deviations from the ‘rules’.

In any case, it could be said about the Epicureans that their teachings intended to function as a kind of ‘antidepressant’. The interesting thing is that ‘Βακχικόν’ seems not to be afar from the epicurean philosophy (without this signifying that it is directly influenced by Epicurus). The request for peace of mind and tranquillity is the most fixed one for Epicureans, it may indeed represent the most constant and persisting part of their teachings. This request is suggested in the first two verses of the Cavafian poem, whilst the ‘πλάνος αστασία’ of the ordinary way of life (which the Epicureans were attempting to surpass by reaching ‘tranquilitas animi’) is stressed, as it is enunciated in a more specific manner in the second stanza.

From the third stanza on one notices an escalating deviation between the two poems. The subject’s escapism is intensified and the poem’s spirit intersects more and more the Athenian Romanticism. While the epicurean philosophy may be in

32 Although I use the term somewhat catachrestically, it is not, however, inappropriate to link the Epicurean philosophy with modern psychology and psychotherapy. It is no coincidence, moreover, that the title of the book Staring at the sun [Irvin D. Yalom, Staring at the sun: Overcoming the terror of death (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008)], by the renowned professor of psychiatry and novelist Irvin Yalom, has been rendered into Greek as Στον κήπο του Επίκουρου [Irvin D. Yalom, Στον κήπο του Επίκουρου: Αφήνοντας πίσω τον τρόμο του θανάτου, trans. Evangelia Andritsanou, Yiannis Zervas (Athens: Agra, 2008)]. This very significant exponent of existential psychiatry has utilised philosophical theories, such as those of Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, in other books of his as well, but always with an aim related to psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. Perhaps the appropriation of Epicurean ethics for the composition of a literary piece of writing by Vizyinos could be associated with his interest and studies in psychology. In the final analysis, the ‘Επικούρειον’ suggests a lifestyle free from psychological problems emanating from repressed instincts and desires and without an undeserved sense of guilt caused by the satisfaction of those instincts.

33 See Yeorganta, Οίνος στην ποίηση, 149, where the author refers to the ‘αδιαμφισβήτο πρότυπο του Δ. Παπαρρηγόπουλου’ and the ‘αστική παράδοση της παλαιάς αθηναϊκής σχολής’, which ‘αποτύπωσε στη φάση της εξάντλησης της τα αδιέξοδα που καταγράφει και η βακχική εξομολόγηση του Καβάφη’. In Paparrigopoulos’s poem ‘Ματαιότητης ματαιοτήτων’ from the collection Ποιήσεις of 1867 that is quoted piecemeal by Yeorganta (Οίνος στην ποίηση, 116) there are several loci communes that can be traced in both poems under consideration here. The most characteristic stanzas are, to my mind, the second («Τις του έαρος δεν δρέπει τα ευώδη άνθη μόνον / επειδή μακρόθεν έρπει προσεγγίζων ο χειμών; / Τε το πεπρωμένον ψύχος προλαμβάνοντες των χρόνων / να μη δρέψωμεν το έαρ των αλόγων μας στιγμών;») and the fourth one («Ματαιότης ο αφρίζων εν τω ποτηρίῳ οίνος / ματαιότης και τα χείλη τα διώνωτα ασπασμών; / Άν πραγματικότης είναι εις την γην αυτήν ο θρήνος, / ας κενώσω την φιάλην, την απάτην προτιμών».}
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accordance with a tendency of retreating from the public sphere and with the emergence of individualism, it is not, however, identified with the negation of reality and the pursuit of fictional recourses. In ‘Επικούρειον’ the resort to drinking does not constitute but a part of an alternative attitude to life capable of ceasing the sorrow which is inherent in human life and leading to elation. In ‘Βακχικόν’ on the other hand, the resort to drinking seems as an end in itself; wine functions as refuge, as narcotic, as panacea.
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The historical text of the Alexiad written by Anna Komnene in the mid-twelfth century constitutes the prime example of history-writing of the Komnenian period. Too much ink has been shed on the encomiastic nature of the work as well as on the author’s literary devices, such as the effective use of gender.\(^1\) Yet the major issue of characterization still invites attention. The purpose of this paper is to take a fresh look at the main characters’ construction through the rhetorical technique of ekphrasis. We will firstly examine how Anna uses ekphrasis to describe her characters’ appearance. Then I shall argue that this technique fulfills a powerful persuasive role and in the same time it shows off Anna’s artistic skills.

Physical appearance is significant for Anna’s characters since it is the mirror of their ethos. For almost every character, a shorter or longer description is given. The fact that Anna’s favourite people are beautiful can be justified on that her favorite figures represent the best ethos.\(^2\) Thus, the ideal personage combines inner and physical beauty.\(^3\) Men admire beauty whereas for women beauty leads to a good marriage. Beauty is defined by white skin, rosy cheeks, blond hair, symmetry of the body and high stature for men.\(^4\) Eyes have a prominent role, for they convey messages but there is not one colour specified as favourite.\(^5\) By contrast, unfavourable figures are usually ugly and they are defined by dark skin, a thin beard, unkind voice, and dark eyes.


\(^{3}\) Barbara Hill, *Imperial Women in Byzantium* 1025-1204 (Harlow: Longman, 1999), 88-93. She explores the significance of women’s beauty in the Komnenian period.


\(^{5}\) Sophia Antoniade, “Η Περιγραφική στην Αλεξιάδα,” *Ελληνικά* 5 (1932): 268, notes that the sparkling eyes and κυανοῦν do not necessarily mean blue eyes.
short height and asymmetry.\textsuperscript{6}

The technique with which Anna provides elaborate portraits of her main characters is known as ekphrasis. Ekphrasis belongs to progymnasmata, elementary rhetorical school exercises.\textsuperscript{7} It could be independent or embedded into a literary work. It could be a praise of a lifeless or a living viewing subject.\textsuperscript{8} Anna attains ekphrasis’s goal; she brings her characters ‘ἐναργῶς ὑπ’ ὀψιν’ (vividly before the eyes).\textsuperscript{9} Because of its encomiastic nature being also named in manuscripts as ‘ἐγκωμιαστικὴ ἔκφρασις’ (eulogizing ekphrasis), its subject is usually beautiful.\textsuperscript{10} Seven elaborate ekphrastic descriptions will be my focus; those of Alexios, Eirene, Maria, Konstantinos, Dalassene, Bohemund and Robert Guiscard.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{The ekphrastic technique}

According to Aphthonios’s and Nikolaos’s progymnasmata, a description has to start from the head and end with the torso and limbs.\textsuperscript{12} Albeit Anna delivers always a full ekphrasis, she inverts the traditional order without following it systematically.\textsuperscript{13} She


\textsuperscript{8} Actions, seasons and times could also be elaborated in a single or compound ekphrastic description. On the subjects of ekphrasis, see Ruth Webb, \textit{Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice} (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 61-86.

\textsuperscript{9} See Theon’s progymnasma on ekphrasis in Webb, \textit{Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice}, 199.


\textsuperscript{11} Anna Komnene, \textit{Alexiad}, edited by Diether R. Reinsch and Athanasion Kambylis (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001). 1.10.4 (Robert's), 3.1.3 (Konstantinos’s), 3.2.4 (Maria’s), 3.3.1-3.3.2 (Alexios’s), 3.3.3-3.3.4 (Eirene’s), 3.8.3 (Dalassene’s), 13.10.4-13.10.5 (Bohemund’s).

\textsuperscript{12} George Kennedy, \textit{Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric} (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 117.

\textsuperscript{13} Compare with Manasses’s ‘Ἐκφρασις ἐικονισμάτων ἐν μαρμάρῳ κυκλοτερεῖ where he describes the personified Earth in the traditional order in Panagiotis Agapitos, \textit{Εἰκών και Λόγος. Ξένι Βυζαντινές Περιγραφές Έργων Τέχνης} (Athens: Agra, 2006), 56-60.
frequently starts with an introductory sentence about the family, origins and a general statement regarding beauty. Robert is Norman from humble origins. Maria of Alania is an aristocrat and Eirene comes from the well-known Doukas family. She then normally describes the stature before the face and returns to the body. The body and stature emerge as more important for men in contrast to the face for women.\(^\text{14}\) She closes the ekphrasis with a general statement again.\(^\text{15}\)

As ekphrasis requires, Anna maintains clarity and uses a plethora of tropes so as to create enargeia (vividness).\(^\text{16}\) The rhetorical question in Maria’s ekphrasis emphasizes her beauty.\(^\text{17}\) Frequently Anna uses similes (Maria ἦν εὐμήκης μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν καθαπερεὶ κυπάριττος, λευκὴ δὲ τὸ σῶμα ὡσεὶ χιὼν);\(^\text{18}\) metaphors (Maria is ῥόδον ἀντικρυς);\(^\text{19}\) personifications (εἶδες ἂν αὐτόχρημα τὴν πυρίπνου ἑπικαθημένην τοῖς χείλεσιν ἐκείνου –Alexios’s– ῥητορικὴν);\(^\text{20}\) hyperbole (τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ ἄνδρος –Robert’s–, ὡς φασι, τὸ ἐμβόημα πολλὰς ἐτρέπετο μυρίαδος);\(^\text{21}\) adynaton (τὸ τῶν ἠθῶν ἐπαγωγόν τε καὶ ἀριστεφεῖς αὐτοκράτορας);\(^\text{22}\) graceful aural schemes such as alliteration (Alexios οὐ πάνυ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπῆρτο ἐπὶ πολὺ);\(^\text{23}\) paronyms (μελῶν καὶ μερῶν);\(^\text{24}\) chiasmus (ὄψεώς τε καὶ ἀκοῆς ἀκόρεστον ὡς ὡς ἡμέρας ἀκουσμά τε καὶ θέαμα);\(^\text{25}\) figura etymologica (τέρψεις τέρπον);\(^\text{26}\) homeoteleuton (εὖρος δὲ συμμέτρως ποις);\(^\text{27}\) epanalepsis (ἐπέραστος μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἐπέραστος δὲ ἀκούσμα);\(^\text{28}\) revision (λέγω δὴ τοὺς ἄρτιστοις εὶς αὐτοκράτορας);\(^\text{29}\)

\(^\text{14}\) Elizabeth C. Evans, “Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography,” Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 46 (1935): 63-64, mentions that a well-proportioned stature was a sign of bravery according to physiognomy.

\(^\text{15}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 1.10.4: ‘Being gifted by fortune, nature and soul, it was natural for him –Robert Guiscard– not to be enslaved or to surrender to anyone’.

\(^\text{16}\) On tropes and schemes, see Jeffreys, “Rhetoric,” 833-835.

\(^\text{17}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.2.4: ‘Τὰς δὲ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἀνέμελα τίς ἀνθρώπων ἐξείποι’; (‘Who would be able to describe the light of her eyes?’)

\(^\text{18}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.2.4: ‘She was tall like a cypress and white like snow’.

\(^\text{19}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.2.4: ‘She is a rose’.

\(^\text{20}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.2: ‘You would see immediately rhetoric sitting fiery on his lips’.

\(^\text{21}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 1.10.4: ‘The cry of this man turned thousands people to flee’.

\(^\text{22}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.2.4: ‘Her charming manners surpassed words and the power of art’.

\(^\text{23}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.2.

\(^\text{24}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.3.

\(^\text{25}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.3.

\(^\text{26}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.1.3.

\(^\text{27}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.2.

\(^\text{28}\) Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.3: ‘Unrivalled in sight, unrivalled in hearing’.
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statement and counter-statement (her face οὐ μὴν εἰς κύκλον ἀκριβῆ διαπέπλαστο
catā tās Ἀσσυρίους γυναίκας οὔδ' ἄλλος ἐξεμηκύνετο catā tās Σκυθίδας, ἄλλ'
ὑπεχαλᾶτο μικρὸν ποις τῆς ἀκριβείας τοῦ κύκλου); 30 Vividness is also achieved
through the emotions which the people described provoke. Kontantinos, the son of
Maria of Alania, provokes delight. Alexios, Eirene and Dalassene provoke awe. By
contrast, Robert and Bohemund arouse fear. Maria provokes desire.

Many tropes are kept within the conventions of classical ekphrasis such as the
simile of the cypress, the rose and snow. 31 Eurhythmy, symmetry and allusions to
mythology are also traditional concepts. 32 The antithesis in Bohemund’s ekphrasis of
tenderness and cruelty as well as the twofold gaze of Alexios, Eirene and Dalassene
are also a topos. 33 Robert’s and Bohemund’s ekphrasis lacks in tropes in comparison
with the other characters’. Moreover Robert’s ekphrasis has asyndeton (Ὁ δὲ Ῥομπέρτος
οὗτος Νορμάνος τὸ γένος, τὴν τύχην ἄσημος, τὴν γνώμην τυραννικός, τὴν
ψυχὴν πανουργότατος, τὴν χεῖρα γενναῖος). 34 Conversely, Bohemund’s ekphrasis has
polysyndeton (τὴν γαστέρα συνεσταλμένος καὶ τὰς λαγόνας, καὶ τοὺς ὤμους καὶ τὰ
στέρνα πλατὺς καὶ τοὺς βραχίονας καρτερός, καὶ τὴν ὀλην ἔξιν τοῦ σώματος). 35

Anna also uses the technical language typical to the ekphrasis. It derives from the
sector of painting and plastic art. 36 Maria, Eirene and Alexios are compared to

29 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.1: ‘I mean the newly-crowned emperors’.
30 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.3: ‘It was not completely round like the Assyrian women’s, neither
long like the Scythians’, but somewhat longer than a perfect circle’.
31 Because of stereotypes in ekphrasis, Anna has many similarities with Psellus. On his ekphrasis of
characters, see Ljubarskij, Η Προσωπικότητα και το Έργο του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού, 329-346. For a
comparison with Libanios’s model exercise in beauty and statues, see Craig A. Gibson, Libanius’s
Progymnasmata. Model exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric (Atlanta, GA: Society of
32 Byzantines stress explicitly the importance of symmetry whereas in classical prosopography it was
implied. On its role in classical and byzantine ekphrasis, see Ljubarskij, Η Προσωπικότητα και το Έργο
tου Μιχαήλ Ψελλού, 336-337.
33 The use of topos should not be criticized as making the portraits unreliable. The accurate adjustment
of rhetorical conventions to the portraits would demonstrate Anna’s skills.
34 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 1.10.4: ‘This Robert was of Norman origin, from a humble family,
self-willed, brave.’ The asyndeton in his ekphrasis describing features of his personality demonstrates
the combination of ethos and physical appearance.
35 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 13.10.4: ‘In his belly and flanks he was thin, and in his shoulders and
breast he was broad, and in his arms he was strong and in his whole body’.
36 The use of technical language is a common feature of ekphrasis. The statue is for first time
encountered in Sappho. See Ljubarskij, Η Προσωπικότητα και το Έργο του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού, 338-339.
Verbs convey the imagery of ἀγαλματοποιεῖν (statue-making); Appeles and Pheidias could not produce (παρήγαγεν) as beautiful a statue as Maria. Anna plays further with the classical ekphrastic logos. Her characters remind of lifeless works of art; Konstantinos could be mistaken for a painting of Eros, and Eirene’s hands and fingers would be thought to have been turned from ivory by a craftsman. However they are concurrently like living statues, thus making perfect models for sculpture. An imagery of spectatorship enriches the profile of the described figures as statues and enhances their vividness; Alexios provoking admiration and delight to people around him is associated with an object of art, viewed and admired by spectators.

Ekphrasis’s role in the Alexiad

At this stage, we are confronted with the question of why Anna uses this technique. Belonging to the genre of rhetoric, ekphrasis can play a persuasive role in historiography. Undoubtedly, it is a device of characterization since many epithets convey inner features. A rounded profile of characters is presented which the audience can reconstruct imaginatively. In addition, it fits within the encomium of Anna’s favourite figures. More importantly characters are classified into a hierarchy; not all deserve an ekphrasis whereas by comparing the ekphrasis’s length, language, and creativity we understand characters’ significance. Maria’s eyes are bright and vivid but Eirene’s provoke emotion. Furthermore Maria is a desirable statue alluding to Knidian Aphrodite but Eirene is explicitly compared to Athena, the goddess of wisdom. Inner beauty is superior to external, and this leads to Eirene becoming more inaccessible and respectable. Her ekphrasis is also much longer. Hence through

37 Bohemund’s description (13.10.4) also reminds a statue, with his stable feet alluding to a statue’s base.

38 In the classical ekphrasis lifeless objects are like living statues, the most famous example being Myron’s cow which is mentioned also in Manasses’s ekphrasis, Agapitos, Εἰκών καὶ Λόγος, 50-53. The duplex nature of Anna’s metaphors being both like lifeless art and living statues, resembles an epigrammatic poem of Myron’s cow (Anth.Pal.9.798): ‘When you see this heifer of Myron, you will perhaps shout: Either Nature is lifeless, or Art is alive’. See Simon Goldhill, “What is Ekphrasis for?” Classical Philology 102, no. 1 (2007): 18.

39 Goldhill, “What is Ekphrasis for?” 3-8, demonstrates the psychological impact of ekphrasis on the audience and readers and their manipulation through enargeia and phantasia.

40 Webb, Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice, 58, stresses the role of interpretation and selection of details.


42 Ljubarskij, Η Προσωπικότητα και το Έργο του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού, 341.
ekphrasis Anna transmits the superiority of her mother over Maria. Similarly, Alexios’s beauty overshadows Polykleitos’s Canon which represents the prototype of symmetry of body in classical sculpture whereas Bohemund fits within it; Alexios’s beauty then—and consequently character—is superior.\footnote{Alexios’s ekphrasis (3.3.1-3.3.2.) is a hero’s imagery; beauty with military and oratory skills make the ideal man. Anna could not hide his not very tall stature but the brightness of all the other features compensate for this lack.} Anna Dalassene has a distinct ekphrasis.\footnote{Anna Komnene, \textit{Alexiad}, 3.8.3.} The symmetry of body and face are replaced by symmetry in philanthropy and morality. Dalassene becomes a spiritual character rather than feminine. Alexios’s, Dalassene’s, and Eirene’s twofold gaze being reminiscent of the Christ’s different sized eyes in iconography conveys their imperial authority, in the sense that it can transmit either fear or sympathy depending on the viewer’s inner values.\footnote{Henry Maguire, “Byzantine Descriptions of Works of Art,” in \textit{Greek Literature}, ed. Gregory Nagy (London, Routledge, 2001), 9:133-134.}

Let us now turn to the ekphrasis of Robert and Bohemund. Their portraits are surprising. Wouldn’t they also be to Anna’s audience?\footnote{According to Goldhill, “What is Ekphrasis for?” 5, astonishment is a feature of the visualization which disorientates the reader from the facts.} In contrast to other ugly enemies, Anna highlights the beauty of these two.\footnote{As ugly are described internal enemies, involved in malicious heresies and beliefs. Ugliness coincides therefore with maliciousness of the inner self.} Buckler’s argument that Anna confesses their beauty is misguided and not convincing;\footnote{Buckler, \textit{Anna Comnena}, 57.} that both were extremely handsome tallying with Anna’s ideals, does not necessarily lead to a long description being granted to them. It is worth recalling that ekphrasis is given for Alexios’s greatest enemies. A long description would make the audience familiar with these enemies. Moreover they are an eternal threat to Alexios. By underestimating them, Anna would underestimate the victory or defeat of Alexios by them. She rather praises them and hence their physical appearance reflects their abilities. Nevertheless, our attention should be drawn not only to the fact that their beauty is expressed but to how this is done. According to the principles of progymnasmata, Anna adopts a different style for them so as to convey the appropriate image and feelings.\footnote{According to Theon, ‘next one should not recollect all useless details and should make the style reflect the subject’. See Kennedy, \textit{Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric}, 47.} The aforementioned lack of tropes makes their description wanting in harmony. Moreover
the schemes of asyndeton and polysyndeton attract our attention. Through their blunt ekphrasis with their fierce characteristics –frightful voice, fierce eyes, strong limbs– their aforementioned beauty excites fear and invokes tension to the audience. These figures are full of passion, making them not merely beautiful but also formidable enemies, whereas the audience gets emotionally engaged.\textsuperscript{50} What Anna achieves is not theirs but Alexios’s praise for dealing with highly dangerous and awe-inspiring men. This is clearly demonstrated in the end of Bohemund’s ekphrasis: ‘Such an enemy only by the emperor could be defeated through fortune, eloquence and many other gifts given to him by nature.’\textsuperscript{51}

The praise of Alexios is made through Anna’s phraseology as well. Extracting vocabulary from plastic art, she achieves both the mobilization of image through a fluid language and the immobilization of the language through a static image.\textsuperscript{52} What finally becomes eternal is image in a given moment. Alexios’s image in a young age will be immortalized through his ekphrasis as his deeds are to be immortalized through his history.\textsuperscript{53}

The ekphrastic descriptions should be examined in their narrative frame as well. The portrait of Robert being placed in Michael’s VII and Botaneiates’s reign in his preparation against Byzantium would make the audience understand how dangerous the Norman enemy would be in future and would criticize Michael VII –and not Alexios– as responsible. The portrait of Bohemund elevates the treaty that Alexios achieved. The ekphrasis of Maria takes the attention far from Eudokia in the section about Botaneiates’s marriage. In fact, Maria overshadows Eudokia, who is bypassed. Similarly Konstantinos’s ekphrasis is placed when Maria has to be justified for staying in the palace. The ekphrasis functions within Maria’s apology. The audience’s attention shifts from Maria to Konstantinos through a transitional and intense idea: the boy was in danger. Through his ekphrasis the audience becomes favorably disposed towards the perfect child and thus they can sympathize with Maria’s desire to protect it. Regarding the ekphrasis of Eirene and Alexios, it shows their unity in opposing the gossip about Maria and Alexios and their public image as a newly married imperial couple. Finally, the ekphrasis of Anna Dalassene is embedded in her character’s broader description which aimed to justify the power given to her by Alexios via the

\textsuperscript{50} On the engagement of the audience through \textit{enargeia}, see Webb, \textit{Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice}, 98-100.

\textsuperscript{51} Anna Komnene, \textit{Alexiad}, 13.10.5.

\textsuperscript{52} Agapitos, \textit{Εικών και Λόγος. Εξί Βυζαντινές Περιγραφές Έργων Τέχνης}, 19-20.

\textsuperscript{53} Pedro A. Agudelo, “Los Ojos de la Palabra. La Construccion del Concepto de Ecfrasis, de la Retorica Antigua a la Crítica Literaria,” \textit{Lingüística y Literatura} 60 (2011): 86-87, refers to the absence of the viewing subject that the ekphrasis aims to cover.
Golden Bull. The spirituality deriving from her ekphrasis tallies with the masculine qualities that Anna Dalassene possesses in that excerpt (intelligence, wisdom, organization, rhetoric skills) constructing a portrait of a reliable female ruler and thus defending Alexios’ policy.

Finally the literary byzantine ekphraseis frequently compete with the art that they describe. Anna in a similar fashion uses words which have an ambiguous meaning; In Alexios’s and Eirene’s ekphrasis ‘γραφεύς γράψειεν’, instead of a painter, could be a writer –Anna– who upon seeing a beautiful subject wants to describe it. Such a meaning would also allude to writers writing encomia; in this context, there is no panegyric sufficient to praise them. Such a dialogue between image and writing elevates Anna’s work. It is not only that her writing is enhanced through poetic language; it competes with sculpture and painting on which art crystallizes more vividly imagery. This is more evident in the comparison of Eirene to Athena. In that section Eirene is not compared to Athena’s painting or statue but to her image as described by authors; there is a double competition. Firstly authors are selected by Anna as the transmitters of Athena’s image throughout the centuries and this makes them superior to visual artists. Secondly, Eirene competes with the written Athena through her description made by Anna. Thus it is Anna who competes with authors on who portrays a beautiful subject more skillfully.

Hopefully the aforementioned analysis demonstrates how the ekphrastic logos of Alexiad can be read as an integral part of the principal characters’ construction. It is primarily developed within the traditional conventions. With the enargeia achieved through tropes, schemes and technical language, ekphrasis becomes a rhetorical device. It is used as a device of characterization from which Alexios and Eirene emerge as superior to male and feminine characters respectively, whereas the adopted style fluctuates according to the quality of persons. Moreover it achieves orientation or disorientation from facts. Finally, Anna participates in the ekphrastic process being she a spectator and her inspiration derives from nature; her models are true. All the ekphraseis ascribe the wholeness of the described people. What Anna also achieves is to make her historical account a literary piece showing off her artistic skills and putting her personal writing into a dialogue with other visual and literary arts; apart

54 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.7.
55 These masculine features should be juxtaposed with the feminine qualities of motherhood mentioned in Book 3.6.
56 Anna Komnene, Alexiad, 3.3.1. My attention to this wordplay was drawn by Agapitos, Εικών και Λόγος, 15-17.
57 See Agapitos, Εικών και Λόγος, 15-38, for the competitive and collaborative relation between writing and image.
from being a passive spectator she takes the pen and creates in imitation of her viewing subject a fluid work of art in its own right.
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Review


Due to the ever increasing scope of Ottoman history, having a regional and/or periodical specialisation has become not only common, but practically essential in order for a historian to work effectively. This is a mixed blessing as one historian can spend their whole career specialising in for example Ottoman Egypt, which does contribute to the scholarship of the Ottoman Empire but does narrow the ability of that historian to gain an overall view of the empire and its identity. Unlike the British Empire, Ottoman Imperial characteristics are difficult to define given the Ottoman tendency to assimilate existing processes of local administration after conquest of an area. Studying the Ottoman Empire is made more complex by the fact that it no longer exists as an entity and due to the geographical, cultural, linguistic and religious make-up of the empire it has no single visible existing legacy today. In studying Ottoman Greece a scholar is often likely to slip into the study of Greece in the Ottoman period.² The distinction is subtle but significant and does have an impact on the writing and understanding of history.

The issues of periodisation, geography and the nature of societies which found themselves under Ottoman rule are addressed by Woodhead in the Introduction. She details the issue of the Empire's fragmented geographical legacy and poses the question of how far societies in the present day Middle East, North Africa and South-Eastern Europe would have considered themselves part of the larger Ottoman world. She offers that examining periodisation is a useful way of reassessing dominant preconceptions³ which, given the arbitrary nature of periodisation, is a valid suggestion. Periodisation appears to have played a part in the classification of only two sections of the book, that of the foundations and the end of the Empire, each of which can be somewhat objectively classified as having their own characteristics

---


distinctive of the intervening years. However this has not limited the options of the contributors many of whom deal with themes that transcend common periodisation.

In its treatment of geography the book is equally inclusive allowing for both regional studies of periods and topics and also general surveys. One of the key strengths of this book is that both editor and contributors have recognised the need for the 'Ottoman state' to mean more than Istanbul and this is realised in the treatment of the capital as a regional study, in the specifying of Istanbul and other regions together and in the segregation of the Imperial household as an area of study independent of the rest of the city. This is a step in the right direction for Ottoman historiography, the Ottoman Empire was more than Istanbul just as the Roman Empire was more than Rome.\(^4\) Expansion is thematic as well as geographical with Woodhead stating in the abstract the need to consider what it meant for ordinary people to be part of an 'Ottoman world'. This declaration is resonant of history from below, a popular approach in the writing of social history in recent decades. While this methodology is not something new the use of it in Ottoman Studies has only more recently become a popular practice.

The key issues of any historical publication are the objectives of the work and whether or not they are achieved. The main aim laid out in the Introduction is: to expand the traditional narrative of Ottoman historiography which is very narrow and government-centric yet which still forms a central part of general textbooks on the Ottomans. The proposed means of doing so, the subversion of traditional periodisation and geographical boundaries as well as an emphasis on the ordinary citizens of the empire are effective. In addition to sections on the empire's foundations and its later years there are sections entitled 'The Ottomans and Others', 'The Wider Empire', and 'Ordinary People' covering respectively Ottoman international relations, Ottoman expansion and administration and the daily lives of ordinary citizens, thus the book does succeed in expanding the 'Ottoman world' beyond its governmental boundaries.

With regards to methodology three case studies give us good examples of approaching a specialism within the context of a large question. These are Nükhet Varlık's *Conquest, Urbanization and Plague Networks in the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1600*, Başak Tuğ's *Ottoman Woman as Legal and Marital Subjects* and Ali Yayıncıoğlu's *Provincial Power Holders and the Empire in the Late Ottoman World*.

Varlık's topic has very little primary documentation and so she offers a wide chronological context and thematic framework of diffusion to build connections between her key themes. Additionally charting a long chronological framework is prudent for the scope of plague, conquest and urbanization. Also in-keeping with the volume's intentions Varlık builds her own periodisation around her specific subject as

\(^4\) I am indebted to Dr Gideon Nisbet for this comparison.
opposed to starting with a period and finding the subject within it which prevents the feeling that coverage of the subject has been cut short owing to a chronological restriction. Finally her core themes encompass all Ottoman society as illness, war and urbanization affected all inhabitants and regions of the empire.

Tuğ also opens the study on Ottoman women in a thematic framework blending the concepts of gender in history and anti-Orientalism setting out to challenge some existing stereotypes. The sub-headings in this chapter are built around case studies selected from the archives to answer the issues of the topic while also offering conclusions based upon the analysis of larger selections analysed under one problematic framework. This study follows the agenda of the volume as a whole by being inclusive and yet specific by turns in dealing with its topic and the spirit of challenging the status quo.

Yayoğlu uses a blend of the above methods in selecting case studies to fit into a wider theme and also offering a broad context to his study. This is a well-rounded chapter emphasising both continuity and change in centre-province relations while also addressing historiography and methodology in the context of the 'big theme'. Yayoğlu manages to keep his study readable while also covering the scope of a large question which meets the goals of the book exactly.

Woodhead intends to provide interest for Ottomanists of all levels, students and non-Ottomanists. The volume does not claim to be a general introduction for students or a complete overview of the empire and its associated historiography, however it is a starting point for projects in all areas of Ottoman studies due to the diversity of its contents.

The Ottoman Empire was certainly more than the sum of its component parts, yet each of those parts did have its own distinctive character making the transcendence of these identities into one overarching 'Ottoman-ness' a certain je ne sais quoi. This book certainly is an editorial achievement for Woodhead having managed to gather such diverse contributors to work towards the one question of 'Ottoman-ness', and if this book does not provide an definitive answer there is certainly something in the contents to interest every student and scholar of Ottoman history and encourage them to think about the definition of 'Ottoman' as it pertains to their interests. Hopefully this book should spark some further debate and scholarship upon the Ottoman Imperial identity.
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