

THE POLITICS OF RECEPTION: KALVOS AND THE GREEK  
LEFT\*

I

Before World War II several scholars had attempted to associate the historical context, particularly Swiss and French Philhellenism, with the twenty *odes*. Some of them made a link between the social circumstances of Zakynthos and Livorno, and the poetry of the Zantiot bard. Very few had noted the democratic and antidespotic characteristics of *Λύρα* and *Αυγινά*, and their relation with the ideals of the French Revolution. The majority of scholars tended merely to describe the events of Kalvos's life, and to interpret the *odes* without suspecting their obvious political character or taking their close connection with the turbulent European political situation seriously. Kalvos remained a figure representing an idealistic atmosphere of Hellenism, Romanticism or Neoclassicism. He was primarily seen as the poet of the Idea, the puritan of Virtue, the fervent Patriot with strange manners, language and versification, the inspired poet with the amazing imagery heralding the revival of ancient Greek grandeur, Foscolo's student, the new Pindar, the liberal spirit, the lonely and tormented literary figure, as well as the heretic of poetry, the shy poet with the unacceptable linguistic and metric forms, an opponent of Solomos and the demotic language, and such like. Of the very few intellectuals who had distinguished the political aspects of Kalvos's life and poetic work, Spiridon Sturaitis, Kleon Paraschos, Leon Kukulas, Stratis Tsirkas, Nikos A. Veis and, from a different point of view, N. B. Tomadakis, are the most notable.

This is understandable, since the horizon of expectations of readers and the general tendencies of the critics were orientated towards different aesthetic and literary principles at different times. It was quite difficult, especially with

\* This is a version of a paper delivered in the Conference: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies: The Next Wave*, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, October 12-14, 1990. For the transliteration of Greek names or words into English, I follow the system of transliteration as given in the *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 4, n. 1, May 1986, pp. 64-66.

the rise of Fascism in Greece in the 1930s, to view Kalvos's life and work through a dialectical historical perspective. The resistance during the German occupation of Greece, with its wide popular base, offered an opportunity to the Greek Left not just to organise systematically but to flex its intellectual and political power. It is no coincidence that Kukulas's ode to Kalvos and Tsirkas's review of Seferis's preface to the edition of Kalvos's poems both appeared during the occupation. Although both these intellectuals kept very close contacts with the circles of the Greek Left, the nature of their contributions to Kalvian Studies does not entirely correspond to the main lines of post-War left critiques. Kukulas's ode is distinguished for its highly anti-fascist and patriotic content whilst Tsirkas's review is chiefly concerned with Seferis's opinions and discusses them from a patriotic and anti-*poésie-pure* point of view. Thus, one can say that the most common characteristic of the pre-War left critiques on Kalvos was their liberal spirit and patriotic enthusiasm. The patriotism of the Left manifested itself differently to "bourgeois" criticism. It was primarily connected with the struggle for political liberalism and the ideals of Socialism.

The first post-War years were very hard indeed, because of the Civil War (1946-1949) and its direct political and social consequences. Yet in the 1950s, which were very difficult years for the Greek Left, its scholars started to occupy themselves systematically with the poet of the *odes*. They were vigorously opposed to idealistic interpretations of literary work and particularly to the artistic view of *l'art pour l'art*. They tended to connect Kalvos's literary work with the various political and social circumstances of its age. Thus, new aspects of the personality and the poetry of the Zantiot bard were elaborated and there was an upsurge of detailed research into his life and work from an entirely new perspective. Its chief object was not to establish the unquestionable poetic value of the *odes* but mainly to reconsider and develop other aspects of them.

## II

Markos Avgeris was a literary critic and intellectual of the Left. Around the middle of the '50s, he published a very significant essay on Kalvos, in which he approached the life and work of the poet in a new light<sup>1</sup>. Avgeris connects

1. The first publication of the essay is in *Ζάκυνθος*, 1954. See also, inter alia, Markos Avgeris, «Ο Κάλβος κ' η εποχή του», in *Καινούργια Εποχή*, Athens: Difros, Summer 1957, pp. 124-129 [= Yiannis Gudelis, *Ανθολογία της σύγχρονης κριτικής. Ποίηση -*

the fervent patriotism and the nationalistic enthusiasm of the Heptanesians with Kalvos's and Solomos's poetic texts, according to him the most skilful and patriotic personal poetry of modern Greece. This poetry was the natural continuation of Rigas Ferreos's revolutionary songs and had been obviously influenced by the revolutionary turmoil which spread all over Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as a consequence of the French Revolution and the ideas of the Enlightenment.

Avgeris claims that the revolutionary events of 1797 in Zakynthos after the arrival of the French army, the rebellious patriotism and the liberal tendencies of Italy (particularly Kalvos's relationship with Ugo Foscolo), the democratic environment of England, Switzerland and France (where the poet lived for a long time), and the struggle of the Greeks for their freedom and independence, all played a part in forming the literary and political character of the Zantiot bard. Kalvos's poetry had been inspired by the principles of the enlightened humanism of his time. This is the main reason for the rebellious patriotism and the continuous praise of Virtue in the twenty *odes*. The revolutionary democratic ideology was a basic characteristic of many intellectuals of Kalvos's period.

Avgeris tends to use modern terminology to describe the historical and social circumstances of Kalvos's age. But he also uses established terms albeit attaching a different meaning to them. His method is definitely a Marxist one (he directly quotes, for instance, the theoretician of Socialist Realism, Plekhanov)<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently, Avgeris insisted on the elucidation of Kalvian Virtue and the political aspects of *Λύρα* and *Λυρικά*, as well as their classical and romantic sides (he relates the classicism of the *odes* to the corresponding beliefs of "bourgeois" democracy), whilst noting their idiosyncratic form, style, versification, and their language which tend to follow the linguistic position of Adamandios Koraes.

*Πεζογραφία*, Athens: Difros 1959, pp. 44-49; Markos Avgeris, *Έλληνες Λογοτέχνες. Σολωμός - Κάλβος - Ψυχάρης - Παλαμάς - Καζαντζάκης - Σεφέρης*, [Athens:] Themelio [1966], pp. 69-87; *Έλληνες Λογοτέχνες*, [Athens:] Ikaros [31971], pp. 51-65; *Έλληνες Λογοτέχνες*, Athens: Buras 1982, pp. 51-65; (the first edition of *Έλληνες Λογοτέχνες...*, by Ikaros [Athens, n.d.], pp. 53-65); the essay can be also found in *Α. Κάλβου 'Απαντα*, [Athens:] Mermingas [n.d.], vol. I, pp. 183-193, and in *Μάρκου Αυγέρη, 'Απαντα. (Αισθητικά - Κριτικά, Θεωρητικά - Κριτικά, Ιδεολογικά Ζητήματα Τέχνης)*. Τόμος πρώτος: Αισθητικά - Κριτικά. [Athens:] «Nea Tehni» [n.d.], pp. 57-69. I shall be quoting from the publication of Avgeris's essay by the «Nea Tehni».

2. *Ibid.*, p. 63: «Σε καιρούς επαναστατικούς η τέχνη γίνεται παιδαγωγός των λαών, παρατηρεί ο Πλεχάνωφ».

Concluding his essay, Avgeris analyses the nature of Kalvian Liberty, and demonstrates its undeniable topicality throughout time:

Ιδιαίτερα σήμερα, μπροστά στη δίψα της ελευθερίας, που ξεσηκώνει τους λαούς της γης και στην περιφρόνηση και στην αποστροφή προς όλους τους δουλικούς συμβιβασμούς, που χαρακτηρίζει τους λαϊκούς αγώνες, η ποίηση του Κάλβου ακούεται μ' εξαιρετική δύναμη και παρουσιάζεται σα μια φωνή σημερινή κι ολότελα επίκαιρη. Διαβάζοντας, λόγου χάρη, τις 'Ευχές' του, είναι σα ν' ακούμε τη ζωντανή φωνή του να υψώνεται πέρα από τους τάφους και να δίνει στο έθνος εντολές αγωγής, όχι πια για ξεπερασμένους καιρούς, παρά για τις ίδιες τις σημερινές καταστάσεις και για τη σημερινή εθνική πορεία μας. [...] Η ποίηση του Κάλβου ακούεται πάντα σαν εγερτήριο σάλπισμα. Είναι το σάλπισμα της Δημοκρατίας, που διψάει πάντα ελευθερία, ισότητα και δικαιοσύνη, ολοένα μεγαλύτερη, ολοένα πλατύτερη<sup>3</sup>.

The echoes from the complicated Greek political situation of the 1950s are obvious. And it is not without significance that Avgeris chooses the rather "political" ode "Αι Ευχαί" to support his stance more effectively.

These views constitute the main positions of the criticism of the Left in Greece on Kalvos during this period. In other words, Avgeris's essay was, for the scholarly circles of the Greek Left, a kind of *aesthetic manifesto*, as regards the interpretation of Kalvos's life and work<sup>4</sup>.

M.M. Papaioannu referred to the Zantiot bard in a brief article in the newspaper *Η Αυγή*, in which he emphasised the liberal and political character of the *odes*, whilst critically reviewing the assessments of other intellectuals on

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 69.

4. For other references to the Zantiot bard by Markos Avgeris, see Markos Avgeris, 'Αγγελος Σικελιανός. Κριτική Μελέτη, [Athens:] Themelio [1966], pp. 105, 114-115; 'Ελληνες Λογοτέχνες..., *op. cit.*, [1966], pp. 37, 44, 53, 151; *Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική ποίηση και πεζογραφία*, [Athens:] Themelio [1967], pp. 113-114, 138-139; *Εισαγωγή στην Ελληνική Ποίηση*, [Athens:] Kedros [1971], pp. 111-112, 136-137; *Ζητήματα της Λογοτεχνίας μας*, Athens: «Σinhroni Epohi» 1979, pp. 14, 149-150; *Μάρκου Αυγέρη, 'Απαντα...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-245, 259-260. Cf. also, Kiriakos Simopoulos, «Ο Μάρκος Αυγέρης κριτικός της Λογοτεχνίας», in *Αφιέρωμα στον Μάρκο Αυγέρη*, [Athens:] Kedros 1976, pp. 325, 326; Kostas Stergiopoulos, «Η φυσιογνωμία και η ποίηση του Αυγέρη», *ibid.*, p. 360; Yiorgos A. Panayiotu, «Ενθυμέομαι Λόγου. Ελαχίστη συμβολή στη βιβλιογραφία Αυγέρη», *ibid.*, p. 381 (n. 40); Yiannis Nikolopoulos, *Μάρκος Αυγέρης. Ο Αντιστασιακός. Η ζωή, το έργο και η εποχή του*, [Athens:] Thukididis 1984, pp. 83-84, 126-127.

the literary value of the “Poet of Virtue”<sup>5</sup>. According to Papaïoannu, Andreas Kalvos was primarily a poet committed to the purposes and the ideals of the Greek Revolution; he published his odes in order to propagate the feats of the fighters, and the Philhellenic Committees undertook the responsibility for their translation and circulation almost immediately after their first publication.

Subsequently, Papaïoannu refuted certain views of Seferis, Elytis, and Apostolakis on Kalvos, and denounced the practice of K. Paraschos and X. Lefkoparidis, of quoting only selected excerpts from Kalvos’s work in their Anthology of Modern Greek Poetry. Papaïoannu was intent on opposing these well known representatives of the “generation of the ’30s” and the entire “bourgeois” criticism establishment; his assessments, especially of the contributions by Elytis and Paraschos, are unfair. But animosity against *poésie pure* and the views of the “bourgeois” critics is understandable, given the political and social context of that period. What Papaïoannu called the “conservative” artistic, philosophical and sociological ideas of the “generation of the ’30s” were the chief targets which had to be opposed<sup>6</sup>. It is characteristic, that in the same issue of the newspaper *H Avgή*, five stanzas from the ode “Αι

5. M. M. Papaïoannu, «Για μια φιλελεύθερη πατριωτική λογοτεχνία. Οι αρνητές του Κάλβου», in *H Avgή*, 25 March 1955, p. 2. [An almost identical article, under the title «Φαινόμενα ακμής και παρακμής στη Νεοελληνική Ποίηση», was reprinted in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 3, n. 15, March 1956, pp. 215-219].

6. See *H Avgή*, *op. cit.*: «Από πλατιούς δρόμους και από στενορίμια, άλλοτε αποκάλυπτα και άλλοτε κρυφά, οι γενιές —και περισσότερο η λεγόμενη ‘γενιά του 30’ (ένas ορισμένος κύκλος λογοτεχνών)— που από την αρχή τούτου του αιώνα επηρεάζονται από κοσμοθεωρίες αντιδραστικές, πήγαν να θάψουν (ή να της αφαιρέσουν την επαναστατικότητα) την ποίηση του 1821. [...] Η πολεμική που τριάντα τόσα χρόνια ασκήθηκε κατά της πατριωτικής ποίησης, συνοδεύονταν πάντοτε με μια πολεμική γενικά κατά της ελληνικής προοδευτικής λογοτεχνίας, κάτω απ’ το πρόσχημα του πολέμου κατά της ηθογραφίας και του ‘επαρχιωτισμού’ και συγχρόνως με μια πρόκληση προς τον κοσμοπολιτισμό, τη φυγή μας και το άπλωμά μας μέσα σε άλλες χώρες. Το αδυνάτισμα του πατριωτισμού και το δυνάμισμα του κοσμοπολιτισμού είναι γνωρίσματα και τα δύο της γραμμής, που ακολούθησε η ‘γενιά του 30’ και που τόσο καθαρά αποδείχτηκε καταστρεπτική και για τη λογοτεχνία και για την πατρίδα μέσα στα χρόνια της κατοχής και κατόπιν ίσαμε σήμερα. Οι καταστρεπτικές συνέπειες αυτής της γραμμής φαίνεται πως διευκολύνουν μερικούς λογοτέχνες να δουν καλύτερα και να στραφούν προς τον τόπο τους και προς τους ανθρώπους του, όπως θα στρέφονταν προς τις αληθινές πηγές της καλλιτεχνικής και της ανθρωπίνης δημιουργίας. Ας ελπίσουμε πως αυτό θα είναι μια νέα αφετηρία για καινούργια δημιουργικά ξεκινήματα και πως αυτή τη φορά οι διδαχές του Σολωμού, του Κάλβου, του Βαλαωρίτη, του Παλαμά, του Σικελιανού και του Βάρναλη δε θα λησμονηθούν. Ας ελπίσουμε ακόμα πως αυτή τη φορά δε θα ξεχαστούν οι λαχτάρεις του λαού για πρόοδο και ελευθερία, που μόνον αυτές μπορούν να γονιμοποιήσουν κάθε κίνηση μέσα στην τέχνη».

Ευχαί” and one from “Εἰς Σάμον” are published in order to demonstrate the political side of Kalvos’s poetry<sup>7</sup>.

Later, Papaioannu referred again to the Zantiot bard and briefly restated the main conclusions of his article and Avgeris’s essay. This is also true of his latest publication on Kalvos, in which Papaioannu connects the central subject of the ode “Αἱ Ευχαί” with Alexandros Mavrokordatos’s political efforts to bring Greece under British protection<sup>8</sup>.

Speaking about Dionisios Solomos, Kostas Varnalis, the well known poet and intellectual, maintained that Kalvos knew modern Greek well and that he belonged to the vanguard of contemporary literary production which was opposed to intellectual and political reaction<sup>9</sup>. Varnalis sang Solomos’s “Liberty” and Kalvos’s “Virtue” twice in his poetry: in his poems “Ο Λαός δεν πεθαίνει” and “Το ‘Ναι’ της Ιστορίας” in his collection *Ελεύθερος Κόσμος*<sup>10</sup>. The titles of the collection and the poems indicate how the towering literary figures of the Greek Left perceived Solomos and Kalvos as poets who were leaders, demonstrating the path of national honour and political liberty. In the second of the two poems, Varnalis adds the examples of Palamas and Mavilis to those of Solomos and Kalvos. The echoes of the very complicated social situation of the time, with the Left under political persecution, become apparent again. In 1960, Varnalis delivered a speech on the poet of the *odes*, on the occasion of the transfer of Kalvos’s remains from Louth, England, to Zakynthos<sup>11</sup>. Varnalis claimed that the Zantiot bard, together with Solomos

7. Anonymus, «Ανθολογία του Εικοσιένα. Οι μεγάλοι ποιηταί στην υπηρεσία της Ελευθερίας», *ibid.*, p. 2.

8. See M. M. Papaioannu, «Ακμή και παρακμή στην ποίηση», in *Από τον Ψυχάρη στον Γληνό*, Athens: Filippotis 1986 [Κριτική - Μελετήματα, 28], pp. 78-92; see also, M. M. Papaioannu, «Μελέτη. Οι ιστορικές πηγές των εμπνεύσεων του Κάλβου η ωδή ‘ΑΙ ΕΥΧΑΙ’», in *Νέα Εποχή*, n. 196, Limassol, May-June 1989, pp. 13-18.

9. See Kostas Varnalis, «Διάφορα άρθρα: I. Ο Σολωμός ήξερε ελληνικά;», in *Σολωμικά - Ο Σολωμός χωρίς μεταφυσική - Οι στοχασμοί του ποιητή κ.τ.λ. - Διάφορα άρθρα*, [Athens:] «Ο Kedros» [1957], p. 125. See also, Kostas Varnalis, «Διάφορα άρθρα: X. Ποιητική ανδραγαθία», *ibid.*, pp. 162-163.

10. See Kostas Varnalis, *Ελεύθερος Κόσμος*, Athens: «Kedros» 1965, pp. 55, 82; cf. Yiorgos Veludis, «Ο σολωμικός Βάρναλης», in *Προτάσεις. Δεκαπέντε γραμματολογικές δοκιμές*. Athens: Kedros [1981], pp. 50-51 (cf. *Το Βήμα*, 28 December 1974, p. 4).

11. See Kostas Varnalis, «Ο Κάλβος Οδηγός», in *Η Εταιρεία Ελλήνων Λογοτεχνών τιμάει τον Κάλβο στο Ελληνικό Λαϊκό Θέατρο (‘Αλσος)*, [Athens 1960], p. [14]. I do not know whether this speech was ever published or not; I have in mind only the edition of a passage from this address, in *Ανδρέα Κάλβου ‘Απαντα. (Η Λύρα - Λυρικά)*. Εισαγωγή Σπύρου Μυλωνά, Nicosia: «Keryneia» 1988, pp. 153-154.

and the Folk Song, constituted a kind of progressive intellectual leadership of the Greek people who were in revolt. At the same time, he took the opportunity to express his disapproval of one of the chief tendencies of "bourgeois" criticism, according to which the real poet must not connect his work with the expression of a particular political line. Once more, the attempt of left wing criticism to give a political, theoretical and aesthetic answer to the "representatives" of the other side is obvious<sup>12</sup>.

In 1959 George Valetas published the ode "Εἰς Ελαίαν Ὑμνος". In agreement with D. Ginis's view<sup>13</sup>, he attributes the poem to Andreas Kalvos; he finds a resilient, symbolic, and patriotic character in the ode, and he places it amongst the best Kalvian poems<sup>14</sup>. Some later references of Valetas to the "Poet of Virtue" are of no special interest<sup>15</sup>.

### III

The intellectual of the Greek Left who gave a significant impetus to Kalvian Studies and provided the basic elements for an entirely new perspective to Kalvos's life and work, is the poet's compatriot Porfirios Konidis, well known

12. See the opinions of Kostas Varnalis in *Ανδρέα Κάλβου Ὑμνος...*, *op. cit.*, p. 154: «Οἱ σταυροφόροι τῆς ἀπόλυτης ομορφιάς, που λέγονται κι' ἀνεξάρτητα πνεύματα, ἰσχυρίζονται πως ἡ αισθητικὴ δημιουργία δὲν πρέπει νὰ παρασύρεται ἀπ' τὴν πεζὴ ροὴ τῆς πραγματικότητας κι' ἐπομένως δὲ στέκει στὴν ἀξιοπρέπεια τῆς νὰ κάνει πολιτικὴ. Νὰ μὴν ἀνακατεύεται μὲ τὸν λαό, ὅταν ἀγωνίζεται γιὰ ὅ,τι πολυτιμότερο ἔχουν ὅλ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι: γιὰ λευτεριά, δικαιοσύνη κι' ἀλήθεια. Δυστυχῶς οἱ ἐθνικοὶ ποιητὲς κάνουνε ὁποιοδήποτε. Καὶ χάρῃ στὴν πολιτικὴ τοὺς εἶναι μεγάλοι καὶ ζωντανοὶ σ' ὅλους τοὺς καιροὺς. Τὸ κακὸ εἶναι πως τ' ἀνεξάρτητα πνεύματα εἶναι πολὺ ἐξαρτημένα καὶ κάνουνε κι' αὐτὰ πολιτικὴ, μὰ τὴ χειρότερη: πολιτικὴ ἀρνητικὴ... Γενικὰ δὲν ὑπάρχει Τέχνη ἐξωπολιτικὴ, ὅπως δὲν ὑπάρχει καὶ Δικαιοσύνη καὶ Ἠθικὴ καὶ Θρησκεία κι' Ἐπιστήμη. Τὸ πρόβλημα εἶναι πῶς πολιτεύεται ὁ κάθε τομέας τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μας πολιτισμοῦ: Θετικὰ ἢ ἀρνητικὰ, προοδευτικὰ ἢ ἀνασταλτικὰ, ὑπὲρ τοῦ Συνόλου ἢ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀλίγων. Ὁ Κάλβος, ὁ Σολωμός, τὸ δημοτικὸ μας τραγοῦδι κάνουνε τὴ σωστὴ πολιτικὴ: ὑπὲρ τοῦ Συνόλου —ἀγωνιστικὴ κι' ὄχι φυγῆς».

13. D. Ginis, «Μία ἀγνωστὴ ὠδὴ τοῦ Κάλβου», in *Νέα Ἑστία*, vol. 23, n. 269, 1 March 1938, pp. 347-349.

14. See G. Valetas, «Κάλβος, Εἰς Ελαίαν Ὑμνος», in *Τὸ Περιοδικό μας*, vol. 2, n. 17-18, November - December 1959, p. 95.

15. See G. Valetas, *Επίτομη Ἱστορία τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Ekdotis Petros K. Ranos 1966, pp. 83-84; *Τὸ Προδομένο Εἰκοσιένα. Ἡ πνιγμένη ἀναγέννηση. Ἡ ἐπαναστατικὴ κληρονομιά*, Athens: Filippotis <sup>2</sup>1979, pp. 127, 143, 162-163, 173; *Τῆς Ρωμιοσύνης. Δοκίμια*. Α' Κρατικὸ Βραβεῖο Δοκιμίου 1977, Athens: Filippotis <sup>2</sup>1982, pp. 55, 104, 105, 201. Cf. Dionisis Serras, *Ὁ Γιώργος Βαλέτας καὶ ἡ Ζάκυνθος. 50 χρόνια προσφοράς*, Zakynthos 1983, pp. 21, 44, 57.

by his philological nom de plume K. Porfiris. Porfiris was one of the most remarkable scholarly figures of the Left in Greece; he was the editor-in-chief of the notable periodical *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* for several years, and he provided us with a considerable number of articles, essays and studies on Heptanesian history, literature, theatre, and thought. He also published many books, comprehensive papers and reviews on Kalvos's life and poetry.

Porfiris was involved in the activities of the outlawed Communist Party of Greece (K.K.E.) from the early '30s, and he was repeatedly imprisoned and banished for his political beliefs. His theoretical and ideological positions, and the tribulations which they brought him, helped him to identify some characteristics of Kalvos's personality and ideology which had been problematic for historical researchers, philologists and the critics of "bourgeois" criticism. Porfiris was helped in his investigations by a thorough knowledge of the history of Europe, the Ionian Islands, and particularly of Zakynthos, and also by the love he felt for his native island.

Thus, where other Kalvicists concentrated on the profuse virtue and idealism of the twenty *odes* or merely described the biographical events of the bard's life, Porfiris spent time and effort on writing an "ideological biography" ("ιδεολογική βιογραφία") of his compatriot based on the circumstances and social conventions of Kalvos's age, and on a very careful interpretation of specific aspects of the *odes*. By participating in the outlawed acts of the Communist Party and fighting his own struggle for the ideals and principles of Socialism, as he saw them, he was able to consider and to analyse the Zantiot bard primarily as a revolutionary spirit and a fervent fighter of revolutionary ideas.

In this lies the chief difference between Porfiris and other researchers. His close friend who was also an intellectual of the Left, Kostas Kulufakos, observed in this connection:

Αυτό επίσης, ξεχωρίζει τον Πορφύρη τόσο από τους φιλόλογους όσο και από τους ιστορικούς ερευνητές, για τους οποίους η εύρεση (ανακάλυψη ή εξακρίβωση φιλολογικών ή ιστορικών πληροφοριών) και η τεκμηρίωση αποτελούν τον τελικό στόχο της εργασίας τους. Για τον Πορφύρη ο στόχος αυτός είναι μονάχα ένα μέσο. Χρησιμοποιεί τις ευρέσεις και τεκμηριώσεις για να αναπλάσει το πρόσωπο, την ανθρώπινη φυσιογνωμία. Και προχωρώντας ακόμη πιο πέρα, χρησιμοποιεί το πρόσωπο για να επισύρει την προσοχή στις ιδεολογικές συνιστώσες της φυσιογνωμίας του. Με δύο λόγια ο Πορφύρης φαίνεται να φιλοδοξεί με την έρευνά του να βρει τα

στοιχεία εκείνα που θα του επιτρέψουν να παρουσιάσει τους βιογραφούμενους κυρίως ως πολίτες, ως παραδείγματα αν και όχι αναγκαστικά και ως υποδείγματα. Νομίζω ότι τον προσανατολισμό του αυτόν τον καθορίζει το κοσμοθεωρητικό του πιστεύω. Μια έτσι προσανατολισμένη συγγραφική δραστηριότητα εγκυμονεί τον κίνδυνο να παρουσιάσει ασύνειδα ο βιογράφος τη δική του ιδεολογία σαν στοιχείο συστατικό της πνευματικής φυσιογνωμίας του βιογραφούμενου κι έτσι να δικαιώνει —αθέλητα ίσως— την προσωπική του πολιτική και ιδεολογική τοποθέτηση. Ο Πορφύρης είχε επίγνωση αυτού του κινδύνου και μπόρεσε να τον αποφύγει χάρη στο ότι πρώτα-πρώτα έκανε τις έρευνές του και χρησιμοποίησε τις ευρέσεις του με πνεύμα νηφάλιας εντιμότητας. Πουθενά δεν παραποιεί τα στοιχεία που βρήκε, πουθενά δεν χρησιμοποιεί 'μισές αλήθειες', πουθενά δεν εξωραϊζει πρόσωπα ή καταστάσεις<sup>16</sup>.

An earlier notable reference by Porfiris to Andreas Kalvos is found in his lengthy biography of Dionisios Solomos<sup>17</sup>. In less than two pages Porfiris compares the main characteristics of the personality and the poetic work of these two great Heptanesian literary figures and establishes the basic similarities and differences between them. Soon afterwards he returns to the same topic and expounds his opinions in detail. Porfiris had already made the connection between an opinion of Solomos on the meaning of virtue, as had been expressed by the latter in his *Elogio sul Ugo Foscolo*, and some verses of the first two stanzas from Kalvos's ode "Εις Δόξαν" and he concluded that both bards expressed ideas of European Romanticism which were widespread at that time<sup>18</sup>.

In 1959, Porfiris published his first paper on the poet, in which he examined three loosely related topics: the usage of uncontracted (*ασυναίρετα*) verbs in

16. Kostas Kulufakos, «Το ενδιαφέρον του Κ. Πορφύρη για τον Κάλβο», in *Περίπλους*, n. 5-6, Zakynthos, Spring-Summer 1985, p. 41. Furthermore, see the review by N.[ikos] G.[riparis] of an interesting lecture of K. Kulufakos, delivered in Zakynthos, in 1964: «Πνευματική κίνησης. Κ. Κουλουφάκος: 'Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος πρόδρομος της μοντέρνας ποίησης'. Διάλεξις στο Πνευματικό Κέντρο», in *Ταχυδρόμος της Ζακύνθου*, Zakynthos, 22 December 1964, p. 2.

17. K. Porfiris, *Διονύσιος Σολωμός. Ένας ποιητής, ένας άνθρωπος, μια εποχή*, Athens: Minoas 1958, pp. 261-262.

18. K. Porfiris, «Το Εγκώμιο του Σολωμού στον Ούγο Φόσκολο», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 6, n. 35-36, November - December 1957, p. 353 [= Yiannis Gudelis, *Ανθολογία της σύγχρονης κριτικής. Ποίηση - Πεζογραφία*, Athens: Difros 1959, p. 586].

*Λύρα* and *Λυρικά*, the year of Kalvos's visit to Samos and the impact of the political and natural environment of this island on him, and thirdly the "Ode agli Ionii", which he rendered into Greek<sup>19</sup>. Porfiris finds that the poetical sensibility of the bard forced him to make use of either contracted (*συννηρημένα*) or uncontracted (*ασυνναίρετα*) verbs, according to his aesthetic needs; to prove this, the author examined thirty excerpts from the *odes*. Porfiris believes that Kalvos's trip and stay in Samos must be dated around 1806-1807, and then he connects the rebellious society of the island at that time with the subsequently rebellious character of the poet and he rightly correlates natural images from the ode "Εἰς Σάμον" with parallel ones from the ode "Ο Φιλόπατρις". In presenting the contents of the "Ode agli Ionii", Porfiris established the stylistic and ideological relationship between the poem and the Greek *odes* (for instance, Kalvos's view on the pedagogic role of a poet, on liberalism, and the praise of Virtue), and, for the first time, he provided a literary translation of this ode, in which he imitates the versification, the language and the style of Kalvos. Lastly, Porfiris perceptively maintains that the omission of Kalvos's enlightening notes to the text of the "Ode agli Ionii" in the edition by Zoras should be attributed to the fact that the Greek and Italian Fascist censorship of the late '30s could not have passed the hints of anti-despotism made by the "Poet of Virtue".

The following year, Porfiris published three further articles on Kalvos's life and work. In the first he elucidated the poetic techniques Kalvos used to give effective expression to his psychological world, the relationship between Kalvos and Solomos, and the political activity of the Zantiot bard<sup>20</sup>. Porfiris maintained that the rhythmical diversities, the internal rhyme, the peculiar syntactic structure, the musicality, the chasmodies (*χασμωδίες*), the idiosyncratic usage of participles and adjectives, constitute some of the main stylistic characteristics of the *odes*. Moreover, Porfiris showed that there is a distant affinity between the two greatest Zantiot bards and he noted the fact that both of them knew the Heptanesian scholar Yeoryios De-Rossi well. He demonstrated that Kalvos's poetry was primarily an obvious political act. In analysing the most important political landmarks in his life, he assumed that the "Poet of Virtue" had been involved in the revolutionary movement of the *Carbonari*. He acutely distinguished Kalvos's rebellious political activities prior to the twenty *odes* from his ideological compromise after his arrival on Corfu.

19. K. Porfiris, «Στοχασμοί πάνω στον Κάλβο», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 9, n. 50-51, February - March 1959, pp. 106-114.

20. K. Porfiris, «Καλβικά Σημειώματα», in *Επτανησιακή Πρωτοχρονιά*, vol. 1, Athens: «Pirforos» 1960, pp. 99-107.

The second paper by Porfiris in this year again examines Kalvos's relationship with Solomos and his political ideology<sup>21</sup>. As regards the first of these topics, he claims that the different social position, education and literary influences of the two compatriots explain why they followed completely different poetic traditions. But Porfiris also maintains that as products of their age Kalvos and Solomos were both reared in the same social conventions and philosophical tendencies. They were both inspired by the Greek Revolution, which Porfiris sees from a "progressive" democratic point of view; they both believed in the pedagogic and instructive role of a poet and condemned the negative sides of the struggle; both had been influenced by Romanticism; they had almost identical views on moral liberty; and their revolutionary enthusiasm had clearly diminished after the Revolution had ended. On the other hand, Porfiris systematically investigated the impact of the events of 1797 in Zakynthos, the teachings and the liberal verses of Andonios Martelaos, the "Enlightened" environment of Livorno, the mutinous situation in Samos, the apprenticeship to Ugo Foscolo, the labour disturbances in England, the Italian *Carbonarism*, European Philhellenism, and the philosophical thought of the French Revolution, in the formation of Kalvos's political ideology. The philosophical principles of the French Enlightenment and the political preachings of the most important leaders of the Revolution of 1789 can easily be seen underlying Kalvos's position regarding death, tyranny, and even Virtue and God<sup>22</sup>.

Lastly, Porfiris's third paper of this year (1960), which was first delivered as a lecture at the festival of the *Εταιρία Ελλήνων Λογοτεχνών*<sup>23</sup>, examines Kalvos's short stay in the rebellious Greek regions at the end of 1826<sup>24</sup>. As regards the date of Kalvos's arrival in Nauplion, Porfiris bases his arguments on the relevant studies of Enepekidis and Zoras. He seems to believe that the

21. K. Porfiris, «Γύρω στον Κάλβο», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 11, n. 63-64, March-April 1960, pp. 191-199.

22. K. Porfiris, *Καλβικά διάφορα*, Athens 1960. See with reference to this publication Anonymous, «Καλβικά διάφορα», in *Προοδευτική*, Zakynthos, 3 June 1960, p. 3; Marietta Yiannopulu, «Πνευματική ανασκόπησης. Από τα βιβλία που εκδόθηκαν τη χρονιά που πέρασε: [...] Κ. Πορφύρη: 'Καλβικά Διάφορα'», in *Ταχυδρόμος της Ζακύνθου*, Zakynthos, 10 January 1961, p. 1.

23. Cf. also note 11 of this paper.

24. K. Porfiris, «Ο Κάλβος στην επαναστατημένη Ελλάδα», in *Ευβοϊκός Λόγος*, vol. 3, n. 29-30, Halkida, July-August 1960, pp. 36-37 [= K. Porfiris, *Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος Καρμπονάρος. Η μυστική δίκη των Καρμπονάρων της Τροσκάνης*, [Athens:] Themelio [1975], pp. 141-150].

“Poet of Virtue” was disappointed by the situation which he found in Greece, a situation which did not correspond with his democratic and revolutionary beliefs at all; Porfiris also assumes that the extreme political ideals of Kalvos may have been the chief hindrance to any co-operation with the Greek government. Of course, nowadays it is accepted that Kalvos arrived in Greece to teach in the Ionian Academy of Lord Guilford<sup>25</sup>.

In 1961, Porfiris published two reviews of five publications on Kalvos's life and literary work<sup>26</sup>. Porfiris's observations and proposals are significant and refer to a great variety of specific topics concerning the Zantiot bard. To these writings one can add a later review of the edition of the twenty *odes* by M. G. Meraklis<sup>27</sup>, as well as a successful translation of an essay on Kalvos by Mario Vitti<sup>28</sup>.

The following year Porfiris published an extensive biography of the poet, written in an outstanding literary style, more reminiscent of a novel than a philological-historical treatise<sup>29</sup>. Porfiris's desire was to describe the life of Andreas Kalvos in a comprehensive and uncomplicated way. The subtitle of the book (*Μυθιστορηματική Βιογραφία*) underlines this. Porfiris of course makes use of the available biographical information about Kalvos and at the end of the book he cites his scholarly sources. Porfiris connects the social and political environment of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with the particular events of Kalvos's life. It is characteristic of his uncannily accurate instinct, that before he even knew of the bard's active participation in the *Carbonari* movement, he portrayed him involved in a vivid dialogue with the secret police of Florence! In short, this is a book addressed to the general public, but based on actual facts. Porfiris was following a general principle of the Greek Left that important scholarly and literary subjects should be popularised so that they are understood by as many people as possible. Porfiris

25. Cf. Vasiliki Bombu-Stamati, «Από την αλληλογραφία του Γκίλφορντ με τον Κάλβο και το Σολωμό», in *Δελτίο της Ιονίου Ακαδημίας*, vol. II [Afieroma sti mnimi tu Linu Politi], Corfu 1986, pp. 197-198 and 203-204.

26. K. Porfiris, «Γεωρ. Θ. Ζώρα: 1) Ανδρέας Κάλβος. 2) Ωδή εις Ιονίους και άλλα μελετήματα. Αθήνα 1960», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 14, July 1961, pp. 87-89, and K. Porfiris, «Καλβικά: Κων. Σολδάτου 'Ανδρέας Κάλβος'. Σ. Α. Σωφρονίου 'Ανδρέας Κάλβος'. Εκδ. Γαλαξίας: 'Α. Κάλβου: Ωδαί'», *ibid.*, n. 82, October 1961, pp. 351-352.

27. K. Porfiris, «Μ. Γ. Μερακλή, Ανδρέα Κάλβου Ωδές», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 23, n. 133-134, January - February 1966, p. 140.

28. See Mario Vitti, «Ο Κάλβος ανάμεσα στις αντινομίες του καιρού του <Μετάφραση Κ. Πορφύρη>», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 20, n. 115-116, July - August 1964, pp. 8-27.

29. K. Porfiris, *Ανδρέας Κάλβος ο Αγέλαστος. Μυθιστορηματική Βιογραφία*, Athens: «20ος Εonas» 1962.

had followed a very similar method in his biography of Dionisios Solomos<sup>30</sup>. This attempt by Porfiris to construct fictional biographies of great literary figures found few imitators<sup>31</sup>.

In fact, Porfiris gives priority to the investigation of Kalvos's life and he does this within the general framework of left wing criticism, which places arti-

30. Cf. note 17 of this paper.

31. It is important to cite Vasos Varikas's critical views on Porfiris's book, in order to show an opposite method, followed by the «bourgeois» critics, of interpreting literary and scholarly phenomena: «Μετά τον Σολωμό, ο κ. Κ. Πορφύρης καταπιάνεται με τον Κάλβο. Το νέο του βιβλίο 'Αγέλαστος' επιχειρεί την μυθιστορηματική βιογράφηση του ποιητή των 'Ωδών'. Προσωπικά, αμφιβάλλω αν ο χαρακτηρισμός, που ορθά έδωσε στην ποίηση του Κάλβου ο Μάρκος Αυγέρης, ταιριάζει και για τον ίδιο τον ποιητή, ακόμη και όπως μας τον βιογραφεί ο κ. Πορφύρης. Αμφιβάλλω ακόμη και για την σκοπιμότητα των λεγομένων 'μυθιστορηματικών βιογραφιών', όσο κι' αν είναι της μόδας τα τελευταία χρόνια. Φοβάμαι ότι αντί να πλησιάζουν, με την 'εκλαίκευση' που επιχειρούν, το ευρύτερο κοινό προς την δημιουργία του ποιητή, το απομακρύνουν οριστικά. Πληροφορούμενο τα εντυπωσιακά καθεκαστα της ζωής τους, νομίζει ότι εξάντλησε και το έργο τους. Η τελευταία αυτή παρατήρηση, ωστόσο δεν αναφέρεται παρά επεισοδιακά στο βιβλίο που μας απασχολεί. Γιατί τα 'μυθιστορηματικά' στοιχεία που συναντάμε στον 'Αγέλαστο' είναι ελάχιστα και θα μπορούσαν ίσως να παραλειφθούν, χωρίς το βιβλίο να χάσει την όποια προσωπικότητά του. Ο μελετητής προηγείται και ρίχνει συχνά εντελώς στην σκία τον μυθιστοριογράφο, μολοντί ο τελευταίος δίνει κάποτε αφορμή στον πρώτο να επεκταθεί στην έρευνα κοινωνικών καταστάσεων και φαινομένων, που απλώς εφάπτονται με την ζωή και το έργο του ποιητή. Είναι το σημείο, που διερευνά με λεπτομερέστερο και με μεγαλύτερο πάθος, θα έλεγα, ο κ. Πορφύρης. Για να μας δώσει πολλές και ενδιαφέρουσες πληροφορίες για το κοινωνικό, το πολιτικό και το ιδεολογικό κλίμα, το ευρωπαϊκό και το ελληνικό, των πρώτων δεκαετιών του περασμένου αιώνα· φυσικό, άλλωστε, αφού ανήκει στην σχολή, που βλέπει τον ποιητή δημιουργήμα, πριν απ' όλα, του περιβάλλοντός του. Με την ίδια άνεση, ωστόσο, κινείται ο συγγραφέας και στα βιογραφικά του ποιητή. Μπορεί κάποτε να διαφωνείς στις ερμηνείες που δίνει ή να διακρίνεις μια υποσυνείδητη ίσως τάση, η συμπάθεια προς τον βιογραφούμενο ή η ανάγκη της δικαίωσης μιας από τα πριν σχηματισμένης αντίληψης που οδηγεί σε κρίσεις και συλλογισμούς, που αντιδικούν με την πραγματικότητα, δεν μπορείς όμως να του αμφισβητήσεις ούτε την γνώση ούτε την φιλέρευνη διάθεση. Από τον 'Αγέλαστο' του κ. Πορφύρη ο αναγνώστης θα πληροφορηθεί πολλά για τη ζωή του ποιητή, τις συνθήκες μέσα στις οποίες υποχρεώθηκε να εργασθεί, για το περιβάλλον και την εποχή του. Μονάχα για την ποίησή του και την κριτική αποτίμησή της, κι ας μη το αγνοεί και το κεφάλαιο αυτό ο κ. Πορφύρης, δεν ξέρω αν θα βγει το ίδιο πλούσιος σε γνώσεις. Και προσωπικά, πιστεύω ότι το διάβασμα και η κατανόηση δέκα στίχων του ποιητή, αξίζουν περισσότερο από δεκάδες τόμους για την ζωή και την εποχή του...» (See *Το Βήμα*, 22 July 1962, p. 2). For other reviews on the same book, see Anonymous, «Ο Αγέλαστος», in *Προοδευτική*, Zakynthos, 31 July 1962, p. 2; Anonymous, «Κ. Πορφύρη: 'Ο Αγέλαστος'», in *Ηχώ της Ζακύνθου*, Zakynthos, 8 August 1962, p. 2; Anonymous, «Πνευματική κίνηση του 1962», in *Η Αλήθεια*, Zakynthos, 9 February 1963, p. 1.

stic phenomena within their historical context and correlates political, economical and social circumstances with their literary and scholarly products.

The most significant contribution of Porfiris to the development of Kalvian Studies and, unquestionably, the most important paper on Kalvos's life in the last twenty-five years, is concerned with the active involvement and participation of the "Poet of Virtue" in the revolutionary movement of the *Carbonari*. As already pointed out, Porfiris had already imagined and assumed such actions on the part of Kalvos. In the summer of 1963 Veatriki Spiliadi carried out a search in the *Archivio di Stato di Firenze* on the request of her close friend Porfiris, and with the assistance of Anioletti, the deputy mayor of Florence, photocopied a great number of the documents relating to the subject (it is now clear that for a long period of time, the Greek authorities did not provide Porfiris with a passport because of his political activities)<sup>32</sup>. The impressive outcome of this research, which proved the participation of the Zantiot bard in the activities of the *Secret Carboneria of Tuscany* and explained Kalvos's deportation from the Austrian kingdom, were first published in the periodical *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* in the same year<sup>33</sup>. The friendship of Kalvos with the scholar Silvio Pellico, who was well known for his revolutionary beliefs, the evidence of Querinna Mocceni Magiotti that Kalvos had moved away from Florence because of his political position and the fervent *jacobeanism* of the *odes* which developed within the environment of the Italian nationalistic and democratic movements provided the main evidence for Porfiris's hypothesis. Kalvos's relationships with some Italian political fugitives in London merely underpinned Porfiris's first thoughts.

In his introduction to the Greek translation of some very important documents relating to Kalvos's involvement with the *Secret Carboneria of Tuscany*, Porfiris sketched the European historical context of the second decade of the nineteenth century, as well as the significant role of the organisation of the *Carbonari* in the struggle for liberation from the Napoleontian and Austrian

32. See Veatriki Spiliadi, «Ένα υποκειμενικό κείμενο για τον Κ. Πορφύρη», in *Περίπλους*, n. 5-6, Zakynthos, Spring-Summer 1985, pp. 42-43. Cf. K. Porfiris, «Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος στέλεχος των Καρμπονάρων (άγνωστα έγγραφα)», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 18, n. 106-107, October - November 1963, pp. 372-373, 385 (notes 3-4). See particularly note 3 on page 385: «Οι κωλυσιεργίες, οι δυσκολίες, τα εμπόδια, οι αρνήσεις και οι απαγορεύσεις που συναντούσαν οι δημοκρατικοί πολίτες για την έκδοση του διαβατηρίου, ήταν η βασική αιτία». See also, K. Porfiris, *Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος Καρμπονάρος. Η μυστική δίκη των Καρμπονάρων της Τοσκάνης...*, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

33. K. Porfiris, «Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος στέλεχος των Καρμπονάρων (άγνωστα έγγραφα)», op. cit., pp. 372-385.

occupation of Italy. Subsequently, Porfiris cited several reports of the Secret Police of Florence, and excerpts from testimonies to the Secret Trial of the Tuscanian Carboneria (amongst them one by Kalvos), from which it emerges that the poet was a notable member of the *Carbonari*. Porfiris also elucidated some specific questions about Kalvos's life. In his conclusion Porfiris made some brief comments on the revolutionary nature of Kalvos's personality and poetry. Thus, he considers that the twenty *odes* primarily express the democratic, anti-tyrannic, and anti-royalist spirit of the Italian Carbonarism and he maintains that the opposition of most of the Greek leaders to the democratic ideology of the "Secret Societies" had forced the bard to leave the rebel Greek areas and depart in haste to Corfu in 1826.

It is not without significance that Porfiris makes use of the contemporary terminology of the Left, when describing quite old historical phenomena; in my opinion, expressions such as *δημοκρατικό, αντιτυραννικό, αντιβασιλικό πνεύμα* indicate the deepest strategic aims and political ambitions of the Greek Left during this period: the fervent anti-monarchism, the systematic attempt to connect the Royal Family of Greece with tyranny as well as the desire of the Greek Left to establish a democratic socialist régime are obvious.

Around the mid-'60s, Porfiris went to Italy for further detailed research in the Florentine archives. The outcome was to be printed in 1967, but the dictatorship of the colonels prevented its circulation; it was finally published eight years after the death of Porfiris Konidis<sup>34</sup> with a preface by Kostas Kulufakos.

Kulufakos describes the various tribulations of this publication, and he notes the concern of Porfiris for the life and work of Kalvos. In his introduction Porfiris briefly analyses the way he arrived at his conclusion that the Zantiot bard had participated in the revolutionary movement of the *Carbonari*. Then, he writes at length about the Secret Societies in Europe, particularly in Italy, during the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century, and he correlates parts of the Kalvian poetry with the ethical teachings of the masonic lodges: «Η αρετολογία, η θρησκευτική ελευθερότητα και ο ορθολογισμός του Κάλβου πρέπει να εξεταστούν και κάτω από το πρίσμα των μυητικών στοιχείων του μυστικού εταιρισμού»<sup>35</sup>. Then Porfiris reviews the relationship of the poet with his father and he presumes that the latter had been involved in the activities of the Freemasons of Alexandria. He notes the importance of Kalvos's re-

34. See K. Porfiris, *Ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος Καρμπονάρος. Η μυστική δίκη των Καρμπονάρων της Τοσκάνης...*, *op. cit.*

35. *Ibid.*, p. 18, note 2.

lations with Ugo Foscolo and Silvio Pellico and his contacts with Italian democrats in London. Porfiris then discusses the origins and the development of *Carbonarism*, the revolts of the Italians against Austrian domination in 1820-1821, the organisation of the Tuscanian Secret Police and the political action of the *Secret Carboneria of Tuscany*. The later part of the book investigates the Trial of the Tuscanian Carbonari and the participation of the "Poet of Virtue" in their conspiratorial activities. The testimonies of the suspects provide much valuable detail about Kalvos's life and also the structure of Carbonarism in Tuscany.

This work by Porfiris must be considered as a very important contribution to the history of European and in particular Italian revolutionary movements in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. At the end, Porfiris links the rebellious spirit of the *Carbonari* with the progressive philhellenic climate. The book also contains an appendix on Kalvos's short stay in Nauplion<sup>36</sup>.

Undeniably, these studies by Porfiris Konidis approach the life and the literary texts of the poet of the *odes* from an entirely new perspective. At the same time, they provide a well-documented introduction to the world of the European masonic lodges, they elucidate wide-ranging and unclear aspects of Kalvos's life and they present several new problems which must be resolved by future historical and philological research<sup>37</sup>.

Before I close this paper which has mainly covered the way in which Andreas Kalvos was seen by the critics of the Greek Left up to 1960, let me mention an indirect allusion to the Zantiot bard, by the well known communist leader (later executed) Nikos Beloyiannis:

Τους καλαμαράδες τους διώχνουν από κοντά τους πολλοί αγωνιστές και ο Σολωμός τους βάζει δίπλα στους Τούρκους. (Στο διάλογο;). Το 21 σφυρηλατούσε και την πνευματική ένωση των Ε-

36. Cf. note 24 of this paper.

37. On Porfiris's particular interest in Kalvos's life and work, see further, Titos Patrikios, «Ο μυθικός και ο αληθινός Πορφύρης», in *Περίπλους*, n. 5-6, Zakynthos, Spring-Summer 1985, p. 19; Tasos Vurnas, «Ο άνθρωπος και το πνευματικό του έργο», *ibid.*, p. 23; Dionisis Serras, «Τα Ζακυνθινά (και άλλα Επτανησιακά) κείμενα του Κ. Πορφύρη στην 'Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης'», *ibid.*, pp. 50-52; Anonymous, «Βιβλιογραφία Κ. Πορφύρη», *ibid.*, p. 52; Yiorgos Andreiomenos, «Η συμμετοχή του Ανδρέα Κάλβου στα επαναστατικά και φιλελληνικά κινήματα της Ευρώπης», in *Τετράμηνα*, n. 30, Amphissa, Spring 1986, pp. 2000-2001. K. Porfiris dealt with Kalvos in an anthology which he assembled in 1964: K. Porfiris, *Ποιητική Ανθολογία 1650-1964. Πρόλογος Νικηφόρου Βρεττάκου*, [Athens:] Takis Drakopoulos 1964, pp. 222-237, 256-257.

φτανήσων με την άλλη Ελλάδα. Μα αντί να τους δεχτούν σαν τα χελιδόνια μιας Άνοιξης, τους αγνόησαν ή τους αποπήραν. Τι λέει ο Σούτσος για το Σολωμό και Κάλβο; Ο Κάλβος και ο Σολωμός, ωδοποιοί μεγάλοι κλπ.<sup>38</sup>.

It is a direct criticism of the spirit of the Phanariots which strove to exclude the literary products of the Heptanesian poets, basically because of their different scholarly tradition, and their linguistic and metrical forms.

After an analytical examination of these critiques on Kalvos, some basic features of the Left's literary criticism in Greece become apparent.

First, the reception of Kalvos's poetry by circles of the Greek Left was, perhaps surprisingly, very positive. Why so? One has to bear in mind the complicated political and social conventions in the 1950s, in order to understand the artistic positions of the left wing. Since the Left was then under political persecution, it was normal for it to attempt to encompass and appropriate leading figures or radical ideas from the past and compare them to present intellectual or social phenomena. Under this premise, Andreas Kalvos was considered as a "progressive" poet who not only sang the feats of the Greek revolutionaries but also fought against any type of political oppression. In their eyes Kalvos became a poet-leader, who showed to the Greek leftists the road of uncompromising struggle. Dionisios Solomos constituted another brilliant example in this direction. And it is no mere coincidence that Varnalis, a kind of poetical idol to the Greek leftists of that period, claimed in this connection: «Στους σημερινούς μάλιστα καιρούς, που η ελευθερία διώχνεται από παντού κ' η τυραννία όλο κι' απλώνεται περισσότερο, το κάλεσμα των δύο μεγάλων ποιητών [Solomos and Kalvos] ακούγεται πιο βροντερό μέσα στην ψυχή του έθνους»<sup>39</sup>.

Kalvos was seen as a fervent patriot, who believed in an optimistic future for the world, a future which was to come after complete self-denial by the individual on behalf of society. And that of course was also one of the most wide-spread tenets of Socialism. The examples of Kalvos and Solomos served to demonstrate this position<sup>40</sup>. Their poetical output was distinguished by their obvious political character.

38. Nikos Beloyiannis, *Κείμενα από την απομόνωση*, Athens: «Sinhroni Epohi» <sup>2</sup>1983, p. 142.

39. Kostas Varnalis, «Σολωμός - Το μεγάλο μάθημα», *op. cit.*, p. 192.

40. On Solomos see Yioryis Valtinos, «Ο πατριωτισμός του Σολωμού και οι υβριστές του», in *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 2, n. 10, October 1955, pp. 325-327; Anonymous, «Οι σωλωμικές γιορτές», *ibid.*, vol. 5, n. 27, March 1957, p. 272.

However, if Rigas Ferreos<sup>41</sup>, Dionisios Solomos and Andreas Kalvos attracted the interest of the Greek Left for their magnanimous patriotism and the political aspects of their poetry, other poets and intellectuals, such as Cavafy, Kariotakis and subsequently Seferis and the literary "generation of the 1930s", were commented upon differently. Cavafy and Kariotakis were primarily seen as typical examples of a world in decline; this world was identified for a long period with the world of the western societies<sup>42</sup>. Seferis was seen as the chief representative of contemporary "bourgeois" poetry<sup>43</sup>. Underlying these literary positions was a suppressed political view fighting back against representatives of the opposing camp.

The interpretation of the literary products of these intellectuals was based on Marxist methodology, which contrasted with the artistic credos of the other side — "bourgeois" criticism. These artistic credos had a lot to do with the well known dogma *l'art pour l'art*. The intelligentsia of the Greek Left was openly and strongly opposed to this dogma. They supported their position by introducing an analysis of literary phenomena which primarily related artistic works with historical events. Some points of Kalvos's poems were obviously seen in a narrow perspective but, at the same time, other, previously unidentified sides of Kalvos's work, were unearthed and commented upon. The same critical stance was taken towards the other poets mentioned above.

41. On Rigas and Solomos see *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, vol. 6, n. 35-36, November - December 1957.

42. On Cavafy and Kariotakis see M. M. Papaioannu, «Φαινόμενα ακμής και παρακμής στη Νεοελληνική Ποίηση», *ibid.*, vol. 1, n. 2, February 1955, pp. 85, 87, 88, 89, 92; cf. *ibid.*, vol. 3, n. 15, March 1956, pp. 209-219; Manolis Lambridis, «'Il gran rifiuto' (Καβάφης - Βάρναλης - Καρυωτάκης και η παρακμή)», *ibid.*, vol. 2, n. 7, July 1955, pp. 29-42; Tasos Vurnas, «Φαινόμενα του 'διαλεκτικού' εκλεκτικισμού. Ο κ. Μανώλης Λαμπρίδης και η παρακμή», *ibid.*, vol. 2, n. 8, August 1955, pp. 120-125; Manolis Lambridis, «Και πάλι περί Βάρναλη, Καβάφη κ.λπ.», *ibid.*, vol. 6, n. 31, July 1957, pp. 50-51. See also two articles by Stratis Tsirkas: «Οι περιστάσεις του μεγάλου όχιν», *ibid.*, vol. 2, n. 12, December 1955, pp. 450-463 and «Η Κόλαση της πόλης», *ibid.*, vol. 8, n. 43, July 1958, pp. 5-18. On Cavafy and Tsirkas see the interesting point made by X. A. Kokolis in «Το έργο του Σεφέρη και η αριστερή κριτική 1931-1950. Επιλογή κειμένων και πρώτος σχολιασμός», in *Σεφερίκας, I*. Athens: Ikaros 1982, p. 79: «[...] 1958 το βιβλίο *Ο Καβάφης και η εποχή του* του Στρ. Τσίρκα αρχίζει να συμβιβάζει τους αριστερούς με τον 'παρακμια' Αλεξανδρινό [...]». See also, M. M. Papaioannu, «Οχτωβριανή επανάσταση και ελληνική λογοτεχνία», in *Νέα Εποχή*, n. 194, Limassol, January-February 1989, pp. 11-12.

43. On Seferis and the other representatives of the generation of the 1930s see M. M. Papaioannu, «Φαινόμενα ακμής και παρακμής στη Νεοελληνική Ποίηση», *op. cit.*, p. 88. On the reception of Seferis by left wing criticism see X. A. Kokolis, «Το έργο του Σεφέρη και η αριστερή κριτική 1931-1950. Επιλογή κειμένων και πρώτος σχολιασμός», *op. cit.*, pp. 77-93 [= *Αντί*, 5.2.77, pp. 30-33].

In short, the criticism of the Greek Left gave an important impetus to the investigation of Kalvos's life and work from a new point of view. After the critical intervention of the Left on Kalvos, the poet of the *odes* was confirmed on the highest pedestal of modern Greek Parnassus.

*Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies  
The University of Birmingham*