

# THE GREEKS OF THE DIASPORA

## A REVIEW ARTICLE

‘Ο Ἑλληνισμὸς εἰς τὸ Ἐξωτερικόν. Über Beziehungen des Griechentums zum Ausland in der neueren Zeit. Herausgegeben von Johannes Irmscher und Marika Mineemi. *Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten*, Band 40, [ed], Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für griechisch-römische Altertumskunde, Berlin, 1968, pp. VIII+583+6 pl. (between pp. 296-297. and pp. 338-339).

This impressive volume contains seventeen papers by scholars from Germany, Cyprus, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Italy, Austria and France. In each one of them some hitherto neglected or little known aspects or aspect of the historical, especially intellectual activity of Modern Hellenism in countries other than Greece proper are being studied. Still, as the editors state (p.V), “*vermochte der Band keine Geschichte des Diasporagriechentums zu geben*”: it simply offers materials to be used for writing such a “History of the Greek Diaspora,” which is indeed a *desideratum* of our studies. To appreciate its importance we should first examine separately each one of the contributions included in it.

1. Georg Max Hartmann, Brandenburg: *Die Rolle Venedigs in den Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Griechenland und Italien* (pp. 1-34). This study serves as a sort of introduction to the Volume and is divided into: I. *Vorbemerkung* (pp. 1-3), II. *Einleitung* (pp. 3-5), III. *Die Entwicklung der venezianischen Handelsmacht* (pp. 6-21), IV. *Der Anteil Venedigs an den kulturellen Beziehungen zwischen Griechenland und Italien* (pp. 21-31), V. *Schlussbetrachtung* (pp. 31-32). Though the literature used by the author (pp. 32-34) is only a fragment of what one would expect for the treatment of such a wide subject, yet the material occurring in the text is important, and points to a more complete study to be effected, in which none could regret the absence of materials such as those published or examined in detail by I. Voyatzides, D. Geanakoplos, J. Irmscher, M. Manoussakas, N.B. Tomadakis, G. Zoras, R-J. Loenertz, Ag. Pertusi and other scholars, especially those

recently working in the Greek Institute of Byzantine and Postbyzantine Studies in Venice. Just by way of example I am citing one of the items unknown to Hartmann though pertinent to his subject-matter: Evro Layton, "Nikodemos Metaxas, The first Greek Printer in the Eastern World," *Harvard Bulletin*, XV, 2 April 1967, pp. 140-168, and 6 plates containing 35 figures, with a rich bibliography (pp. 161-166). It should equally be underlined that no mention of the role of Greek islands or other provinces occupied by the Venetians in the exchanges between Greece and Italy occurs in this study. Nor can I find sufficient reference to the part played by the Greek scholars, printers and publishers in Venice (e.g. see Irmscher, in *Probleme der neugriechischen Literatur*, III, Berlin, 1959, pp. 144-179), and especially Deno Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, Cambridge, 1962; (cf. my own paper below no. 4). Still Hartmann's grasp of the subject is generally correct and covers several of its substantial aspects.

2. Režena Dostálova-Jemištová, Praha: *Eine neu-gefundene Schrift des Jakob Palaeologus. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Wirkung des italienisch gebildeten Griechentums in Mitteleuropa* (pp. 35-44, and 5 plates). In this well-documented article there is much new about the little known sixteenth century Chian Dominican Jacob Palaeologus, of the Guistiniani family, who studied in Italy, lived in exile in Poland, Moravia and Transylvania, and died on the Inquisitions' pyre as a heretic. What is new about Jacob's career and ideological evolution comes from an unpublished work of his preserved in Moravia, which was addressed from Hluk, a small town in South Moravia, to the Queen of England on 23.IX.1576, and also from several equally unpublished documents from the *Staatszentralarchiv Prag*. It seems that Jacob, already known to have been a secret agent of the Austrian Royal House, had met an English delegation in Praha and grasped the opportunity to communicate to their Queen his feelings of grudge against his persecutor Pope Pius V and some of his ideas on the monopoly of Saint Peter's succession by the Pope—which he violently attacks,—on the relation between church and state and relevant matters which might interest the throne of England at that time. As Dostálova states, "*Palaeologus' Kritik des römischen Papstums natürlich in keinem Punkte von der Position oder unter dem Einfluss der griechischen orthodoxen Kritik geführt wird. Diese Tatsache entspricht seiner katholischen italienischen Bildung...*" (p. 43).

Of great interest are the information and remarks of D. about P.'s,

unpublished works and about his attitude towards Calvin, Calvinism and Michael Serveto (Servetus), whom he defended against the Calvinists' intolerance, thus proving liberal-minded in a widest sense. To the literature used by the author add also Gustav Gündisch, "Zum Siebenbürgischen Aufenthalt des Jacobus Palaeologus," *Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes*, IV. 1-2, 1966, pp. 71-79.

3. Anneliese Malina, Berlin: Nikandros Nukios, 'Αποδημῖαι, *Buch I. Bericht über seine Reise durch Deutschland in den Jahren 1545-1546* (pp. 45-181). The author gives a new critical edition of Book One of Nikandros Nukios' 'Αποδημῖαι (pp. 59-139) provided with a German translation, an apparatus criticus, a "Register" (pp. 140-146), and numerous important "Erläuternde Anmerkungen zum Text" (pp. 147-181), and preceded by a useful "Einleitung" (pp. 45-58). This edition has been deemed necessary by Malina despite the appearance of a complete edition of all three Books of Nukios' 'Αποδημῖαι by J.A. de Foucault (Paris, 1962): in the latter occur "eine Reihe bedauerlicher Fehler," which Malina corrects in her edition. Several of Malina's corrections are based on a careful reading of the Codices and are indubitably acceptable, some of them even being important and essential (e. g. see 35.3 and 35.4), while in other cases she has adopted some of Foucault's corrections. However even in her own text a number of slips or errata occur, which will be corrected in another article of the present writer.

4. Κωνσταντῖνος Π. Κύρρης, Λευκωσία: *Cypriote Scholars in Venice in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries with some notes on the Cypriote Community in Venice and other Cypriote Scholars who lived in Rome and the rest of Italy in the same period* (pp. 183-272). This survey is based both on published and unpublished material, the latter taken from the Archives of the Greek Church in Venice (see especially pp. 192-203), and has used most of the achievements of modern scholarship in an effort to arrive at a fresh and profound grasp of the subject. In the Notes (pp. 235-272) besides bibliographical references and documentation are contained materials of importance, which could be included in the text. Still a number of errors, both slips and errata as well as omissions occur in my article too, some of them to be corrected in the light of recent research. This correction will be attempted on another opportunity.

5. Gyula Moravcsik, Budapest: 'Οδοιπορικὸ τῆς Σιβηρίας σὲ 'Ελληνικὴ γλῶσσα (pp. 273-288) [= *An Itinerary of Siberia in Greek*]. This article was originally written and published in Hungarian by the famous

Byzantinist of Budapest, and was translated for the Volume under consideration into Greek by Dem. Hatzes. It deals with a text "Διήγησις περὶ τοῦ Σιμπηρίου ἐν συνόψει" found in Cod. Paris. Supplem. Gr. 672. This text was translated from the Russian original into "Phanariotic" Greek and may have probably been written by Nicolaos Spatharios the "Moldovalacon," first interpreter of the Russian Court since 1671, who had been entrusted with a mission to China four years later and written in Russian an "Itinerary of Siberia" and other works. Prof. Moravcsik traces the similarities and differences between the Διήγησις and the <Itinerary>, which he knows from its Roumanian translation by G. Sion (1889), having not been able to consult its Greek translation made for Chrysanthos Notaras in 1693. The article ends with a survey of Greek translations of Russian works toward the end of the XVIIth century.

6. Robert Benedicty, Budapest: *Eine unedierte Rede von Nikephoros, Metropolit von Cherson* (pp. 289-295 and 1 plate). The speech in question is a "Προσφώνημα τῇ εὐσεβεστάτῃ θεοστέπτῳ τρισεγίστῃ/καὶ φιλανθρωποτάτῃ Αὐγούστῃ Κυρίᾳ Αἰκατερίνῃ Ἀλεξίδᾳ/Αὐτοκράτορι πάσης Ρωσσίας/ἐκφωνηθὲν ὑπὸ Νικηφόρου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Σλαβονίου καὶ/Χερσῶνος/ καθ' ἣν ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης βαθμὸν προεβιάσθη," published from a Greek MS in the National Library of Budapest. The text is followed by a short but substantial commentary bearing upon the historical context of the speech, in which Nikephoros Theotokis "spricht als griechischer Patriot und als orthodoxer Christ" asking Catherine, the protector of the Eastern Church, to liberate the enslaved Greek people. One notable default of Benedicty's documentation is his ignorance of Greek bibliography (e.g. Demaras, etc.). For N. Theotokis and especially for his work Ἀπόδειξις τοῦ κύρους τῶν τῆς Νέας καὶ Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης βιβλίων... see now my article "Ἀνέκδοτος ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Σεργίου Μακραιῶν (1805)"..., *Στασίνο*, III, (1966-1967), 1968, pp. 101-119, espec. 103 ff.

7. Jan Reyehman, Warszawa: *Une famille albanaise au service de la Pologne au XVIIIe s.* (pp. 297-311). The family in question were the Albanian Cruttas, several of whom served as interpreters and/or consular chancellors for the Polish king in Constantinople or in Ottoman provinces including Cyprus,—where the surname still occurs (Γρούτας). It is interesting to note the instability of some Cruttases and their subsequent change of master,—sometimes under the influence of progressive ideologies (e.g. Antoine Crutta, 1795, passed to the service of France)

and the chequered careers of most of them. The article of Reyhman is well documented and has even made use of archival material from Warsaw. Only for the Cruttas who lived in Cyprus he cites no testimonies; however, for one of them, "*Signor Crutta, Dragoman of the British Nation [at Larnaca] who happened to be at Nicosia [in 1750]*", see Alexander Drummond's report, 1750, apud Claude Delaval Cobham, *Excerpta Cypria*, Cambridge, 1908, p. 304.

8. Ödön Füves, Budapest: *Stand und Aufgaben der Forschungen zur Geschichte der Griechen in Ungarn* (pp. 313-338 and 5 plates). This is a valuable contribution to the subject. Among its contents especially worth noting are the *Katalog der bedeutendsten griechischen Kolonien in Ungarn* (XVIIIth cent.) (pp. 317-318), the *Katalog der ungarischen Adligen griechischer und gräko-zinzarischer Herkunft* (pp. 320-322), and the *Katalog der griechischen Bücher in Szentendre* (pp. 324-333). I note that *Palikutya* alias *Palikucsevny* (p. 322) resembles the Cypriote family name Πηλακούτσας. It is most encouraging that apart from Greeks (Sathas, Mertziou, Antoniadou, Lambros, Enepekides, Laïos, N. Camarianos, etc.) non-Greek scholars like Füves, Anton Spiesz (see *BSt*, IX, 2, 1968, pp. 381-428), Radu Florescu (*BSt*, IX, 2, 1968, pp. 301-308), Andrei Pippidi, Nik. Todorov, Dutu and others in Central and South-east Europe have recently turned their attention to the study of Hellenism in that part of the world in modern times.

9. Stojan Maslev, Sofia: *Die Rolle der griechischen Schulen und der griechischen Literatur für die Aufklärung des bulgarischen Volkes zur Zeit seiner Wiedergeburt* (pp. 339-395). This richly documented article should be welcomed for its abundant new information, chiefly drawn from Bulgarian sources and bibliography, and also for its considerable degree of objectivity. It is equally noteworthy that Mr. Maslev has also used many — but not all — Greek sources available, among them an unpublished MS in the Bulgarian National Library, a *History of Apollonia, Anchialos and Messembria* by M. Constantinides (see fn. 4, p. 385). Basically he recognizes and illustrates, by the use of documentary and other evidence, the view of the notable historian and literary historian Ivan D. Sismanov, that "*wir fast unsere gesamte mittelalterliche Kultur und Literatur den Griechen verdanken; aber wieviel Leute wissen, dass wir sogar für unsere nationale und kirchliche Wiedergeburt welche wir als unser ureigenes Werk zu betrachten lieben, zum grossen Teil denselben Griechen verpflichtet sind?*" (p. 339). Maslev's method consists in follow-

ing the story of Greek educational establishments in Bulgarian towns since the late XVIIIth century and tracing the influence exercised by each one of them on the Bulgarian people, namely the number of Bulgarian pupils attending them and that of Bulgarian teachers teaching in them, but also the cultural impact of Greek education upon both and the Bulgarian people in general. This impact resulted into the hellenization of the Bulgarian youth studying in Greek schools, and, after the outbreak of the Bulgarians' movement for substituting their language for Greek in their schools and churches, into a bitter reaction by Bulgarian nationalists against everything Greek: ever since, in Maslev's words, "*spielten die griechischen Schulen und Lehrer in Bulgarien im allgemeinen eine negative Rolle gegenüber den gerechten bulgarischen Forderungen und Bestrebungen*" (p. 348). Ever since (mid-XIXth century, cf. Goran D. Todorov, Nikolai Žečev, in *Etudes Historiques*, ed. Académie Bulgare des Sciences, Institut d'Histoire, III, 1966, pp. 173-239), there was a rivalry between Greek and Bulgarian schools as well as churches and communities, apparently to be mainly explained by the influence of the newly appearing Bulgarian bourgeois class (cf. Nikolai Todorov, "La genèse du capitalisme dans les provinces Bulgares de l'empire Ottoman au cours de la première moitié du XIXe s.," *Et. Hist.* [I]. 1960, pp. 221-251), whose interests were opposed to those of the Greek merchant and upper class, especially those living in Macedonia and Bulgaria. This opposition overrode the facts that, (a) the program of Greek schools was very rich and took into account the "*Interessen der breiteren Volksmassen*" (p. 349), that (b) the Greek schools in Bulgaria had prepared many teachers for the Bulgarian schools who in teaching used Bulgarian besides Greek and "*womit gleichzeitig zur Entwicklung der bulgarischen Sprache beitrugen*" (ibidem) and (c) that there was no policy of assimilation on the part of the Greek Patriarchate and its clergy at least "*bis zu den dreissiger Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts*", and even "*später ist keine systematische und planmässige Assimilationstätigkeit des Patriarchats nachzuweisen*" (p. 383; cf. pp. 354-360, 366). Still, what mostly displeased Bulgarian nationalists, "*die extreme Vorliebe für alles Griechische*" and "*die Abtrünnigkeit*" [=apostasy, hellenization of conscience], although rare, according to Maslev, were indisputable facts, "*weniger die Folge einer unmittelbaren Einwirkung der griechischen Geistlichen, Lehrer oder Händler, als vielmehr des Mangels, an bestimmten gesellschaftlich-politischen, gesellschaftlich-moralischen und kulturellen Grundlagen des bulgarischen Volkes zu jener*

*Zeit, als die sich entwickelnde neue bürgerliche Gesellschaftsordnung mit den alten mittelalterlichen Gegebenheiten in Widerspruch geriet*" (p. 383).

Under such circumstances no blame for a 'negative role' (pp. 348, 374) can be imputed against the Greek schools, teachers and communities in Bulgaria, even after the outbreak of the Greco-Bulgarian Church strife in which their participation was undeniable: the Greek schools, teachers and communities were there, they continued their work as before, and could not stop being Greek. Their intellectual superiority inflamed the jealousy and destructive instincts of Bulgarian chauvinists, which resulted into the tragic scenes of blind anti-Greek violence in Philippoupolis, Anchialos and elsewhere in 1906 (see Kosmas Myrtilos Apostolides, *Ἡ τῆς Φιλιππουπόλεως Ἱστορία, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων*, Athens, 1959, pp. 418-425; Drakos K. Mavrokommates, *Ἡ Ἀγχιάλος μεσ' ἀπὸ τὶς φλόγες*, Athens, 1930, pp. 5-40). The burning of libraries, churches, schools and other cultural establishments was by no means equivalent to '*historische Notwendigkeit*' or to '*geistige Emanzipation*' for the Bulgarian people, but was a black page inspired by chauvinist leaders and circles aspiring to the domination of the Bulgarian people. No doubt such circles were not lacking on the Greek side, and it is high time through national-historical self-criticism to arrive at a sincere and clear comprehension of a series of events which created a psychological gap between the two nations and to try to remove it. No doubt peaceful procedures of solving inter-national problems can be followed, and only these can lead to real "emancipation." Finally, excessive Greek pride and contempt of other peoples in cases such as those mentioned by Maslev (pp. 373, 348, 369 f., etc.) did obviously cause reaction among them and, together with our enthusiastic patriotism, contributed to the creation or promotion of Bulgarian patriotism (see pp. 372, 373, 369, etc.). In this perspective even "negative" Greek influence had beneficial results for the Bulgarian nation, whose intellectuals were inspired the love of their national language and the ideal of a "Great Bulgaria" from the Greek examples (pp. 369-370, cf. 373, 382). After all Theocletos Pharmakides' struggle for a national Greek Church was not an insignificant temptation for the Balkan peoples (cf. p. 355). Therefore the term "negative" used also by other Slav scholars (see *BSt*, IX, 9, 1968-p. 5: Krste Bitoski) should be used with reserve and with a specific meaning such as that analysed above.

Besides his revealing information about Greek schools in Bulga-

ria, which he classifies into elementary, "allodidaktisch," hellenic—high schools, etc., Maslev also studies the numerous cases of Bulgarians who were educated in Greek schools outside Bulgaria, and such were "*die grossen bulgarischen Aufklärer und Volkserwecker aus der Zeit des Beginns der Wiedergeburt*" (p. 366). Such schools were those of Moschopolis, Bucarest, Athos, Jannina, Serres, Chios, Thessaloniki, Kydoniae, Smyrna, Andros, Athens, Constantinople, etc. The role of the University of Athens and other Greek schools, Priests' Seminars, the School of Chalki, etc. in the Bulgarian renaissance is duly stressed by the author (pp. 371 f.), who also devotes pp. 374-382 to the study of the ever longer influence of Greek on Bulgarian literature of that period, more specifically of Bulgarian translations of Greek works, literary, philological, religious and other; and on p. 382 underlines the importance of the existence of numerous Greek books in Bulgarian libraries for the education of the Bulgarian youth and "*als Informationsmittel für die bulgarische Intelligenz*," to end with a list of some Greek loans in the Bulgarian language (*ibid.*). As regards Σχεντερμπέτης, one of the two epic poems of Grigor Parlichev, a graduate of Athens University, it should be noted that it has been recently edited by Chr. Kodov, Sofia, 1967. For the influence of Greek books, see now Manio Stoyanov, "Les Syndromites" Bulgares de livres grecs au cours de la première moitié du XIXe siècle," *Byz. Neugr. Jahrb.*, XIX, 1966, pp. 373-406, and cf. its review by C. Papacostea-Danielopolu in *Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes*, VI, 4, 1968, pp. 697-699, with several emendations and corrections. With regard to the friendly relations between Greek and Bulgarian peoples in the XVIII-XIX centuries ought to be cited the works of Nicolai Todorov, *Filiki Eterija i Bългарite*, Sofia, 1965, (ed) *Izdatelstvo na bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite*, pp. 170; "La coopération interbalkanique dans le mouvement grec de libération nationale à la fin du XVIIIe et au début du XIXe siècle—son idéologie et son action," *Et. Hist.* II, 1965, pp. 171-184; "La participation des Bulgares à l'insurrection hétéariste dans les principautés danubiennes," *Etudes Balkaniques*, 1, 1964, Sofia, Académie Bulgare des Sciences, pp. 69-96. Further the case of Hilarion of Tǎrnovo, who favoured and helped much the Bulgarian school at Gabrovo (1832), sent Neophytos Rilskij to Bucarest to study the Bell-Lancaster system, subscribed to Bulgarian books and charged Neophytos with translating the New Testament into Bulgarian, and also the cases of other Greek Bishops who followed a similar policy (pp. 360-363, etc.) are worth special mention, and ought to be corre-



lated with a wider trend of cooperation between intellectuals of Bulgarian and Greek descent such as attested in I. Snegarov's works: *Materiali za istoriata na balgarskata prosveta prez vazrazdaneto izvestija na arhivnija institut*, I, 1957, pp. 199-265; and *Prinos kam biografijata na Neofit Rilski*, Sofia, 1951, pp. 480, where a Greco-Bulgarian Dictionary by Neophytos, on which he worked until his death in 1881, is frequently referred to. See also the substantial, well-documented article of J. Clarke "Hilarion of Tirnovo in the light of historical criticism," *Ier Congrès International des Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européennes*, Sofia, 26 août - 1 septembre 1966, *Résumé des Communications. Histoire*, (XV-XIX s.) Sofia, 1966 p. 140-152, in which it is concluded that "*His [=Hilarion's] connection with Aprilov, Neofit Rilski and the Gabrovo School are enough to give him a secure place in the history of the Bulgarian national revival. His collaboration with the British and Foreign Bible Society is additional evidence of his Bulgarophilism*" (p. 152).

A serious omission in Maslev's article is Arbanassi, the well-known Greek-speaking village near Tarnovo, where Greek education and communal life flourished throughout modern times as attested in its churches—filled with post-byzantine Greek icons, wall-paintings, inscriptions and other monuments (see Ivan Dujcev, "Die Begleitinschriften der Abbildungen heidnischer Denker und Schriftsteller in Bačkovo und Arbanassi," *J.Ö.B.G.*, XVI, 1967, pp. 203-209)- and tombstones and other vestiges (see generally Dimitar Kostov, *Arbanasi, naučno-populjaren očerk*, Sofia, 1959, *Darzavno izdatelstvo "Nauka i iskustvo"*, pp. 126 + 74 pl., a richly documented but not exhaustive work), especially in a manuscript of the National Library of Sofia in which information about Arbanassi occurs in notes and memoirs starting in 1621 and going until the late XIXth century (cf. Ivan Snegarov, *iz arbanaskite staropечатni knigi v sofijskata biblioteka, spisanie na ban. kn. Istoriko-filol. i filos. Obstešten*, 28, 1937, pp. 141-176). Among the teachers mentioned by the scribe Δημητράκης Γεωργιάδης (Παπᾶ Συμεωνίδης Μουσικὸς) are these: "Τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν διδασκάλων μου/ Μαργαρίτης Παπᾶ Νικολάου ἐκ τοῦ Μ. Τυρνόβου/Θεοδόσιος Κυπριώτης/Κωνσταντῆς Κωνσταντινουπολίτης/Δημήτριος ἐκ σελίμου/ Δ.Γ.Π.Σ. /" (to. 962vo, about 1880).—Finally it should be noted that the "*Lyra der H. Athanasios*" translated into Bulgarian before 1847 by the Bulgarian poet P. R. Slavejkov (p. 381) must have been the 'Lyra' of Athanassios (C) Christopoulos; this should attract the attention of Greek literary historians. Concerning Seliminski the following important book ought to be added:

Σν. Kristanov, Ιν. Renakov, Στ. Maslev, Δρ. Ivan Seliminski *kato ugitel i obsrestvenik*, Sofia, 1962, pp. 466 (ed. Bulgar. Acad. of Sciences).

10. Γεώργιος Ζωΐδης; Βουκουρέστι: *Τὸ θέατρο τῆς Φιλικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Ὁ ρόλος του στὴν ιδεολογικὴ προετοιμασία τοῦ 1821. Ἡ ἐπίδρασί του στὴν ἐξέλιξη τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ καὶ τοῦ ρουμανικοῦ θεάτρου* (pp. 397-436) [= *The Theatre of the Philike Hetairia. Its role in the ideological preparation of the Revolution of 1821. Its influence on the development of Greek and Roumanian Theatre*]. This article was first published in *Ἑπιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, year IX, Vol. XVII, fasc. 100, April 1963, pp. 260-281, and has been reviewed in detail by Ariadna Camariano-Cioran in *Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes*, III, 1965, no. 3-4, pp. 7-9-750. Mr. Zoides' sources are both Greek and Roumanian, and the information extracted therefrom points to the progressive, liberal, revolutionary, patriotic and national character of the earliest Greek theatre, whose appearance coincided with the period of preparation of the Greek Revolution of 1821 and contributed to that preparation in Odessus, Bucarest and other Danubian urban centres. Of particular interest are the relationships between Greek and Roumanian theatrical origins studied in parts IV-V, and also the attested continuation of the theatrical traditions of the Philikè Hetairia in Greece in the thirties and forties of the XIXth century (part VI). In summary we have to agree with Mme Ar. Camariano that Zoidis' article is "*un travail laborieux, consciencieux et rempli d'interprétations judicieuses*" (*R.E.S.E.E.*, cit., p. 750). Only some pertinent modern bibliography ought to be added here, such as: Nestor Camariano, "Sur l'activité de la 'Société Gréco-Dacique' de Bucarest (1810-1812)", *R.E.S.E.E.*, VI, 1, 1968, pp. 39-54, espec. pp. 48-49 for the translation of two dramatic pieces of Metastasios with the Society's care. Cf. also no. 11 below.

11. László Gáldi, Budapest: *Sur quelques éléments néohelléniques de la langue roumaine parlée d'autrefois* (pp. 437-456). This article is a continuation of the author's work, *Les mots d'origine néo-grecque en roumain à l'époque des Phanariotes*, Budapest, 1939 (Magyar-görök tanulmányok, 9), in which he had studied the Greek loans of the Roumanian language as occurring in the comedies of B. Alecsandri (1821-1890). In the present article Mr. L. Gáldi examines the loans occurring in newly-published XIXth century Roumanian comedies such as those of I. Golescu, C. Caragiali, C. Bălăcescu, C. Faccà, and M. Millo. His method includes the "*analyse statistique [of loans] dans l'ensemble du système lexical dont ils avaient été autant d'éléments constitutifs*" (p. 450).

12. Oronzo Parlangeli-Giannino Aprile. Novoli (Lecce): *Ellenismo Salentino* (pp. 457-478). This is a collection of poems in the 'dialetto grecho' of Salento, all of them translated into Italian verse. The poems are by eminent Salentinian Greeks: *Vito Domenico Palumbo* (1854-1918), *Il Kokkaluto* (= Vitantonio Tomasi, XIX-early XXth century), *Antonio Lefons* (1882-1952), *Giuseppe Lefons* (1891-) uncle of the co-author of the article Giannino Aprile, *Giuseppe Aprile* (d. recently), *Pantaleo Aprile* (d. 1918), and *Brizio Leonardo Colaci*,—all of them born in Calimera. One is struck by the high lyrical quality of this poetry, which is just a selection out of "*una copiosa produzione greco-salentina*" (p. 459).

13. Πολυχρόνης Κ. 'Ενεπεκίδης, Βιέννη: 'Ο Σαίξπηρ καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες μεταφρασταὶ του. Ἀνέκδοτοι ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦ Δημητρίου Βικέλα πρὸς τὸν Γάλλον Βυζαντινολόγον Ἐμμανουήλ Μίλλερ. Ἐκ τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῆς ἐν Παρισίοις Ἑθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης (pp. 479-98) [= *Shakespeare and his Greek translators. Unpublished letters by Demetrios Vikelas to the French Byzantinist Emmanuel Miller, (taken) from the Manuscripts of the National Library in Paris*]. Prof. Enepekides is here publishing for the first time three letters of Vikelas to Em. Miller, one written in French most probably early in 1883, a second one written on 11.I. 1883 in French too but given here only in Greek translation, and a third written in Greek on 18.IX.1883. The editor does also refer briefly to other letters of 1875 and 1876, of which he quotes some extracts. Letter (a) is given both in the French original and in Greek translation made by Prof. Enepekides. The importance of these letters lies in their literary and philological information from Greece, especially Athens, and in the views expressed in them by Vikelas on Greek literary problems such as the Γλωσσικὸν Ζήτημα, the translation of Shakespeare into modern Greek which had been undertaken by him, the performance of Shakespearean tragedies in Athens for the first time, Kontos' linguistic theories and their impact on Greek literature and life, and the like. What deserves here a special note is Vikelas' firm opinion that only demotic Greek should be the language of Greek theatre and literature, and this five years before the appearance of J. Psycharis' famous book *Τὸ Τᾶξιδι μου* (1888). This points to Vikelas' pioneer role in Greek literary affairs and to the fact that what Psycharis expressed in his book was an idea shared by other Greek thinkers at that time, an idea "in the air" of their epoch. Let it, however, not be forgotten that both Vikelas and Psycharis were Greeks of the Diaspora, who,

like the "Philikoi" in the early XIXth century, could view Greek problems against a certain perspective, and judge without passion and under direct European influences (cf. below, no. 15).

14. Pierre Guiral, Marseille: *Marseille et les Grecs du XIXe siècle à nos jours* (pp. 499-512). The author draws information from rich archival material in Marseille (Archives Municipales, Archives Départementales, Archives Nationales, etc.) and from special literature and sources including journals and the like. He follows the story of Greek immigrants to Marseille from the end of the XVIIIth and particularly from the beginning of the XIXth century until today. The Greek colony in that city being composed mainly of merchants, shipowners, bankers and other entrepreneurs, its story is part of the economic history of France and the whole Mediterranean. Mr. Guiral refers to the activity of several Greek merchants, bankers, entrepreneurs and others, either individuals or associated in companies and divides their story into stages suiting the general stages of French History. As it was to be expected, Greek participation in events and developments of a national moment for France appears frequently in this account and illustrates the inevitable adaptation of our colony to the national and political realities in which it was and has been living, an adaptation which, however, has not turned into assimilation and has not eradicated its Greek character and memories.

15. André Mirambel, Paris: *La France et le vulgarisme néo-hellénique* (pp. 513-531). This is one of a number of articles by Prof. Mirambel on problems of modern Greek literature and its ideology (e.g. see his *art. cit.* p. 527 ftn. 1; especially see André Mirambel, "Les aspects révolutionnaires des lettres néo-grecques aux XIXe et XXe siècles", *R. E.S.E.E.*, (VI, 4, 1968, pp. 557-572). In the article reviewed here Prof. M. studies the French influences exercised upon John Psycharis and through him on modern literature, particularly in the sphere of linguistics, in which the "question of language"—καθαρεύουσα versus δημοτική—prevailed. M.'s conclusion is this: "*C'est à l'Occident, principalement à la science française, que la Grèce doit le vulgarisme, tel qu'il a été formulé et répandu. C'est au vulgarisme et à son élaboration que la France et l'Occident doivent l'essor des études néohelléniques, spécialement dans le domaine linguistique*" (p. 526). No doubt, if the "vulgarisme" had no indigenous national roots, it would have scarcely been produced by mere foreign influences, or even chiefly by them. But, on the other hand, the elaboration and direction of the "vulgarisme" owe too much

to the French impact: to the positivistic, naturalistic and rationalistic spirit of the illustrious French scientists, historians, philosophers, philologists and authors of the mid-XIXth century and after—Aug. Comte, E. Renan, H. Taine, Louis Havet, Alfred Croiset, Gaston Paris, the theoreticians of the “Pléiade” and others, all of them having fed lavishly the thought of the leader of Greek vulgarism, J. Psycharis, who lived in Paris, but not only him. It is a matter of justice and accuracy to recall and stress here the powerful French, English and other European influences exerted upon other Greek pioneers of the “vulgarisme” at about the same period as J. Psycharis; namely Emmanuel Rhoïdes, Dem. Vikelas (cf. above, no. 13) Costis Palamas, not to mention earlier founders of δημοτικισμός such as D. Solomos, J. Vilaras, J. Polylas, Ad. Corais and others (cf. Mirambel, pp. 515-516, 521). In any case, the most interesting section of Prof. M.’s paper is that tracing the basic linguistic preoccupations and principles permeating Psycharis’ purely scientific works (philological, literary and other: pp. 522-525).

16. Johannes Irmscher, Berlin: *Neue Materialien zur Franzschen Verschwörung* (pp. 533-551). Prof. Irmscher re-examines the part played by Johannes Franz, a German classical philologist who served as chief interpreter for the Bavarian regency in Greece (1833), in the political conflicts within the regency, which, however, involved local Greek party oppositions, plots and counter-plots and resulted into the well-known trial of Theodore Kolokotronis and Franz’s expulsion from Greece. Among the new sources used by Irmscher are unpublished letters by Franz kept in the Bayrische Staatsbibliothek München (Thierschiana, 132, 7 and Maureriana, 19, 1b, 70a: see ftns 21, 62 of Irmscher’s article), etc. see ftns 8, 42-45). In these letters Franz denies all connection with the Greek anti-Bavarian opposition party led by Kolokotronis,—something often claimed by contemporary sources—and appears as a victim of the said opposition and probably of count Armansperg, the President of the Regency—whose he had been the personal dragoon. What should be observed with regard to this well-informed contribution is that its subject-matter obviously refers to Hellenism in Greece itself and not to Hellenism Abroad: a branch of research, in which Prof. Irmscher has made notable contributions and has been distinguished as an excellent authority.

17. Ilse Rochow, Berlin: *Neugriechischstudien an der Berliner Universität 1850 bis 1905* (pp. 553-583). The author examines the state

and standard of modern Greek studies in Berlin University under five Professors or "Privatdozenten": 1. *Johannes Franz* (1840-1851), 2. *A.E. Wollheim da Fonseca* (1851-1853), 3. *F.W.A. Mullach* (3. XII.1853-1862), 4. *Heymann Steinthal* (1873-1892 with intervals), 5. *Paul Kretschmer* (1891/92-1896/97). He does also give an account of the establishment on 27.X.1883 and early story of the *Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen* in Berlin, in which modern Greek was taught by *Johannes Mitsotakis* (October 1888-2.IX.1905) and *Johannes Kalitsunakis* (1906-1966). The Seminar was founded by the Ministry of Education and competed the scientific work done at the University, its program being a practical, political and utilitarian one aiming at educating interpreters for the civil service, colonial officers, jurists, post-officials, missionaries, doctors, merchants, technicians etc., but still attracting even future scholars, students of classical philology and others. This competition reflects and is derived from the limited interest aroused among scholarly and literary circles in the modern Greek lectures delivered at the University of Berlin. The major question arising here is whether the said University lectures did in fact serve practical purposes as well, but in a wider perspective and in the long run, which was the case with most foreign language and culture curricula, especially Levantine, Oriental, Asiatic and African that had been introduced into University courses in Europe ever since the Renaissance. This question would require a specific treatment which is beyond the scope both of Rochow's and the present review article. What can be provisionally stated here is that material-practical preoccupations and needs did usually underly all expansion of knowledge into new fields of linguistic and cultural studies in modern times as formerly. For example such needs dictated the establishment by Colbert in 1669 of the *Ecole des Jeunes de Langues* in Paris, "*destinée à fournir des drogmans ou secrétaires-interprètes aux postes consulaires et diplomatiques, situés dans l'Empire Ottoman*". This school followed the model of the *Dil oglani* School in Constantinople, and, when in the late XVIII century it had fallen into decay, another school was founded as its substitute, the *Ecole Spéciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes*, that became *Nationale* ever since 1914 and absorbed the former (see I. Mélikoff, "Documents d'histoire Ottomane: La correspondance de Thomas-Xavier Bianchi et d'Amable Jourdain", *Polychordia*, Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag, besorgt von Peter Wirth, I. Amsterdam, 1966, p. 218 ftn.1 and text; cf. Rochow, art. cit. pp. 564-565; and Mirambel, art. cit. in 'Ο Έλληνισμός εις τὸ Έ-

ξωτερικόν. p.p. 521-522). From these schools "pure scholarship" did gradually emerge, and 'University Methods' were developed, which particularly flourished in Universities themselves. In Germany the University of Berlin preceded the State in Oriental and related studies, while in France, England and elsewhere the opposite occurred. But even in the case of Berlin and other similar cases, practical needs did subconsciously underly all scholarly work in Oriental fields, and it was the failure of the University to satisfy such needs that drove to the establishment of the *Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen* by the State. The said establishment, though following a process contrary to that of France, pointed to the primary purposes of Oriental including modern Greek studies as conceived by the ruling strata of German Society at that time (and later). One particular merit of Rochow's article is the use made in it of unpublished information from the Archives of the University of Berlin besides other sources and publications.

The collection under review is no doubt important for modern Greek studies and particularly for the study of Modern Hellenism Abroad. As already stressed, this is not a History or even an attempt at a History of the Greek Diaspora in Modern Times, but just provides some valuable materials for such a history and points to the necessity for its realisation one day by a team of coordinately working scholars.

However limited the purpose of the Volume might be, it could have been richer within its own limits, by including more articles on neglected areas of activity of Modern Hellenism, e.g. India (for which see Spyros D. Loukatos, "*Έλληνες και Φιλέλληνες τῶν Ἰνδιῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν Ἐπανάστασιν*.... Athens, 1965), Egypt, England, Russia, Albania, Serbia and Yugoslavia, etc. Still more important, one would expect from the editors to add to their volume two basic appendices—not to mention the indispensable but still lacking Index: one should consist of a *Scheme for a History of Modern Hellenism Abroad*: i.e. a plan, divided into Parts, Chapters and Periods, Sectors and Areas; the second appendix should consist of a *Bibliography* for such a History, that might be very rich though not exhaustive. Time limits ought to be carefully elaborated for both and possibly strictly complied with.

Still both these requirements of a methodological order would probably rather attract the attention of and be gradually and systematically fulfilled by a number of Scholarly Institutions occupied with the

study and research of Modern Hellenism, both Institutions in Greece proper and Abroad. The fulfillment of the said two requirements will be the primary prerequisite for writing after all a *History of Modern Hellenism Abroad*.

Nicosia

COSTAS P. KYRRIS