

Introduction

Katerina Zacharia

This volume draws on recent research and provides a forum to reflect on Hellenism. A distinguished group of historians, classicists, anthropologists, ethnographers, cultural studies, and comparative literature scholars have contributed essays exploring the variegated mantles of Greek ethnicity, and the legacy of Greek culture for the ancient and modern Greeks in the homeland and the diaspora, as well as for the ancient Romans and the modern Europeans. This work is intended to initiate a public dialogue among authoritative and discipline-specific voices, exploring a variety of Hellenisms, and sets out to present a sense of Hellenism in the construction of a grammar of national ideologies.

This study covers time periods spanning the archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman periods, the war of independence, the early Greek state, and the modern era, though the coverage is by no means exhaustive. Inevitably for a volume addressing such a vast historical span, the focus is selective. Certain historical periods and geographical areas are only cursorily mentioned. Rather than aspiring to comprehensive coverage, the volume makes a point of offering, where possible, multiple interpretations for a number of chronological periods discussed. Indeed, the aim of this work is to generate a scholarly dialogue, producing further research that will address Greek ethnicity at greater length in all areas and periods, and especially in those not covered in depth in this volume.

The term Ἑλληνισμός (Hellenism) was used in antiquity first by the grammarians and Strabo to denote “correct Greek.” Then in biblical passages, it means “Greek habits;”¹ in the Acts of the Apostles (6:1; 9:29), the term *Hellenistai* means more than just “those who act in a Greek way,” probably something like Greekness in our modern sense of the word, that is, Greek culture. In modern times, the nineteenth-century ancient historian J.G. Droysen, in his *Geschichte der Hellenismus* (*History of Hellenism*), gave the term a special flavor: It now meant not just “correct Greek” but was applied more widely to “the fusion of Greek and oriental.” Droysen associated

¹ See, for example, 2 Maccabees 4:13, in the Greek (Septuagint) translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. But note that the Maccabees are not included among the canonical books of the Old Testament by the Western Protestant Churches, though they are in the Catholic Bible.

the word “Hellenismus” with the period of the maximum diffusion of Hellenism, when the Greeks with Alexander and his successors visited distant oriental places.² This is the so-called “Hellenistic Age,” that is, the period between Alexander’s accession to the throne, 336 BC, and the victory of Octavian (later Augustus) at Actium in 31 BC. So in its Latin/German use, the term came to be applied to a period of history and referred no longer to a process. In English, on the other hand, “Hellenism” has never been limited to the Hellenistic Age, whereas “Hellenistic” is not an adjective corresponding semantically to the noun “Hellenism,” but rather refers to the Hellenistic Age.³ The current consensus among scholars, such as Walter Burkert and Martin West, on ancient Greek religion or Sarah Morris on ancient Greek art, is that “Hellenismus,” that is, the “fusion of Greek and oriental” in its Latin/German form, is not restricted to the Hellenistic Age. Oriental influences in art and religion are to be found at very early stages and are not distinctive to the Alexandrian period.⁴ Hellenism, therefore, needs to be revisited now.⁵

What is missing is the sense of classification on whether Hellenism is an ethnic, political, or cultural category. Yet, classification was not an issue in earlier centuries, and modern ideas cannot be retroactively applied to antiquity, when there was no real concern for the performance of ideas. Still, we may examine the complexity of Hellenism and map its diachronic pathways.

As our study shows, the term “barbarian” was not an ethnic term. The classification Greek/barbarian is a soft and permeable one. There is a development in the difference between Greeks and barbarians. The earlier accounts, such as whether the Macedonians were Greeks, are pseudo-problems, as Simon Hornblower shows in Chapter 2. Yet, during archaic times, there was a static element in the definition of Greekness, an internal structure.

In Hellenistic times, a distinction appears between a political and a cultural Hellenism. There are multiple Hellenisms during the same

² On Droysen, see Burstein, p. 62 in this volume.

³ See Ehrenberg’s article under “Hellenistic Age” in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. See also Matthew Arnold’s famous distinction between Hellenism and Hebraism in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869).

⁴ Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan (Oxford 1985; Ger. orig. 1977); Martin L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford & New York 1999); Sarah Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton 1992).

⁵ The derivative term “Hellenization” (from the Greek *hellenizein*) referring to the diffusion of Greek culture (“Hellenism”) brings associations to cultural imperialism and may need to be avoided.

period: Sicilian, Egyptian, in Seleucid Asia, etc. The existence of these various Hellenisms undermines any objective criteria by which Hellenism is defined and the emphasis is now given to what the people themselves thought was Greek. Seleucids and Egyptians bestowed the denomination “Greek” to certain social classes of the locals, so that, for instance, they could be exempt from paying taxes, whereas barbarians were often paid less or nothing for their services to the “Greeks.” Here is an example of the use of cultural characteristics for the benefit of the empire. Cultural Hellenism in the eastern Mediterranean implied autonomy, intermingling, and expansion during the Hellenistic years.

During the period of the Second Sophistic (second century AD), Greece was associated with leisure time and culture.⁶ The image of Greece is created during this period, but also the very “structure” and concept of the image. The structure has now two chronological phases; the first sets the norm and the second repeats the norm.

The sense of Hellenism for the Romans was a utopian project, an ideal community, which did not exist in the past or present, composed of intellectuals. This concept of Hellenism formulated the idea of Hellenism and Greek national identity during the later periods. As a kind of ideological representation of Hellenism, it is a utopian cultural ideal that presents the intellectuals as leaning towards assimilation and participation. A certain normativity is created, as it acquires the characteristics of a norm widely approved. In *Down from Olympus* (1996), Susan Marchand presents Hellenic Hellenism as a reflection of Western Hellenism, which still uses concepts that entail normativity. In Japan, there is no concept of ruins, since every 80 years there is reconstruction; there, the normative cultural context was Confucianism. For the Western world, the normative cultural context is the artistic, dramatic, and philosophical output of the Greeks, that is, the concept of Hellenism for the Westerners. As Japan is to China, so was Athens to Hellenism and Europe.⁷

This volume casts a fresh look at the multifaceted expressions of diachronic Hellenisms, offering a re-orientation of the study of Hellenism away from a binary perception to approaches giving priority to fluidity, hybridity, and multi-vocality.⁸ Contributors deal with issues of recycled

⁶ “Old Greece was a country learning how to be a museum; cultivated Romans admired Greece romantically for what she had been” (Bowersock 1965: 90–91).

⁷ On the European appropriation of Classical Hellenism, the creation of a “new ancient Greece” and the re-orientation of European self-consciousness with Greece featuring as the new European intellectual *topos* of descent, “cradle of Western civilization,” see Iakovaki 2006.

⁸ On cultural *disemia* (binary meaning/thinking) and on cultural syncretism in Greece, see Zacharia, p. 332 n. 34, and p. 341 with n. 54, pp. 343–6, in this volume.

and invented tradition, cultural categories, and perceptions of ethnicity, challenging all reductive approaches to Hellenism. I chose to maintain the historical scope for the earlier periods, but the closer that one moves to the modern era, the more interdisciplinary and more theoretically complex the contributions become. In this manner, they reach a broader coverage and better account for the divergent views about Greece among Westerners and Greeks themselves. The volume is arranged in three parts with 14 chapters. The tripartite arrangement avoids a strictly linear chronological layout and any claims to historicism, though the importance of historical contexts is never understated.

The first part examines Greek culture and identity from the archaic to the Byzantine Period, maintaining a historical sequence. We now think that Greek language and religion can be pushed back into the second millennium BC. The decipherment of Linear B has revealed, for instance, the name of the Greek god Dionysos. This very important discovery showed both that Greek was already being written at that time and that some features of ancient Greek religion as we know it from the Classical Period also already existed then. However, it is impossible, given the source material available, to begin to pose questions about Greek self-consciousness in this period. It is only with the archaic period and with the development of Panhellenic institutions, like the Olympic Games, and the rise of enemies, such as Persia, who helped to crystallize ideas of “the fatherland in danger” that the subject of this volume begins to be a reality. We are concerned with culture and with ethnicity in the sense of constructed identity. For this reason, I decided, in effect, to take a leaf out of Hippias of Elis and begin this study in 776 BC, the date of the first Olympic Games. At the outset, I offer an evaluation of the historical, literary, epigraphical, and material sources (Chapter 1). I introduce the Greek/barbarian distinction, the Greek ethnic subdivisions, the Greek colonial ties modeled as mother–daughter relationships, and the “kinship” diplomatic relationships between Greek city-states, and I discuss the four Herodotean criteria of Hellenism, namely, shared lineage, language, religion, and customs, setting the pace for some of the themes addressed in the volume, and especially in this first part.

Simon Hornblower (Chapter 2) uncovers the slippery dichotomy of Greek *versus* barbarian, stressing the fluidity of the term “barbarian,” a non-essentialist term, and boundary permeability in archaic and Classical Greece (776–323 BC). He further explores the use of Greek myths in the Mediterranean colonies, the metropolis-colony relationships, as well as *polis* membership as a criterion of identity. The ancients played with the sense of performance and the negotiation of identities even more than the moderns. There was a lack of clear categorization as a result of war and constant trade and exchanges. Applying the four Herodotean criteria of Greek identity

to the case of Macedon, Hornblower concludes in favor of its Greekness, with the caveat that most of our evidence is drawn from Macedonian royalty, who wished to be regarded as Greek, asserting exclusiveness and superiority in a domestic context in contradistinction to their non-Greek Macedonian subjects. This strategy was probably also intended to make the Macedonian kings more palatable to their Greek subjects. Initially, that is, in the fifth century BC, before Greece was subject to Macedon, the aim of the Macedonian kings was to get themselves recognized as Greeks (descended from Argos, so they said), but eventually the ideology of Macedonian Greekness must have been part of a strategy of subjugation. Macedonian religion and language were essentially Greek and the Macedonian royalty shared Greek blood, but in the case of customs, Macedon was organized in a manner quite unlike that of the Greek *poleis* (cities).

Stanley Burstein (Chapter 3) explores Greek identity in the Hellenistic Period, when Greek language and culture had expanded beyond the boundaries of the Greek city-states to cover the entire span of the new world of Alexander's conquests in the three centuries of the rule of Alexander's descendants (323–31 BC). Whereas Greek historiographers of the Hellenistic Aegean recognized Greek identity as rooted only in the Greek *poleis* of the homeland and stressed the "otherness" of the Macedonians, in the Macedonian kingdoms of Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Asia, Greek language and culture survived as shared links to the cities of the Greek homeland, kept alive both by the Ptolemaic royalty who imitated the high culture of the Greeks as insignia of nobility and by the ruling Greeks who immigrated to the ends of the Macedonian kingdoms for better job opportunities. Though creating Greek identity in the remote new colonies was difficult, imitation of Hellenism induced by incentives of high administrative posts is attested, along with an inevitable fusion between Greek civilization and the local traditions. Greek became the *lingua franca* (common language) of the Hellenistic kingdoms. And there was religious continuity as well as change. For instance, the bilingual Buddhist inscription (SEG 20.326), in Greek and Aramaic, of the Mauryan King Asoka (third century BC), which points to the existence in the Kandahar area of Afghanistan of "a nucleus of educated Greeks willing to co-operate with him,"⁹ that is, with Asoka or Piodasses, reminds us that Hellenism was subject to radically new influences in the Hellenistic Period. Though Peter Fraser's publication in 1979 of a Greek dedication by "x the son of Aristonax" in the *temenos* (sacred enclosure) of what

⁹ See Burstein 1985: 51.

was evidently one of the old Greek gods, also from Kandahar, points to religious continuity.¹⁰

From the Hellenization of the barbarian East by Alexander and his descendants, we move to an exploration of the extent of Romanization of the Greeks during the period of the Roman rule (31 BC–AD 324). In this period, again, we observe contradictions, blurred definitions, and multiple identities. The Greeks had been accustomed to foreign domination long before the Roman conquest of Greece. They dealt with it by more than one strategy: They could either make out that they had defeated the enemy comprehensively, which is what they did with the Persians (although as a matter of historical fact, Greeks in Asia Minor were subject to Persia for extended periods, that is, the victory over Persia was only partial), or they could assimilate the conquerors to Greeks, as with Macedon. In the case of the Romans, they could make out that they were, after all, in some sense Greeks or at least could be brought within the general scope of kinship diplomacy. The Aeneas legend actually makes the Romans out to be Trojans not Greeks; but there is evidence that Greeks did treat the Romans as quasi-Greeks.¹¹ Or, they could claim that the Greeks had a civilizing mission. This is probably new in the period of Roman power and, if so, it is an important respect in which the Romans changed Greek self-perceptions. To be sure, literary sources like Plutarch claim that already in the fourth century BC Alexander thought of himself as having a mission to propagate Hellenism, but modern work has shown that this is highly dubious as a motive for his city foundations.¹² So this motif is something retrojected into the Hellenistic Period, whereas it was really formulated in the time of Roman subjects like Plutarch himself. This leads to the third possible strategy: They could dwell lovingly on the glories of the great Greek past, as happened with writers of the Second Sophistic (second century AD), as a way of escaping from the intolerable fact of

¹⁰ Fraser, *SEG* 30. 1664.

¹¹ The most famous example is Lampsacus in the 190s BC (Dittenberger *Syllogeed.* 3, no. 591), which treats the Romans as kin because Lampsacus belonged to the Trojan league and Rome was descended from Troy. As Gruen says, Lampsacus “saw no contradiction between its Hellenic character and its claim on Roman kinship through Troy.” Gruen 1990: 20. Lampsacus was certainly Greek; like Massalia/ Massilia/Marseilles, whose ambassador it honors in the inscription, Lampsacus was a colony of Phokaia in the Aiolian part of Asia Minor.

¹² Fraser 1996.

Roman domination.¹³ It must have been flattering to the Greeks to feel that Rome was offering itself as the new Greece.¹⁴

Ron Mellor (Chapter 4) provides a full background of the complex history of Greek interaction with Rome, ranging over a wide variety of evidence, including literature, archaeology, art, and numismatics, and explores the ways in which the collision with and subjugation to Rome affected Greek self-perception. There were multiple levels of classification. An individual could be identified as Athenian in Alexandria but Greek in Rome. The elite had different notions of ethnic identity than did the uneducated mass that still identified more with their clan and families. Roman nobility was bicultural, bilingual, and bisexual, imitating Classical Hellenism privately but acting publicly according to Roman decorum. The Roman Senate upheld the Roman mores and values and criticized Greek extravagance. Among the Roman intellectuals, Greece was admired as the cradle of civilization, with Classical Hellenism featuring as an ideological *topos* (place/category) at the core of Greekness. And the Greek intellectuals of the Second Sophistic classicized their Greek identity and, thus, were also pleasing to the Roman elite. But though a hybridization of Greek and Roman culture and cult was widely observed during the Roman rule, there was hardly any linguistic hybridization, for a number of reasons adeptly discussed in this chapter.

From the distinction between Greeks *versus* barbarians, to the one between Greco-Romans *versus* barbarians, we now move to Byzantium, with the classification of Christians *versus* barbarians and pagans/Hellenes. Claudia Rapp (Chapter 5) offers an overview of the history of the Byzantine Empire (AD 312–1453), but cautions that the sources for this long period again offer the slanted perspective of a small erudite elite. Rapp notes the archaizing tendencies of the Byzantines, and their significant role in securing the preservation and transmission of the Classical Greek literary sources, including Herodotus' *Histories*, provided there was proper Christian use of this ancient literature. Rapp offers an insightful discussion of the concepts of Greekness, *Romanitas* and *Christianitas*, in an attempt to provide a more objective appreciation of a sense of identity during this period, also noting

¹³ Hornblower (ed.) 1994: 55f. The Romans themselves exploited these feelings and, for instance, enthusiastically adapted and adopted the theme of pride in the Persian Wars, as Tony Spawforth showed in an excellent chapter at the end of that same book.

¹⁴ The phenomenon of “reverse cultural imperialism,” with Greece ultimately conquering Rome through its superior culture, reflected a trend in past studies of Roman Greece. More recent studies, as Mellor points out in this volume, are offering an alternative insight into the many changes that accompanied Greece’s passage into the Roman Imperial sphere. Cf. Alcock 1993.

the role of Byzantium in the argument for and against the continuity between ancient and modern Greece. The political identity of Byzantium was Roman, its religious identity Orthodox Christian, and its cultural identity Greek. By the time of the Fourth Crusade (AD 1204–1261), when the political *Romanitas* was attacked by the Latin-speaking Western invaders, a sense of shared Greek identity prevailed among the Greek-speaking Byzantines. This was further enhanced during the Paleologan Renaissance (AD 1261–1453), when the Classical cultural heritage of the Byzantine Empire was foregrounded at the expense of the Roman administrative heritage, and Latin language became obsolete in the drastically reduced Byzantine territory, a process that had begun gradually as early as in the sixth and seventh centuries AD. Constantinople was founded in AD 324 by Constantine as the new Rome, but within a century it was viewed as the new Jerusalem of the second Covenant. By the time of the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in AD 1453, Byzantine *Christianitas* had paired with a shared Greekness, downgrading its *Romanitas*. Still, the “Byzantines” continued to call themselves “Romans” up to the end (and beyond).

The second part of this volume presents the cultural legacies of Hellenism for Europe and modern Greece from the post-Byzantine period to the early twentieth century. The relationship between European Philhellenism and Greek nation-building, and the favored collective identities of the intellectual elite and the peasantry, are topics examined in the four essays of this part. Some of the questions asked are: Were there multiple ways of imagining the new society on the basis of different interpretations of European Philhellenism, and by whom? What were the processes of marginalization of non-hegemonic alternatives, and in what social spaces in eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century Greek society did these marginal perspectives circulate (for example, Greek Enlightenment, demoticists, leftists), and why? How did Greek Enlightenment intellectuals appropriate the discourse of Philhellenism to articulate a vision of modern Greek society and identity? Is it the case that European Philhellenism was translated in the exclusive service of nationalism, or is it that other cosmopolitan and non-nationalist traditions attached to European Philhellenism were considered in the political project of creating a modern Greek nation-state? Which model prevailed and why? The contributors’ answers range from an exploration of German Philhellenism and its interpretation and adaptation of the Greek cultural legacy, and, in particular, an analysis of Humboldtian humanism as a preferred German pedagogical system aiming to make the Germans “real” Germans *via* close imitation of the Classical Greeks (Chapter 6); to the Greek Enlightenment and Korais’s project of educating the Greek nation in the Classical Greek and European traditions and of “reinstating”

Greek language to its classical excellence (Chapter 7); to an analysis of the construction of national historiography, geography, and language, and the forces at work during the nation-building of the modern Greek state (Chapter 8); and, from an overview of nationalism, language, and lineage in the late Byzantine Period to a presentation of the collective identities and the preponderant role of religion during the period of the Ottoman Occupation and the early Greek state until the Balkan wars, when Greece first fought as a nation-state against another Christian neighboring state, Bulgaria, thus asserting the decisive victory of nationalism over the pre-national community of Orthodox Christendom presided over by the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Chapter 9).

Glenn Most (Chapter 6) probes the trend of Philhellenism among German intellectuals in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and its tension with German nationalism. The political dimensions of the Romantic Hellenist movement and its relationship with Nazism, as well as the close relationship between modern politics, Classical archaeology, and the scholarship on the ancient world have been carefully explored in recent studies. Most here discusses Humboldtian humanism and its impact on the German educational system and contrasts it to the German nationalist model. Humboldt argued that Germans can only become Germans by a process of sublimation and through the mediation of the Greeks, a claim the nationalist model found preposterous. To counteract the nationalist claim that the individual is subordinate to the nation, German Philhellenism posits the idea of the freedom of the individual in the ancient Greek city-state as the cause for the superiority of the Greek cultural achievement. German Philhellenists highlight the separation into competing city-states rather than the unification under one Panhellenic Greek nation-state as another contributing factor to Classical Greek excellence. Some German Philhellenists claim that Greek art has an unmediated relationship with nature. Others present the Greeks as freely adopting from the ancient Near East, transforming their borrowings in a unique, essentially Greek way. The Greeks' cultural tolerance and free-spiritedness feature as prime components in the rhetoric of the German Philhellenists, who advocate the liberality and cosmopolitanism of Greek culture and contest the chauvinism of the nationalistic ideologies.

Olga Augustinos (Chapter 7) offers an appraisal of the relationship between European Philhellenism, and the Greek revival project in the context of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Adamantios Korais (1748–1833), a Greek expatriate intellectual living in Paris, launches his campaign of *metakénesis*, that is, of transferring the European Classicism and its ideas of rationalism and liberal humanism through translation of

European books into modern Greek,¹⁵ so as to awaken the Greek nation from its Ottoman slumber, “resuscitate” memories of Classical Hellenism, and, essentially, synchronize it with contemporary European culture. Korais’s “cultural-transfers” project is making early steps towards the construction of a European-mediated modern Greek identity. Embedded in his project was the idea of an intellectual and linguistic decline of Greece since the fall of the ancient world, hence his initiative to “revive” that world and to “correct” modern Greek language by avoiding the use of post-Classical loanwords, and by making Greek words conform to the morphological system of ancient Greek, restoring them to what he considered to be their original form during its Classical apogee. Contemporary nascent social anthropology turned to Hellenism to find a model for the development from *homme sauvage* (savage/wild man) to civilization, but saw in modern Greece the decline from civilization. Korais came to prove otherwise; Greece needed only to be stirred into action and “recapture” its civilization. He pleaded to European Philhellenists for support on this Neo-Hellenic project, arguing that they had a moral obligation to aid the modern Greeks to catch up with their European counterparts as a debt of gratitude for the Classical heritage Greece bequeathed to Europe. He encountered adverse European criticism and Greek opposition, and experienced the diasporic feelings of displacement and loss as an Eastern native who had constructed a syncretic self modeled after the Western European intellectual and behavioral value systems. In his retorts to his detractors, he displays a clear awareness of the politicization of cultural characteristics. For Korais, his new Hellenism was not a cult of antiquity, but possessed a normative function for the formation of modern Greek identity. The Hellenic *paideia* (education) he advocates has already entered the national domain. His new Hellenism is a case of mediated revival and a reflection of Western Hellenism, using concepts that entail normativity and aim at the expansion of a monolithic European culture, whereas his German contemporary, Herder, sees a community based on its own traditions and values being reborn in a polyphonic multicultural universe through spontaneous native regeneration. Had Korais, who had such a decisive influence on the formation of Greek language and culture, heeded Herder’s message, Greece may not have been subjected to *diglossia* (two distinct languages/dialects) for 150 years.

From the vision of a renascent modern Greek society based on the models of Classical *paideia* and Enlightenment thought as articulated by Western-oriented Greek diaspora intellectuals in Europe, Antonis Liakos

¹⁵ Interestingly, although Korais encouraged the translation of works from European languages, he himself only translated one, namely Beccaria’s *Dei delitti e delle pene* (Paris 1802).

(Chapter 8) moves to a subtle analysis of the creation of a Greek national sense of the past and ideology of Greekness (Hellenicity) from the time of the Greek Enlightenment till the academic battles of the second half of the twentieth century on the issue of the “continuity” of the Greek nation from the Classical to the modern age. Liakos examines Greek nation-building as a process leading to the nationalization of time, language, and space, and the attendant re-organization of collective memory. He analyzes how modern Greece was Hellenized, and how it adopted and internalized the idea of Greek continuity from antiquity to the present. This idea, which became the core of Greek national consciousness, was created through the closely connected processes of the remaking of history, the canonization and purification of language, and the restoration of the old toponyms. The appropriation of Hellenism by modern Greece demonstrates *a posteriori* the multiple dimensions and ambiguity of Hellenism and uncovers how this complexity has been downplayed in the nationalization of the concept of Hellenism in modern Greece.

In the post-independence period, the Greek written language was purged of all European and Turkish loanwords, and formulated into a new artificial “purified” Greek (*katharévoussa*). Similarly, the Greek landscape was “relieved” of memories of its most recent past, giving precedence to relics of the ancient world. In the early twentieth century, one-third of the Greek villages were given new names “rescued” from the annals of the Second Sophistic itinerant historian Pausanias. Greek language and geography were essentially re-Hellenized. Liakos observes the role of cultural history in the development of a new locally produced national Greek identity that replaced the Western revival model promoted by the Greek diaspora intellectuals with a schema of historical continuity effected by the appropriation of the Byzantine Period, and the refocusing of attention from the intellectual elites to the “ordinary” people in search of Greek “authenticity” in their language, artifacts, and “spirit.” The deployment of such aesthetic considerations in the national imagining and historiography was instigated by the demoticists, who sought to nationalize the masses, give precedence to the demotic (vernacular) language over the *katharévoussa*, and breathe “the elements of life” into the static Hellenism of the Philhellenists and the archaizing intellectuals, staking their claim as cultural leaders of the nation. After a century-long language controversy, the demotic language was finally established as the official language in 1976.

Building on earlier discussions on Byzantine identity, European Philhellenism, and the Greek Enlightenment imagining of the nation, Dimitris Livianos (Chapter 9) focuses on the Greek peasantry, the community of Orthodox Christendom, the importance of religion in the pre-modern Ottoman period, and the transition to nationalism in the first century of Greek

statehood (1821–1913). The continuum of collective identity afforded all Orthodox Christians since the Byzantine Period a concrete sense of belonging that lasted throughout the period of the Ottoman rule. The patriarch of Constantinople was the spiritual leader of the multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, self-governing Orthodox Christian Commonwealth in the Balkan Peninsula and Anatolia. With the advent of Western ideas of nationalism, the Classical revival program propounded by the Western intellectuals, and their call to the Greek people to revolt against the Ottoman oppressors, the Patriarchate sensed its faltering grip on its Orthodox dominion and, in a last attempt to retain its sovereignty, condemned the Greek revolt of 1821. Soon after, and as ideas of nationalism matured in the developing Balkan nation-states, the Orthodox Commonwealth divided into its varied component parts, and the Churches of Greece (1833), Romania (1865), Bulgaria (1870), and Serbia (1879) became national Churches and achieved independence from the Patriarchate, which was now under foreign (Ottoman) rule. The hitherto-Christian geography and calendar were nationalized and language and culture were given priority over religion. The Balkan wars served the final blow to the Orthodox Christian Commonwealth, when Greece as a nation fought fiercely against their Bulgarian co-religionists (1912–1913).

The focus on the Greek people encountered during the Byzantine years of the Orthodox Christian Commonwealth was re-introduced by the demoticists (Psycharis, Palamas) and later taken up by the modernist poets (Seferis, Elytis, and especially Ritsos) and popular musicians (Theodorakis, Hadjidakis) who immortalized *Romiosýne* in their artistic output, reclaiming a diachronic link to Christian Byzantium as the Eastern Roman Empire and to the Ottoman centuries over the pre-Christian Hellenism of the Western archaizing intellectuals, who were in turn criticized for attempting to subjugate the masses with imported elitist ideas. Leftist ideologies share this interest in *Romiosýne* with Orthodox Christianity, since it was during this pre-national time that the collective identity of the masses was more immediate and unencumbered by later superimposed social and intellectual structures. The eventual cohabitation of Hellen, Romios, and Orthodox Christian in the Greek collective identity attests to the success of the national imagining project that produced a diachronic pluralistic self-representation for the Greeks.

Having already cursorily introduced cultural history, folklore, and the aesthetic renderings of nationhood, we now open up the issue of Greek ethnicity to inquiry by way of a number of diverse disciplines, including psychoanalysis, anthropology, ethnography, cultural studies, and women's studies. In this third and final part, we move from historiography to the history of representations and culture as performance in Greece and in Greek America in the last century.

Charles Stewart (Chapter 10) offers an analysis of dreams of treasure as sharing in common with narratives of identity, historiography, and national ideology an articulation of temporalities where past events are evoked by present events or circumstances, but narrated in linear continuity. A sense of identity is formed by the personal, collective, and historical pasts organized chronologically in rational consciousness, or episodically in dreams in “flash-bulb” memory experiences, where the unconscious slips through seeking to satisfy a desire for historical and existential meaning. Stewart, through a psychoanalytical engagement with the anthropological data collected from Greek dreamers on the island of Naxos, shows how the social significance of history and religion in Greece affected the dream sequences of a mining village, Koronos, during the century following the Greek independence from the Ottoman rule. The Koronos dreams of treasure consist of a series of religious visions that led to the discovery of a small icon of the *Panagia* (All Holy Mother of Christ) in 1836. Instructions on the location of a second icon of St. Anne (Mother of the *Panagia*), though never found, appeared in a new series of communal dreams that began a century later, in 1930, engaging the local miners to use their skills of a dying craft, as poverty and the emigration to the urban centers took their toll on the local population. These religious treasure dreams, then, link the villagers to their recent Orthodox Christian Commonwealth past, but also by sacralizing their mining skills they dictate the continuity of the community by envisaging a glorious future, reference to which validates existence and activity in the present. Stewart argues that in Greece, whose eventful history plays such an integral part in the formation of a personal and national sense of identity, human temporality and the historicity of self-identity produce intriguing dreams of treasure, and history itself is seen as treasure and as symbolic capital to be safeguarded at all costs.

Peter Mackridge (Chapter 11) examines the creation of a diachronically and synchronically homogeneous cultural image of Greece and its dissemination via schoolbooks, street names, the archaeological “purging” of the Parthenon of all later accretions to the Classical building, the Athens 2004 Olympic Games campaign along with their opening and closing ceremonies, and the depictions of Greek history on the new euro coins and recent postage stamps—in short, the projection of Greek culture and identity domestically and abroad. In all these representations of Greek identity, the Classical image of Greece is still preponderant, though in recent years there is a trend towards emphasizing the prehistoric period, from where the Olympic mascots were inspired, and, especially, the prehistoric Minoan Period, and the prehistoric Cycladic Period that gained attention once Brancusi and Modigliani modeled their artwork after them. Notably, in the new euro coins, Greeks have downplayed the Macedonian

heritage that had been aggressively promoted in the early 1990s to prevent the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) from appropriating the star of Vergina in their new national flag. Furthermore, in a recent series of postage stamps, Greeks have selected to illustrate the regional variety in Greek folk music and dance. Both theme choices in the euro coins and in the aforementioned series of stamps are admittedly positive gestures towards Greece's Balkan neighbors. As Chapter 12 also stresses, Greece is transforming into a multicultural society and country of emigration and a necessary makeover of its international image is taking place so as to address the needs for this new age when the Classical Greek currency is no longer as potent. At the same time, Greece is negotiating claims of universality of its Classical heritage with claims of the individuality of this same culture and its rightful possession by the Greek state, claims behind its campaign for the return of the Parthenon marbles from the British Museum to the new Acropolis Museum, at the foot of the Acropolis in Athens.

In Chapter 12, I survey cinematic representations of Greek identity in contemporary Greek film. The internationally successful films of the 1960s, *Zorba the Greek* and *Never on Sunday*, created an image of Greece as an exotic escape location offering respite from the constraints of the civilized Western world. The artistic and intellectual elite reacted strongly against this exoticization of Greece. In Greek cinema of the past 30 years, Greek filmmakers highlight the different ingredients in the making of modern Greek identity, drawing on European modernism and Greek cultural particularity to articulate Greece's uniqueness. I examine the work of Theo Angelopoulos and Michael Cacoyannis as representative film directors of the modernist and the indigenous representations of Greekness, respectively. There is an outward-directed Greek cinema, designed to export Greek culture to international markets. In the second part of the chapter, I examine Greek cinema and its stand towards Europe and the Balkans. The intellectual descendants of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979) reversed Western romantic Hellenism, the implication of which had been to suppress the Eastern aspect of Greek civilization. This repositioning of Greece in academic studies away from nineteenth-century European Philhellenism corresponds to a cinematic shift in attitudes. In the post-Cold War era, Greece is increasingly featured in European discourses as part of Eastern Europe and the Balkans, though striving to differentiate herself from them. The Balkanization of Greece is a kind of marginalization effected by Western Europe. This Eurocentric vision excludes the Balkans from a share in a common European culture and in effect leads to a "third-worldization"

of the Balkans.¹⁶ Greek filmmakers respond with renewed sensitivity to Greece's position in the Balkans since the 1990s, representing it as the recipient of Balkan refugees and immigrants. As people cross boundaries, insularity and homogeneity can no longer sustain national myths equating a culture and a space. In this respect, Greek cinema is attuned with the global fascination with cultural flows and circulations, syncretism and migrancy, engaging in the post-colonial discourses of multilayered identities and deterritorialization, and deconstructing dominant national discourses. I ask whether this repositioning of Greek cinema can be sustained, and what its success or failure has to tell us about the longer-term history of the attempt at the construction of a coherent, homogeneous, and continuous Greek identity.

This volume privileges the analysis of specific topics and periods through a wide range of scholarly voices and methodologies. The modern Greek diaspora is a final case in point. A cultural formation of particular vitality, the Greek diaspora has been until recently neglected by scholarship. There are a number of new notable initiatives among diaspora Greeks to preserve identity in the context of globalization and a number of contemporary distinguished artists, such as Jeffrey Eugenides and George Pelecanos, who address inter-racial relations, exile, dislocation, and home in a creative manner. Given the importance of and emerging scholarly interest in this diaspora, which numbers approximately 7 million members, I decided to focus on Greek America in order to situate the transformation of Greek worlds in diaspora in a specific sociopolitical context. In this regard, two essays explore cultural change in Greek America through two distinct methodologies: Yiorgos Anagnostou offers an insightful analysis of Helen Papanikolas's chronicle of Greek America from a cultural studies perspective (Chapter 13), and Artemis Leontis offers a subtle presentation of the ethnographic material of Greek-American women's handmade textiles (Chapter 14). Both essays contribute to emerging research on Greek hybridity and syncretism, as well as cultural discontinuities and continuities. The discussion of these issues contributes coherently to this book, since these topics are treated elsewhere and in relation to a variety of periods covered in the volume.

Yiorgos Anagnostou (Chapter 13) challenges the claim that during the post-World War II period, the Greek immigrant vernacular culture

¹⁶ See the controversial book by Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, *Europe: A History of Its Peoples* (published simultaneously in the EU languages—except Greek—in 1990), which airbrushed the peoples who lived east of Germany (including the ancient Greeks) out of European history; this attitude—on the eve of the collapse of communism—seems as mindless as Francis Fukuyama's notorious "end of history." See also, Todorova 1997 and Jordanova 2001.

progressively withered away until it completely died out, due to imposed assimilation and willful adaptation to the dominant American culture. A close reading of Papanikolas's ethnographically documented family biography illuminates the complex transformations of an immigrant subject, as well as processes of immigrant cross-cultural fertilization, the enduring power of the vernacular culture, and the production of syncretic selves enriched by imitation, blending, and intermingling, processes observed earlier in the volume in the multi-ethnic and multicultural environments of the Hellenistic Age, the Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman periods and, more recently, in modern Greece since the waves of Balkan migration of the 1990s. Anagnostou observes the performance of the Greek immigrants' ethno-religious identity, as well as the performance of assimilation during a period when the immigrants had to negotiate with white supremacy a new social space of ethnic whiteness for themselves so as to be accepted and eventually allowed to ascend to the middle classes of the host country. Still, social spaces were highly gendered spaces, and even more so for the immigrant wife who was entrusted the role of the preserver and transmitter of the Greek language, traditional values, and mores, but at the same time had to show visible signs of assimilation to the American way of life. Anagnostou's discussion cautions against generalized claims about cultural loss, favoring analysis that is grounded in specific contexts and social relations. Thus, his reading points to an immigrant woman's multitude of cultural repertoires as they are performed in identifiable settings: her ethno-religious identity deployed at home; her acquired expertise in American cooking performed beyond ethnic networks, among a circle of women acquaintances; her abilities as a dream-interpreter, repeatedly displayed to a devoted fan club among women of various nationalities; and, in the midst of a life history dotted with change, her steadfast, albeit selective, adherence to traditional modes of conduct. This kind of analysis illustrates a versatile immigrant subject who negotiates a variety of social relations and positions herself in multiple social locations. The life history of this multifaceted individual calls off any linear treatment of assimilation, pointing instead to the importance of exploring Greek diaspora as circuits of heterogeneous practices across diverse social settings. Anagnostou (p. 358) proposes a "shift from a generalized to a site-specific examination of cultural change," suggesting it as a model for "further research on the multiple ways in which" global Hellenisms traveled through time and across space.

With Artemis Leontis's essay (Chapter 14) on the development of the Greek-American migrant women's subjectivity in the New World and their espousal or rejection of their socially dictated role as upholders and transmitters of the Greek language, faith, customs, and lineage, the issues of culture, identity, and ethnicity are "brought home" through the handmade

heirlooms of mothers, a “tangible inheritance” from the motherland. Transported as part of a bridal trousseau by the migrant daughters across the Atlantic, the maternal stitched handwork was rendered obsolete upon arrival and the trunk transformed into a repository of memories, embroidered dreams, and material culture. The maternal “voice of the shuttle”¹⁷ combines with national discourses disseminated at schools and churches in the first half of the twentieth century to become a mandate for a prescribed gendered identity inculcated in the minds of the young females who are destined to become the mothers of the Greek nation. Such instructions are negotiated creatively at the coming-of-age in the New World, when identities are refashioned and traditional ideas are soon superseded in favor of assimilation to American culture, only to be recalled, re-evaluated, and reclaimed at the news of the death of the mother or at moments of reflection of the migrant female’s life in the diaspora. Then, the immigrant trunk becomes a treasure chest, and the personal infused with the national.

This is a book about a vastly complex subject matter in a large diachronic sweep. My primary aim as editor is to open up the issue of Greek ethnicity and culture to inquiry through a number of diverse disciplines and, thus, provide a multiplicity of perspectives and voices that contribute to an ongoing dialogue, and invite further academic discussion on the topic. I believe that the volume, with its good number of engaging contributions, presents itself as a strategic publishing intervention that seeks to direct attention to the multifaceted expressions of diachronic Hellenisms. With the exception of Margaret Alexiou’s work, there have been, indeed, very few attempts to deal with the subject spanning antiquity, medieval, early modern and modern periods.¹⁸ There are a number of general theoretical monographs about ethnicity, several applications of ethnicity studies to archaic and Classical Greece (Edith Hall, Jonathan Hall, Irad Malkin), Roman Greece (Simon Swain, Ewen Bowie, Simon Goldhill, Jas Elsner, Susan Alcock), Byzantine Greece (Robert Browning, Spyros Vryonis), and many interesting studies of modern Greek literature and cinema, raising similar issues (Artemis Leontis, Andrew Horton). Some studies, though (Horton, in particular), are less than sure-footed when their authors stray

¹⁷ Borrowed from G. Hartman, “The Voice of the Shuttle: Language from the Point of View of Literature,” in *Beyond Formalism: Literary Essays 1958–1970* (New Haven and London 1970).

¹⁸ Alexiou 2002. See also, Hokwerda (ed.) 2003, which is another attempt at a diachronic multi-authored survey of Greek identity; and see Peter Mackridge’s review of this volume in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 31.1 (2007). Also, the edited volumes by Vryonis 1978; Brown & Hamilakis (eds) 2003; and Yatromanolakis & Roilos (eds) 2005.

away from their own special period of knowledge. Hence, my recruitment of experts in this present study.

The volume does not aspire to offer the final word in an authoritative and definitive voice in a cultural dialogue that is still very much ongoing. Its specific contribution lies in the fact that it problematizes the fluidity of Hellenism and offers a much-needed public dialogue between disparate viewpoints, in the process making a case for the existence and viability of such polyphony. The volume aims to constructively couch and contextualize this dialogue, explore its potential for the reader, ask poignant questions, and map future research directions. The readership envisaged is not just academic. I intend for this book to have a wide non-specialist appeal. To this end, I have ensured that all ancient and modern languages are translated into English. Given the widespread reluctance of English-speaking academic presses to publish books on diachronic Hellenism—most publishers were willing to publish only the parts on the archaic to the Byzantine Period of the present volume, expressing a lack of interest in the modern era—the publication of this volume is a groundbreaking step in the field of Hellenic studies.