


Historein

Vol 19, No 2 (2021)

From the Greek Revolution of 1821 to the Metapolitefsi: Historiographical Debates in Greece across Two Centuries



The Historiography of the Greek Revolution of 1821: From Memoirs to National Scholarly History, 1821–1922

Panagiotis Stathis

doi: [10.12681/historein.18371](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.18371)


Copyright © 2021, Panagiotis Georgios Stathis



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Stathis, P. (2021). The Historiography of the Greek Revolution of 1821: From Memoirs to National Scholarly History, 1821–1922. *Historein*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.18371>



**The Historiography of the
Greek Revolution of 1821:
From Memoirs to National
Scholarly History, 1821–1922**

Panagiotis Stathis

doi: 10.12681/historein.18371

To cite this article:

Stathis, Panagiotis. 2021. "The Historiography of the Greek Revolution of 1821: From Memoirs to National Scholarly History, 1821–1922". *Historein* 19 (2).
<https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.18371>.

The Historiography of the Greek Revolution of 1821: From Memoirs to National Scholarly History, 1821–1922

Panagiotis Stathis

University of Crete

The Greek Revolution of 1821 constitutes both the founding historical condition of the Greek nation-state and the key transition point, on the one hand, from the prenational religious identity to the modern national one (for largest part of the southern Balkan Christian populations), and, on the other, from the absolutist Ottoman regime (an ancient regime-like type) to a representative parliamentary polity with liberal institutions. In other words, it constitutes a link in the circle of the liberal national revolutions that started with the American Revolution of 1776, peaked with the French Revolution of 1789 and spread across the Americas and Europe in the end of the eighteenth century.¹

This study discusses the historiography of the Greek Revolution of 1821, what in Greek is often referred to “Twenty-One” (*Eikosiēna*) or the “Struggle” (*Agon*). Since 1821 constitutes the founding condition of the Greek state and autonomous existence of the Greek nation, it can be considered as the main historiographical field of modern Greek history. Throughout most of the twentieth century it represented a field of conflict between opposing historiographical but also ideological and political currents. Opposing ideological environments and collective identities (such as the political factions of the left and right) formed different readings of Greek history in which the Greek Revolution played a central role. Its reading and interpretation served as the compass for reading and interpreting the whole process of modern Greek historical development. Opposing collectives also made selective use of history by searching for their “ancestors” in the revolutionary past; thus, they formed historical genealogies through which they could claim authentic continuity with leading social groups and figures of the revolution. Consequently 1821 obtained exemplary power. Each of its readings functioned as the starting point in shaping the respective political practice in the present. In other words, each and every reading of 1821 (in)formed the directional guidelines of political practices in the present. In fact it was political practices in the present that sought support and justification in the 1821 Revolution. Conversely the “greatness” of the “heroes” of the struggle, comparable to that of the ancient Greeks, served as a shining example but also as an elusive dream. Accordingly, the central importance of the revolution in Greek history obliged every political and ideological collectivity or every social movement to adopt an often polemic, interpretive approach to

1821. It is precisely this exemplary meaning of 1821 that ensured that each of these historiographical approaches would not be confined to the scientific community; it also set the ground for broader social conflict. For example, some of the most intense debates about school education had to do with the way pupils were taught the period of Ottoman rule and the revolution and with the relevant content of history textbooks.² In the “history wars” of twentieth-century Greece, 1821 constituted either their centre or their important outcome.

The main historiographical controversy through most of the twentieth century was that between the opponents of the national history and the Marxist or left historians concerning the character of the revolution. This controversy is summarised in the dilemma whether 1821 was a national or a social revolution; a dilemma which, however, simplifies and schematises the terms of the discussion. For instance, it does not reflect the depth and complexity of the approaches of several of those accused of supporting the second part of the dipole.

Moreover, each one of these broad fronts, that is, of national and leftist historiography, was neither unitary nor immutable: they experienced significant shifts and differentiations both contemporarily and historically.

If the central issue was about the national or social character of the revolution, a number of questions were at the heart of the debate:

1. Was 1821 a revolution or, rather, a war of independence and, consequently, when and how was the Greek nation actually created?
2. Why did the revolution begin in 1821? In other words, which ideological and socioeconomic developments led to its outbreak?
3. Who were the agents, the social forces of the revolution, and what was their exact role during the struggle?
4. What was the nature of the civil wars during the revolution?
5. What was the role of the European powers?
6. What were the results of the revolution and, therefore, what was the type of State founded by the revolution? To what extent did the revolution succeed or fail in its goals? To what extent were radical changes, ruptures or breaks more important than continuities in the political, social and economic field, but also in the fields of ideology and culture?

The dominant position of nationalist ideology within Greek historiography in the last two centuries predetermined the historiographical perspective of Ottoman rule as a period related mainly to the revolution and having no special historical interest to be studied per se. The period of Ottoman rule gained autonomy in Greek historical studies only after the

fall of the dictatorship in 1974 and only within academic circles.³ Otherwise the four centuries of the so-called *Tourkokratia* (“Turkish rule”) merely constitute the preparatory period of 1821. Consequently, the dominant periodisation follows the political landmarks suggested by national history and ideology: AD 330 (the transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Byzantium, which was then renamed Constantinople, and the beginning of the history of the Byzantine Empire), 1204 (the conquest of the Byzantine Empire by the Crusades), 1453 (the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans), 1821. However, from the point of view of social and economic history and the history of identities important political changes occurred in the sixth century (the transition from ancient to medieval society) and in the eighteenth century (the decline of feudal relations, commercial development and the formation of Greek nationalism).

Revolutionary and postrevolutionary period

In the first postrevolutionary decades, until about 1880, several texts related to the 1821 Revolution were published, many of which had been written during the revolution. These involve mainly memoirs, texts largely based on the memories of the author-fighter of the revolution. At the same time, a few texts attempting a historiographical synthesis⁴ or scientific study of the struggle were also published.⁵ In any case, in the first postrevolutionary decades, the distinction between historiographical and nonhistoriographical works is hard to draw. The majority of the authors sought to substantiate their claims not only on their direct personal knowledge and “reliable witnesses” but also on the number of documents they cited. Some of the narratives cover, both in terms of space and time span, a large part or even the whole of the revolution. While some of the authors were scholars with considerable educational background, none had completed any academic philological or historical studies. After all, the first Greek university was not founded until 1837. To be more accurate, before the last quarter of the nineteenth century, one can hardly talk of professional historians, namely writers with specialised studies who were systematically occupied with historical research.

Moreover, historical essays had yet to acquire a widely accepted, academically recognised form: on the one hand, the work of Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos – appointed professor of history in the University of Athens in 1851 and the most prominent Greek historian of the nineteenth century – lacks citations and footnotes and does not include documents,⁶ while, on the other, Ioannis Filimon, a scholar who was a revolutionary fighter and then a journalist, devotes almost half of his four-volume book on the history of the revolution to publishing documents.⁷

Yet, what is really critical is that the authors’ narrations and interpretations are mediated by the experience of participating in the revolution and, in particular, the side they chose in the sociopolitical confrontations during it. And this is so, irrespective of their degree of education or scholarship and the extent of their historical composition. Moreover,

their narrative styles differ as some are emotionally engaged while others opt for a more detached writing style.

Furthermore, there are several historical narrations about the Greeks under Ottoman rule and during the revolution written by foreign authors. There were mainly two types of writers. The first category includes philhellenes who participated in the revolution or diplomats who served in Greece. The second category includes a number of intellectuals, often professional historians, who specialised either in modern history or the history of classical antiquity but the appreciation they had for the ancient Greek world made them interested in modern Greeks. It is precisely this period, which, compared with later periods, is marked by a considerable augmentation of published histories of 1821 written by foreign authors; most of these books were actually published during the revolution, between 1822 and 1832. The vast majority of these foreign authors supported the rising liberal wave. They expressed their interest in the Greek Revolution by considering it as part of the broader struggle between liberals and conservatives in Europe, sometimes as an example of the revolutionary overthrow of the old regime. At least 27 foreign writers wrote historical books about the Greek Revolution, seven of which were translated into Greek and independently published by 1880.⁸

Furthermore, 1821 holds a special place in the literary works of the period, both in prose and poetry.⁹ In fact, several literary works claim historical accuracy and explicitly seek to act as channels for the diffusion of historical knowledge: they constitute a literary transformation of real historical facts, they narrate many extensive accounts of historical context, some supported by numerous references and footnotes.¹⁰ But while the prose had little impact on the broader audience, the poetic works such as those of Dionysios Solomos, Alexandros and Panagiotis Soutsos, Aristotelis Valaoritis and Achilleus Paraschos had a much bigger influence.¹¹ Around 1860 the first textbooks exclusively regarding the revolution were published.¹²

Of particular importance is the publication of folk songs collected by both Greek and foreign scholars. These collections would create the basis for the formation of the new discipline of folklore studies and its key argument of proving the “continuity” of Greek popular culture, that is, the Greek nation, from antiquity to the present times. In this vein, they would play a crucial role in the historiographical approach to 1821. In all these collections the “klephtika” songs, that is, the songs of the klephts or pallikars of the revolution, cover a large part; this folk material was going to support the perception of the klephts and the martoloses as prime agents of the active national resistance of modern Greeks against Ottoman rule. The historical introductions in these publications, the historical commentary on the songs as well as the klephtika songs themselves were going to be used as key evidence for the above-mentioned perception.¹³

In contrast to the folk songs, there were limited and insufficient efforts to collect,

maintain and publish archival material related to the revolution, despite the adoption of an adequate legislative framework. The Library of Parliament only began in 1855 with the systematic process of collecting records of 1821, leading to the publication of two volumes entitled *Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας* (Archives of the Greek Regeneration) (Athens, 1859, 1862). However, the publication did not proceed. The most important publication was due to the personal initiative of Andreas Mamoukas, a senior civil servant in the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Education, who collected and published 11 volumes of archival material under the title *Τα κατά την Αναγέννησιν της Ελλάδος, ήτοι συλλογή των [...] συνταχθέντων πολιτευμάτων, νόμων και άλλων επισήμων πράξεων από του 1821 μέχρι του 1832* (Documents Concerning the Greek Renaissance, that is, Collection of [...] Constitutions, Laws and Other Official Acts Composed from 1821 until 1832) (Athens, 1839–1852).¹⁴ In both cases, these were official government documents: mainly acts and laws of the revolutionary constitutional assemblies and the parliamentary minutes. Also, few powerful prerevolutionary communities who sought to regain their strength in the postrevolutionary period undertook the publication of the first collections of community archives.¹⁵ Some progress was also accomplished regarding the collection and publication of personal archives: this involved mainly the publication of document collections regarding leading personalities whose attitude during the revolution provoked resentment, doubt or reactions. Therefore, the publication of those documents was intended to vindicate these figures.¹⁶

Generally speaking, the aspirations of social subjects (individual and collective) in postrevolutionary Greek society, which was still under formation, constitute the main reason that led writers of the time to express opposing views and, consequently, embryonic interpretative schemes of sorts of the revolution. Indeed, the texts of this period reflect, at times explicitly and at others implicitly, hesitating, ambiguous and contentious behaviour: the reluctance of people and social groups at the beginning of the revolution, the interests and pursuits that led various groups to finally participate in it, the contradictions and conflicts during the struggle concerning the form and the political organisation of the new regime that would succeed the old one. The multiple sociopolitical confrontations during the revolution between military officers and politicians, the fighters from Roumeli and the Peloponnesian fighters, the “autochthonous” Greeks and the indigenous Greeks from abroad (“heterochthonous”), and between chieftains and notables are also presented, often with aggressive expressions. During the first postrevolutionary decades, the revolution actually constituted a field of historiographical debate, regardless of the general agreement that 1821 was primarily a struggle for national liberation against the Ottoman rulers. In other words, different interpretative approaches were formulated, although in a rather rudimentary way and lacking sufficient cohesion. However, none of these interpretations managed to prevail in the public sphere. It is significant that many of the relevant texts published are argumentative; in other words, they were published to refute or correct earlier texts.

The factors which contributed to the formation of this pluralist historiographical

landscape of the period included the personal involvement of the people in prerevolutionary and revolutionary contradictions and conflicts, the short proximity to the events in question that kept the memory alive and the strong influence of Enlightenment ideas. However, the real stake was not historiographical but political, as the social and political position of the protagonists of these debates in postrevolutionary society was, by and large, determined by their attitude during and contribution to the revolution. Each author's opinion about the revolutionary challenges as they developed and, mainly, his position in postrevolutionary Greek society decisively influenced his point of view. Accordingly, these texts not only refer to the revolution, but also to the postrevolutionary period, specifically, the circumstances under which they were written and the postrevolutionary social debates to which they relate. Besides, in these memoirs the revolution is interpreted retrospectively, as people were aware of its outcome. In the postrevolutionary period, the former fighters sought financial compensation, social advancement or political careers on the grounds of their revolutionary action. Therefore they wrote under the influence of the constraints imposed by the postrevolutionary balance of power. For example, the notable Kanellos Deligiannis expressed his discontent when he realised that after the revolution he and the family of Theodoros Kolokotronis were treated as equals, although, according to his beliefs, the latter belonged to lower social strata. Therefore, in his memoir, Deligiannis tried to downplay Kolokotronis' role in the struggle. The chieftain (and later General) Yannis Makriyannis argued that in postrevolutionary society traditional captains were pushed aside by educated "heterochthonous" Greeks. Therefore, he retrospectively formed an interpretative scheme according to which civil conflicts and military defeats in the revolution were due to the selfishness of politicians from abroad (mainly Alexandros Mavrokordatos, Ioannis Kolettis, Andreas Metaxas). However, during the struggle, he sided with the liberal wing of Mavrokordatos, Kolettis and Georgios Kountouriotis.

Schematically, the texts about the revolution written in the postrevolutionary period can be divided into two broad categories. On the one hand, there are the texts of the agents of traditional culture, who try to interpret and, at the same time, resist the modernisation process and the disintegration of traditional structures through the concept of autochthonism, that is, the ideological construction of the "merit" of the autochthon (indigenous, native). These memoirs defend the action and practices of traditional social strata during the revolution and evaluate them in moral terms. On the other hand, in their own texts, the representatives of modern European ideas evaluate the attitude of the protagonists of the revolution based on the rationality of their choices during the process of the establishment of the modern state.¹⁷

The 1880–1922 period

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, 1821 was gradually transformed from a lively part of collective memory and a controversial field regarding its meaning into a sacred national treasure and, at the same time, a scientific object of history in which a consensual spirit dominated. The main purpose was now the integration in the historical narrative of all social groups, on an equal basis, and the amelioration of historiographical conflicts about the meaning of the revolution. In this development two factors played a decisive role: on the one hand, the gradual withdrawal from the scene of the protagonists, who had kept alive the personal and social confrontations throughout the revolutionary and postrevolutionary periods; on the other, the gradual fusion of the opposing social elite groups of the revolution in the new sociopolitical setting of the independent nation-state. Indeed, the distinctive lines among the descendants of the above-mentioned elites, that is, the notables, the *klephtokapetanaioi* (klepht captains) and the educated Greeks from abroad were blurred gradually as they became educated politicians or military officials while intermarriage between the families of these elite groups increased. Furthermore, from the 1850s onwards the gradual rise of new urban social strata based on the slow but substantial industrialisation and commercial development changed the framework of ideological and political confrontations: earlier controversies (such as those between captains and notables, autochthonous and heterochthonous Greeks, or between modernist scholars and traders, on the one hand, and traditional social elites, on the other) became rather anachronistic and insignificant within the new social context. At the same time, the emergence of Balkan competitors (Bulgarians, Serbs and Albanians) in the populations and territories claimed by the Greek nation favoured the renegotiation of recent Greek history in the direction of the unification of the nation in the face of the new external enemies. Moreover, the gradual formation of history as an academic discipline with rules and structural hierarchies shaped a more rigid normative framework regarding the acceptance, imposition or, on the contrary, exclusion of historiographical approaches.

The turning point in transition was the publication of the fifth volume of the *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Greek Nation] by Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos in 1874, dedicated to “neohellenic” history (from 1204 onwards). Paparrigopoulos formed a historical narrative for this period and especially the 1821 Revolution, introducing the following key elements: by personifying the nation and nationalising (that is, rationalising) the concept of divine providence in terms of a secularised national mission, the so called *Megali Idea* (Great Idea), he retrospectively justified the revolution in light of this mission: the revolution was made because the mission of the Greek nation was the dissemination of (Western) culture in the underdeveloped East. Thus, Paparrigopoulos incorporates the period of “Turkish rule” in the heart of national history by interpreting multiple uprisings of Christian populations as a series of revolutionary national-liberation movements and, overall, by presenting the “400 years” of Ottoman occupation as a period when the Greek

national existence was preserved under the weight of gloomy slavery; so, the Ottoman era became a preparation period for the great Revolution of 1821 and, subsequently, for the realisation of the historic mission of the Greek nation. The overall decline of “Hellenism” after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 made the need to survive and maintain the unity of the genus (here, the Greek nation) a primary duty. According to Paparrigopoulos, the necessary elements for the preservation of the nation during Turkish rule were the following:

1. The preservation of religious beliefs due to the ecclesiastical authorities. The patriarch acted as a quasi-national political leader.
2. The establishment of a “self-administration” of modern Greeks under Turkish rule (that is, national self-rule) through “Greek rulers”, such as the Phanariots and the beys of Mani, and, of course, through the creation of a specific community system (a sort of local authority of Christians), which in Paparrigopoulos’ words was “one of the best community organisations mentioned in history”.
3. An independent foreign policy, as evidenced by the fact that for 368 years the Greek nation constantly allied with all the enemies of the Porte.
4. The creation of a self-sufficient national armed “infantry and naval power” (martoloses, Souliotes, Maniots, pirates, island navies).
5. The establishment of an self-regulated “public education system”.
6. The great number of uprisings covering the entire period of Turkish rule. The uprisings in Paparrigopoulos’ interpretative scheme operate in two ways: they both prove the preservation of national consciousness and prepare for the great . At this point, the influence of Konstantinos Sathas’ work *Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάς: Ιστορικών δοκίμιον περί των προς αποτίναξιν του Οθωμανικού ζυγού επαναστάσεων του ελληνικού έθνους (1453–1821)* (Greece under Turkish Occupation: A Historical Essay about the Revolutions made by the Greek Nation for its Liberation from the Ottoman Yoke, 1453–1821) (Athens, 1869) is evident. (The relevant chapter in the earlier work of Paparrigopoulos also entitled *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Greek Nation] published in 1853 is poor; it refers only to the movements from the Orlov insurrections onwards and is not governed by the logic of the continuing revolutionary disposition of the enslaved Greeks.)

Freedom of religion and ecclesiastical government, freedom of language, community organisation, the penetration of Greeks in administrative offices of the Ottoman state (Phanariots, Maniot beys) and the system of martoloses constitute the typical content of the so-called “privileges” (according to the national historiography), which the Ottomans were forced to grant to the Greeks because, the former being barbarians, could not effectively

govern the conquered countries. In Paparrigopoulos' interpretative scheme, the Greek nation maintained or formed a special national life despite the horror of slavery. It is a quasi-national state organisation with all institutions following the European government standards of the nineteenth century: church, government, education, military, foreign policy, and, from the seventeenth century onwards, an important culture.¹⁸

Therefore, for Paparrigopoulos 1821 constituted the outcome of the continuous and uninterrupted desire of the Greeks to gain their freedom. If it differed from previous uprisings this was only because of its "panhellenic" character, the organisation of Hellenism in the secret revolutionary society Filiki Etaireia (Society of Friends) and the fact that the Greeks relied on their own merits rather than foreign aid. These traits of the 1821 Revolution were due to the progressive decline of the Ottomans and the "material and moral progress" of the nation, specifically, the gradual maturation of consciousness and other conditions. Civil wars and sociopolitical and ideological conflicts during the revolution either fade into oblivion or are attributed to a "lust for power" and "discord", which were considered to be national characteristics of the Greeks from antiquity to the present. So, the interpretative key of discord, translated into political ambitions and personal rivalries, underestimated or ignored the ideological differences and social conflicts.¹⁹ At the same time, in Paparrigopoulos' work the revolution was released from all sociopolitical connotations regarding the change of traditional structures and the elimination of the arbitrary authority of the sultan and was limited to a revolution of national liberation from the foreigner (and not just infidel) oppressor.

Thus, a pantheon of the heroes of the revolution was gradually established which included, on an equal basis, persons with diametrically opposed views and attitudes, both in terms of the prospects of the revolution and the form and the organisation of the nascent state: the leader of Filiki Etaireia Alexandros Ypsilantis alongside Patriarch Grigorios V; the first governor of Greece, Ioannis Kapodistrias, who ruled in an absolutist manner, alongside the local notable/*kotsabasis* of Mani Petrobey Mavromichalis, whose family members assassinated Kapodistrias; and the liberal scholar Adamantios Korais, who opposed Kapodistrias' rule. Also, one can find the chieftain and later commander of the revolution Theodoros Kolokotronis alongside the liberal Phanariot statesman Alexandros Mavrokordatos, his opponent in the civil conflicts during the revolution; or the notable Kanellos Deligiannis and the merchant shipowner Georgios Kountouriotis, who were opponents in the civil strife; or the warlord Odysseas Androutsos alongside the statesman Ioannis Kolettis, who is held responsible for his murder.²⁰

The same historiographical line is followed by the most prominent historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: Dimitrios Vernardakis, Spyridon Lambros (the most important historian of the period from 1880 to 1920, specialised in the ancient and Byzantine periods, who in his few works concerning modern Greek history follows Paparrigopoulos' interpretative scheme), Pavlos Karolidis, Epameinondas Kyriakidis, Tryfon Evangelidis and, to a certain extent, Georgios Kremos.²¹ Paparrigopoulos' interpretative

scheme formed the basis of the national historiographical conception of the revolution, which remained dominant throughout most of the twentieth century.

A heir of Paparrigopoulos' legacy, Pavlos Karolidis published in 1892 a history of the 1821 Revolution as the second volume of his three-volume work entitled *Ιστορία του 19ου αιώνα μετ' εικόνων* (Illustrated History of the Nineteenth Century) (Athens, 1892–1893). He adopted Paparrigopoulos' basic interpretive scheme and tried to highlight the international significance of the revolution. The central role of the Greek nation in world history was not limited to ancient and medieval times. It thus followed that in modern times the Greek Revolution was the major event of the nineteenth century. Karolidis believed the 1821 Revolution was the major event of European history in the nineteenth century, and led, in a substantial way, to the dissolution of the Holy Alliance, while it awakened the national consciousness of the subjects of the Ottoman Empire, leading to internal reforms. Through the revolution, the Greek nation awakened the Greek East by restoring culture, a task that the West had not managed to accomplish. Karolidis minimised the significance and the results of civil conflicts, considering them as the product of two factors: on the one hand, the parliamentary regime established by the National Assembly of Epidaurus (1822), a regime which did not suit the Greek people and was unexpectedly imposed during the revolution; and on the other hand, the simultaneous existence of several strong personalities – both products and tokens of the nation's worth – none of whom could accept anyone else as equal. Consequently, he argues that the appropriate form of government the Greek Revolution had to establish was a strong royal monarchy and to place on the throne an offspring of the big European royal houses. His argument was based on the idea that kingship constituted a Greek creation, whose origin went to Greek history and, thus, was the most appropriate type of polity for the Greek nation. Otherwise, they had to establish a strong military government from among the members of military aristocracy of the period, namely the powerful chieftains.

The historical reading of Ottoman rule and the revolution in terms of the continuity, unity and progress of the Greek nation was due not only to the dominance of national ideology but to the prevalence of particular versions of the Megali Idea, namely irredentism, as well as the political and cultural dominance of the Greek nation in the Ottoman imperial space. The Greek historians of the time wrote in a conjuncture when the onrush of the nation to fulfil its irredentist aspirations was either *ante portas* (before 1912) or a work in progress (1912–1922). The tension between the antagonistic Balkan nations gradually escalated in the late nineteenth century, often leading to armed confrontation (the 1897 Greek-Turkish War, armed struggles between guerrilla groups in Macedonia from 1904 to 1908, uprisings in Crete). In actual fact, the antagonism between the Balkan nations over the Christian populations of Ottoman-controlled Macedonia that had commenced around 1870 initially revolved around education and ecclesiastical administration and culminated in

armed confrontation between guerrilla groups from 1904 to 1908.

In the face of escalating national antagonisms, many Greek scholars maintained that the strengthening of the state and the successful prosecution of the coming military confrontations required the establishment of a powerful central authority and a unitary national body, unaffected by particularistic collective identities, partisanship and class conflicts. Some were in favour of a powerful monarchy or even against parliamentarianism. These political stances also shared a strong critique of universal male suffrage, a right institutionalised since the National Assembly of 1864. Either adopting a liberal vantage point or drawing on a conservative perspective, this line of critique contended that universal suffrage contributed to, or preserved, party factionalism, nepotism, clientelism and inefficient administration.²²

Their orientation towards contemporaneous developments defined their attitude towards history or the synchronic view determined the diachronic perspective. In this ideological and political framework, the historians of the time approached the Greek Revolution retrospectively, as a unitary struggle against Turkish rule. The dimensions of this process, such as the overturning of the traditional absolutist Ottoman regime and the establishment of a modern liberal parliamentary state, vanished from their horizon. Accordingly, in their eyes, the revolution appeared to have failed not because it ended up in Otto's absolute monarchy but due to the limited space the new-born Greek state occupied. They attributed the military defeats during the revolution and the limited space of the nascent Greek state to the institutionalisation of constitutionalism and parliamentarianism that brought about polyarchy and hindered military operations. Thus, what was required was the establishment of a strong government with authoritarian powers or even another monarchy or a dictatorship to wage with a firm hand the struggle against the Turks. Particularistic social interests and collective subjects that dissolved the unity of the nation while it was conducting an actual or anticipated war with the eternal enemy placed obstacles to the national effort. Accordingly, in a national-liberation revolution, such as the 1821 one, there was no room for particularistic collective subjects other than the nation: the collective revolutionary subject was unitary and national. Consequently, the debates internal to the nation were not attributed to class or ideological-political differences but to a particular characteristic of the race: ultra-individualism led to philarchia.

The idea that the national body as a whole should be subjugated to a strong state and a powerful government to fulfil its historical mission was not just an after-effect of a particular reading of the conjuncture. Historiographically speaking, it derived from the homologous approaches of German historicism and, in particular, of the Prussian school that dominated Germany in the second half of the nineteenth century. The historians of the school (Johann Gustav Droysen, Theodor Mommsen, Heinrich von Sybel, Heinrich von Treitschke), frustrated by the failure of the 1848 revolutions, reevaluated the importance of a strong state, in this case of the Prussian state, for the fulfilment of the historical mission of the nation, in this case the unification of Germany. To the extent that liberal movements had

failed to unify Germany, the task fell into the hands of the Prussian state. In this context, the power of the nation was identified with the power of the state. The effective national state had a strong central power, a strong monarchic power to which civil and political rights were subjugated.²³

Accordingly, in the Greek case, the fulfilment of the historical mission of the nation, namely the territorial expansion and the substitution of Ottoman rule, in the East, with Greek rule, required the central political power of the revolution and, later, of the Greek state to be strong and insulated from personal ambitions and party factionalism. The ideal solution would be for power to be concentrated in the hands of a political and military leader. Indicatively, the majority of Greek historians of the time had studied in Germany and were influenced by the German historiographical climate, including Vernardakis, Lambros, Karolidis, Kremos and Evangelidis.

Greek historians, in their attempt to stress the unity of the nation and to downplay the ideological-political debates and social conflicts that marked the revolution, systematically avoided any comparison with the French Revolution or any other revolutions and contemporary social movements, assuming that the 1789 Revolution did not play any role in the Greek national movement. In this way, they abstained from inscribing the 1821 Revolution in the European liberal and revolutionary context and, consequently, from drawing on the theoretical patterns and methodological tools provided by studies of the French Revolution or other European revolutions to analyse the Greek one. Typically, in this respect, Karolidis assumed that, apart from being an external occasion that offered leverage to the national uprising due to the international military crisis it triggered, the French Revolution shared with Greek Revolution

neither an internal bond nor a commonality of ideas and historical origins, nor common causes and final ends. A priori, all it takes to prove this is to compare the dates: the French Revolution, which started in the last decade of the eighteenth century (1789), could not have been in the least the internal cause of the Greek Revolution which, from a moral point of view, started the day of the fall of the Greek state [that is, in 1453] and, since then, it has been constantly reignited to, eventually, result in the major struggle that started in 1821 ... The major Greek Revolution of 1821 may have broken out after the French Revolution but, in actual fact, constitutes the continuation of the two great revolutions of 1769 and 1788, which preceded the French one.²⁴

This perspective can be traced back to the period of struggle, when the revolutionary administration sought to distinguish the Greek movement from its liberal European counterparts and to refute the charge of being a Carbonari-like organisation with a similar ideology in order to gain the support of European states. For like reasons, and to the extent that the nascent state required the support of the European powers to survive and thrive, one can hardly find similar allusions in most postrevolutionary writings (and, particularly, in

the most scholarly ones). After all, the most radical political ideas enjoyed marginal support in Greek postrevolutionary society while the political system converged on the adoption of a moderate constitutional monarchy. In one of the few references to 1789, Filimon wrote that when the French Revolution broke out many Greeks “dragged their eyes from there, where the destruction of dynasties first appeared. The transformation of France promises in a way universal freedom, it (in)forms new convictions and a new world”.²⁵ A comment by Theodoros Kolokotronis is also worthy of mention: “The French Revolution and Napoleon, in my opinion, opened the eyes of the world. Prior to that, nations did not recognise their kings, who were viewed as gods on earth and whatever they did was regarded as well done. For this reason it is more difficult now to rule a people.”²⁶ It needs to be stressed that relatively few studies on the French Revolution were translated into Greek or written by nineteenth-century scholars while a few more were dedicated to the history of Napoleon.²⁷

However, until the late nineteenth century and simultaneously with the development of the romantic historiography introduced by Paparrigopoulos, a number of liberal scholars underlined the intellectual and economic growth of the last prerevolutionary decades and the progressive decline of the Ottoman Empire as key elements of the 1821 Revolution. Accordingly, they connected the path towards revolution to the Enlightenment and the progress of Greek commerce and education in the eighteenth century. Though they did not distance themselves from the national approach of history, they considered the Greek Revolution mainly as a revolution against the tyrannical and arbitrary power of the sultan: As Anastasios Polyzoidis wrote in 1875

it is quite incomprehensible to the sultan that the sovereign does not have or cannot have absolute power but only in terms of a legal election ... Therefore, according to the true meaning of the law, the sultan is not a political ruler but a despot and a tyrant and his state is not a republic but despotism, a kingdom of cruel violence and arbitrariness ... The revolution of the Greeks against the Turkish rule ... was justified because of the arbitrary power or despotism of the government [sultanism] which does not recognise either civil liberty or property of its subjects as legitimate demands.²⁸

Along with Polyzoidis, this category of scholars included Stefanos Koumanoudis²⁹ and Demetrios Vikelas. Vikelas formed a coherent interpretative scheme on 1821, according to which economic development, that is the growth of trade, led to the development of education, the growth of political consciousness of the nation and the outbreak of the revolution, in which the leaders were again the merchants.³⁰ Kremos, too, although he follows the general line proposed by Paparrigopoulos, took a strong liberal deviation, which is apparent in the way he approaches the period of Kapodistrias’ rule. According to him, this period was mainly a confrontation between Kapodistrias’ authoritarian regime and the liberal parliamentary opposition party. At the same time, in the ideological context of the late nineteenth century, where the demoticists (champions of the demotic/vernacular language) held a prominent position, a reconfiguration of the concepts

of the “the people” and “the countryside” took place. Kremos, for example, gave credit to the armed irregular forces of the revolution (the former klephts and martoloses), maintaining that their role in the struggle was underappreciated.³¹

As mentioned before, in the 1880s the demoticist movement appeared: linguistic, literary and educational in character, it supported the use of the demotic language of the people instead of the archaic and scholarly, largely constructed katharevousa. The demoticists did not constitute a political and ideological unified front; several of their representatives followed different ideological routes over time. However, the emphasis they gave to the importance of popular language, the language of tradition, the language of the people, predominantly of the rural working classes, led demoticists to evaluate the action and attitude of individual and collective subjects in history by considering language as their main standard.³² From the ranks of demoticists came two attempts of historiographical composition, those of Argyris Eftaliotis and Georgios Skliros. The former published two historical works, the first a volume that appeared in 1901 under the title *Ιστορία της Ρωμιοσύνης* (History of Romiosyni). (It was a history of Hellenism but the word “romiosyni”, as broadly used by the demoticists, underlines the popular character of the Greek nation.) This book, the second volume of which never appeared, covers the period up to the reign of Justinian. The other work by Eftaliotis entitled *Ιστορικά ξεγυμνώματα* (Historical Denudements) was serialised in 1908 in the demoticist journal *Noumas*. In it, the author contradicted the part of the history of Paparrigopoulos concerning the Ottoman period and tried to form a contrapuntal approach based mainly on two points. First, on the negative valuation of the intellectual creation expressed in literary language, mainly because he considered authentic national works to be those written in popular dialects. Secondly, he evaluated the attitude and contribution of social groups on the basis of resistance to or cooperation with the occupier and, subsequently, he appraised the revolts based on the independent nature of each attempt or the reliance on any foreign power. Therefore, he believes that the elites of the nation lacked national consciousness. Intellectuals, by either fleeing to the West or teaching in a literary, dry language not understood by the people, left the people without guidance. Church leaders, Phanariots and notables, characterised by their lust for power, as well as their discord and venality, were focused only on their individual interests and not on national policy. Only the bandits and martoloses showed the way of resistance, although they too promoted their individual interests. They even attacked the Greeks who acted under the protection of the Turks: the notables and priests not involved in the resistance against Ottoman rule. The only independent national movements that originated from a national consciousness were the uprisings of the Souliotes and of Lambros Katsonis. Throughout the period of Ottoman domination, those characteristics most developed in the Greek race such as vanity and individualism did not allow the Greeks to cooperate in undertaking independent national action without any reliance on foreigners.

Since national consciousness was missing, what preserved the nation? In Eftaliotis' view, it was due to the specific characteristics of the race, the heroism and the "natural cleverness and courtesy of the people".³³ "The people stayed pure and unchangeable because they sought refuge in their natural haven, in their undying soul." And he continued: "The soul ... of their [the people's] soul, namely their language, beliefs, traditions, hopes, their love of fighting, love of songs and, above all, love of homeland, all these they [the people] did not manage to lose; moreover, they nourished them and raised them with their invisible, dark, unruly and unsettled existence."³⁴ The great hopes and great calamities that the movements of the eighteenth century brought about, as well as the influence of the "nation-making ideas of modern civilisation", that is, of the French Revolution,³⁵ led to the revival of national consciousness, the union of the Greeks and the revolution with protagonists the founders of the Filiki Etaireia. However, the teaching of the intellectuals and the naive expectation of foreign aid during the revolution led to the limitation of the borders of the Greek state while much of the race remained unredeemed: "half-Greece, half-life, with half of resources and hope".³⁶ The emphasis on the immanent forces of the nation and the rejection of foreign aid was due to the frustrations that the intellectuals of the late eighteenth century experienced as a result of the attitude of the European powers in the Crimean War (1853–1856) and the Russian support for the national Slavic movements (in the last quarter of the century). Eftaliotis' approach does not substantially vary from that of Paparrigopoulos regarding the continuity scheme; however, it was much less consistent and contained significant internal contradictions.

The demoticist writer Yannis Vlachoyannis, a systematic collector, publisher and researcher of the records of the revolution, and also first director of the General State Archives (1914), in his historical articles and short stories in various newspapers and journals formed a "demoticist" historical approach to the prerevolutionary and revolutionary periods: he tried to highlight the crucial role of the irregular armed groups (bandits, *martoloses*, *Souliotes*) in the revolution against the other groups (notables, scholars, *Phanariots*, foreigners). The above-mentioned armed men constituted the main representatives of the people, who, according to Vlachoyannis, carried out the revolution based on the power of the "popular soul".³⁷

The "popular soul" constituted a central concept in the language of the demoticists, who often used it as an alternative to the term "national soul".³⁸ For them, it embodied all the distinctive, timeless, authentic, psychic and moral characteristics and traditions of the Greek people, which were reflected in folk songs, folk tales, proverbs and oral traditions. All these constituted the main field of research and promotion of the newly formed science of folklore, which, under its central exponent, the University of Athens professor Nikolaos Politis, became a science that aimed to demonstrate the continuity of the Greek nation from antiquity to modern times through the Byzantine period.³⁹ A major part of demoticists considered the people to be the authentic bearer of national characteristics, as opposed to the *loiotatoi* (the erudite, the most learned but the less true and wise) and the political elites,

both of which were deemed to have been corrupted by European intellectual currents that were alien to the Greek temperament but also by personal jealousies and divisions, and too attached to the dead formalities of Greek antiquity, which were also irrelevant to the timeless essence of the Greek nation. In this context, the reconciliation of the literary elite and the people was not understood as an expression of the relations of political and economic domination and/or exploitation, but as an inability of the leading strata to express in an authentic way and to fulfil the national aspirations for spiritual and material progress and territorial expansion in the regions of the late Byzantine Empire.

In fact, the reconceptualisation of the “people” (especially rural people) as the guardian of national culture introduced by folklore studies and the demoticist current went hand in hand with a distinct disposition to reform and educate the people according to national values.⁴⁰ This tendency was linked, among other things,⁴¹ to an attempt to widely diffuse recent heroic national history so that it could work as an example before the imminent campaign of the nation for the liberation of unredeemed brothers. Therefore, from the late nineteenth century, but especially in the early twentieth century, many writers turned to the heroic past, especially the late Ottoman period and the revolution. They published historical novels, fictional biographies or historical articles, mostly in newspapers and journals, resulting in the wider circulation of a public, nonacademic, history of 1821, which focused mainly on heroic individuals and heroic events. The approach of the revolution differed from the romantic historical novel of the previous period; free of drama, the literary representation of the “holy” struggle was now realistic or naturalistic and with a strong emphasis on the description of local customs. Pioneers in this turn were Demetrios Vikelas and his novel *Loukis Laras*, which narrated the adventures of a refugee after the Chios’ catastrophe (1822) and Alexandros Papadiamantis and his novel *Christos Millionis*, which bore the name of an eighteenth-century *martolos*.⁴² But the principal authors who focused on the revolution were Kostas Krystallis, Christos Christovasilis, Ioannis Kondylakis, Georgios Tsokopoulos, Yannis Vlachoyannis and Konstantinos Rados. During the same period, from around 1900 to 1930, a kind of paraliterature on banditry flourished, contributing to the glorification of the armed *pallikars* (*klephts* and *martoloses*) of the Ottoman period and the revolution.⁴³

In 1907 two books were published that would play a very important role in the perception of 1821, although not in their time but later on. Vlachoyannis published the memoirs of revolutionary chieftain Makriyannis, which, however, were appreciated mostly after the Second World War.⁴⁴ Georgios Skliros published his study *Το κοινωνικόν μας ζήτημα* (Our Social Issue), which was a first attempt to apply Marxist methods in Greek history, although in a rather mechanistic way. His interpretive scheme of Greek history was influenced by George Plekhanov’s Marxism and, more broadly, by German Social Democracy as well as by the evolutionary theory of Ernst Haeckel. The section devoted to

the 1821 Revolution was small for, in actual fact, his concern was not 1821 but contemporary Greek society and he utilised history to identify its evolutionary stages. According to Skliros, 1821 was a bourgeois revolution “caused by the unprecedented economic well-being of internal and external urban elements, the awakening of national feeling, particularly of the civilised strata and the scholars of the nation”. Therefore, it was a social revolution carried out by the bourgeoisie.⁴⁵ However, the debate it caused remained limited to demoticist circles and concentrated mostly on language issues and socialist ideology.⁴⁶ However, Skliros’ approach later influenced Yanis Kordatos, who in 1924 published a history of the 1821 Revolution which enjoyed both great appeal and triggered major reactions, thus changing the landscape of Greek historiography.⁴⁷

Although, at first glance, it may seem that in the period in question (1880–1922) there was a diverse landscape of approaches to the Ottoman and revolutionary periods, Paparrigopoulos’ romantic historiography dominated completely. Neither liberal scholars, who did not constitute a unified historiographical current, nor the populist approaches of the demoticists⁴⁸ in the early twentieth century nor the first socialists managed to influence the academic historiography of their time. In the political-ideological environment of the time, Paparrigopoulos’ scheme of the continuity and unity of the nation, without social dividing lines, became much more functional: it legitimised historically and covered the ideological needs of hegemonic conservative liberalism but also of the dominant ideology of the Great Idea, that is, the idea of the cultural, economic and territorial expansion of the nation in the Balkans and the Near East.

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century the process of historicising 1821, that is, the process of its transformation from living memory to history and the object of scientific research, was based on a series of developments. In the 1880s the systematic teaching about the “Turkish occupation” and the Greek Revolution was introduced in primary and secondary schools.⁴⁹ From 1890 the revolution began to be taught at university, originally by Kremos and then by Karolidis and Rados.⁵⁰

The establishment of the Historical and Ethnological Society in 1882 constituted a landmark in the historiography of 1821 because it conducted a series of relevant activities. The society created an archive with an emphasis on the Ottoman period and the revolution, published from 1883 a journal, a significant part of which was devoted to articles or publications of primary sources concerning 1821, and in 1884 organised the Exhibition of Artefacts of the Holy Struggle, which constituted the basis of the Historical and Ethnological Museum.⁵¹ The effort to collect records related to 1821 was not limited to the Historical and Ethnological Society. In 1903 the Ministry of Finance gave the so-called Greek Revolution Fighters Archive (Αρχείο της Επιτροπής Θυσιών και Εκδουλεύσεων του Ιερού Αγώνος) to the National Library. Vlachoyannis first, as already mentioned, and since 1914 the newly established General State Archives (under his direction) were particularly active in locating and rescuing relevant records. From 1890 to 1910 there was an increased interest in the publication of memoirs of the struggle, several of them on Vlachoyannis’ initiative.

Briefly, the main features of this period included, on the one hand, the systematic venture to historicise 1821 with a single, conciliatory and generally acceptable approach, which acquired a scientific status, and, on the other, the exemplary function of the historiography on 1821 vis-à-vis the new national and irredentist struggles. A typical example was the linking of the rebels of the Macedonian conflict (the conflict between antagonistic Balkan nationalisms for the control of the vast Macedonian territory still under Ottoman rule) with the irregular armed forces of the 1821 Revolution. The persistence in the continuity and unity of the nation produced a political, diplomatic and military history and, secondarily, a history of education. Social differences and conflicts were absent from the lens of historians. The economic phenomena occupied a very small part of the historiographical interest and were conceived as a mark of material progress of the nation and evidence of a linear process of national “maturity”. The discovery and circulation of records were a key part of the published historical material.

Conclusions

The first century following the Greek Revolution of 1821 was punctuated by the entanglement of two historiographical trajectories: what had started as a historiographical conflict, among the protagonists of the struggle, with political connotations, by the end of the century, was transformed into a unitary historiographical scholarship with consensual undertones. In particular, in the initial decades after the revolution, vivid debates took place among participants of the revolution, mainly through written accounts published as books or in the press. These fierce debates concerned either the revolution as a whole, or particular details of it, based on the personal experiences of the revolutionaries.

By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a new, consensual narrative of the revolution had developed, produced, for the most part, by professional historians. According to that narrative, the revolution was exclusively a Greek war of independence against “Turkish occupation”. Furthermore, that narrative lacked any context concerning the political goals of the revolution towards the building of a modern, liberal, centralised state; at the same time, the social, ideological and personal conflicts between revolutionary leaders were downplayed. Thus, the revolution was assessed through the lens of military and diplomatic history and the priority of this ideological perception was the formation of a powerful and expanded state. This interpretation of the revolution served the political aspirations of the time concerning the territorial expansion of the Greek state at the Ottomans’ expense, while its historiographical principles were drawn mainly from the Prussian School of German historicism. Since that was a time when the scientific status of history was built on historical positivism and archival publications, this narrative about the Greek Revolution was advocated by prominent academic historians. The national narrative

described here was not challenged until the emergence of Greek Marxism, namely by Skliros in 1907. However, this counterinterpretation had to wait until the interwar period to flourish.

¹ Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1962).

² See Harris Athanasiades, *Τα αποσυρθέντα βιβλία: Έθνος και σχολική ιστορία στην Ελλάδα, 1858–2008* [The withdrawn books: nation and school history in Greece, 1858–2008] (Athens: Alexandria, 2015); Maria Repousi, *Τα Μαρασλειακά 1925–1927* [The Marasleika, 1925–1927] (Athens: Polis, 2012); Manolis Piblis, “Καταραμένα βιβλία σχολικής ιστορίας” [Cursed history school books], *Ta Nea*, 7 October 2002.

³ Antonis Liakos, “Modern Greek Historiography (1974–2000): The Era of Tradition from Dictatorship to Democracy,” in *(Re)Writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism*, ed. Ulf Brunnbauer (Münster: LIT, 2004), 351–78; Liakos, “The Making of the Greek History: The Construction of National Time,” in *Political Uses of the Past: The Recent Mediterranean Experience*, ed. Jacques Revel and Giovanni Levi (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 27–42.

⁴ See indicatively Alexandros Soutsos, *Histoire de la révolution grecque* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1829); Konstantinos Koumas, *Ιστορία των ανθρωπίνων πράξεων* [History of human actions], vol. 12 (Vienna: Haykul, 1832); Ioannis Filimon, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικόν περί της Φιλικής Εταιρείας* [Historical essay on the Filiki Etaireia] (Nafplio: Kontaxis and Loulakis, 1834); Spyridon Trikoupis, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* [History of the Greek Revolution], 4 vols. (London: Taylor and Francis, 1853–1857); Ioannis Filimon, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικόν περί της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* [Historical essay on the Greek Revolution], 4 vols. (Athens: Soutsas and Ktenas, 1859–1861).

⁵ Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Γεώργιος Καραϊσκάκης κατά τους προτέρους βιογράφους, τα επίσημα έγγραφα και άλλας αξιόπιστους ειδήσεις* [Georgios Karaiskakis according to earlier biographers, official documents and other reliable information] (Athens: Passaris, 1867).

⁶ See, for example, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Greek Nation], 5 vols. (Athens, 1860–1874); Paparrigopoulos, *Γεώργιος Καραϊσκάκης*.

⁷ Filimon, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικόν περί της ελληνικής επανάστασεως*.

⁸ I have restricted myself to complete histories of the revolution or histories of the Greeks in the Ottoman period that conclude with interpretations regarding the revolution. I exclude memoirs, diaries and travel literature.

⁹ For prose, see Panagiotis Stathis, “Λογοτεχνία και ιστορική μνήμη: Το Εικοσιένα στην πεζογραφία, 1830–1880” [Literature and historical memory: the Greek Revolution of 1821 in prose, 1830–1880], in *Λόγος και χρόνος στη νεοελληνική γραμματεία (18ος–19ος αιώνες): Πρακτικά συνεδρίου προς τιμήν του Αλέξη Πολίτη* [Discourse and time in modern Greek literature (18th–19th centuries): Festschrift in honour of Alexis Politis], ed. Stefanos Kaklamanis, Alexis Kalokairinos and Dimitris Polychronakis (Irakleio: Crete University Press, 2015), 621–54.

¹⁰ Rather characteristic are the novels of Stephanos Xenos, *Η ηρωίς της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως: ήτοι Σκηναί εν Ελλάδι από του έτους 1821–1828* [The heroine of the Greek Revolution: Scenes in Greece from the years 1821–1828], 2 vols. (London: Vretanikos Astir, 1861) and “Ο Αλή Πασσάς: ήτοι πολιτισμός, απλότης, τυραννία. Ιστορική μυθιστορία” [Ali Pasha: culture, simplicity, tyranny. Historical novel], serialised in *Vretanikos Astir* 3 (1861) and 4 (1862). This phenomenon is also evident in poetry: for instance Valaoritis frames his poetic works with historical prefaces and extensive historical notes. See Aristotelis Valaoritis, *Η κυρά Φροσύνη* [Lady Phrosyne] (Corfu: Ermis, 1859); Valaoritis, *Αθανάσιος Διάκος* [Athanasios Diakos] (Athens: Nikolaidou, 1867).

¹¹ For Valaoritis, see Yiannis Papatheodorou, *Ρομαντικά πεπρωμένα* [Romantic destinies] (Athens: Vivliorama, 2009). For Solomos, see Dimitris Dimiroulis, ed., *Διονύσιος Σολωμός: Έργα, ποιήματα και πεζά* [Dionysios Solomos: works, poems and prose] (Athens: Metaxmio, 2007).

- ¹² Spyridon Antoniadis, *Ο Ελληνικός Αγών* [The Greek struggle] (Athens: Antoniadis, 1860); Georgios Theophilos, *Επίτομος Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης* [Brief history of the Greek Revolution] (Athens: Sakellariou, 1860); Dimitrios Paparrigopoulos, *Σύνοψις της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης* [Synopsis of the Greek Revolution] (Athens: Nakis, 1864). See also Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions idéologiques de l'historicité en Grèce (1834–1914): Les manuels scolaires d'histoire et de géographie* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991), 331–32.
- ¹³ The first published collection belongs to Claude Fauriel, *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne*, 2 vols. (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1824–1825). The first collection created by a Greek and printed in Greece is Antonios Manousos, *Τραγούδια εθνικά* [National songs], 2 vols. (Corfu: Ermis, 1850–1851). See Alexis Politis, *Ρομαντικά χρόνια: Ιδεολογίες και νοοτροπίες στην Ελλάδα του 1830–1880* [Romantic years: ideologies and mentalities in Greece in 1830–1880] (Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Hellenism–Mnimon, 2009), 48–60; Politis, *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι* [The folk song] (Irakleio: Crete University Press, 2010).
- ¹⁴ The first relative attempt was made five years earlier by Nikolaos Skoufos but included only a small number of documents: *Συλλογή των Συνθηκών, Πρωτοκόλλων και Διπλωματικών Εγγράφων, Αποτελούντων το Ουσιωδέστερον Μέρος της Διπλωματικής Ιστορίας του Νέου Ελληνικού Κράτους* [Collection of treaties, protocols and diplomatic documents, constituting the most fundamental part of the diplomatic history of modern Greek state] (Nafplio: Kontaxis and Loulakis, 1834).
- ¹⁵ *Τα Υδραϊκά: ή μέρος των εν Ύδρα σωζομένων εγγράφων, εκδιδόμενα δαπάνη του δήμου Ύδρας* [Hydra: or part of Hydra surviving documents published in expense of the municipality of Hydra] (Athens: Pantelis, 1844); Anargyros Chatzianargyrou, ed., *Τα Σπετσιωτικά, ήτοι Συλλογή ιστορικών εγγράφων και υπομνημάτων αφορώντων τα κατά την Ελληνικήν Επανάστασιν του 1821* [Regarding Spetses, namely a collection of historical documents and memoranda relating to the Greek Revolution of 1821], vol. 1 (Athens: Mavrommatis, 1861).
- ¹⁶ *Επιστολαί Ι.Α. Καποδίστρια, Κυβερνήτου της Ελλάδος, διπλωματικά, διοικητικά και ιδιωτικά, γραφείσαι από 8 Απριλίου 1827 μέχρι 26 Σεπτεμβρίου 1831* [Letters by I.A. Kapodistrias, governor of Greece, diplomatic, administrative and private, written from 8 April 1827 to 26 September 1831], 4 vols. (Athens: Rallis, 1841–1843); Ioannis Th. Kolokotronis, *Ελληνικά υπομνήματα, ήτοι επιστολαί και διάφορα έγγραφα αφορώντα την Ελληνικήν Επανάστασιν από 1821 μέχρι 1827* [Greek memoranda, namely letters and various documents regarding the Greek Revolution from 1821 to 1827] (Athens: Nikolaidis Philadelphus, 1856); *Τα κατά τον αοίδιμον πρωταθλητήν του Ιερού των Ελλήνων Αγώνος, τον Πατριάρχην Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Γρηγόριον τον Ε΄. Καταταχθέντα μεν, διορθωθέντα και υπομνηματισθέντα υπό του καθηγητού Γ.Γ. Παπαδοπούλου, συλλεγέντα δε κι εκδοθέντα υπό Γ.Π. Αγγελοπούλου* [According to the blessed champion of the holy struggle of the Greeks, Patriarch of Constantinople Gregory V: recorded, corrected, annotated by Professor G.G. Papadopoulos, collected and published by G.P. Angelopoulos], 2 vols. (Athens: National Printing Office, 1865–1866).
- ¹⁷ On the first category see, among others, Amvrosios Frantzis, *Επιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος αρχομένη από του έτους 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835* [Concise history of reborn Greece starting from 1715 and ending in 1835], 4 vols. (Athens: Vitoria, 1839–1841); Fotakos, *Απομνημονεύματα περί της ελληνικής επανάστασης* [Memoirs on the Greek Revolution] (Athens: Sakellariou, 1858); Makriyannis, *Αρχείον του στρατηγού Ιωάννου Μακρυγιάννη, τόμος δεύτερος (περιέχων τα Απομνημονεύματα)* [General Ioannis Makriyannis Archive, vol. 2 (including the *Memoirs*)], ed. Yannis Vlachoyannis (Athens: Vlastos, 1907); Kanellos Deligiannis, *Απομνημονεύματα* [Memoirs], ed. Georgios Tsoukalas, 3 vols. (Athens: Tsoukalas, 1957). On the second category, see Spyridon Trikoupis, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης; Filimon, Δοκίμιον ιστορικών περί της ελληνικής επανάστασης*; Nikolaos Dragoumis, *Ιστορικά αναμνήσεις* [Historical recollections] (Athens: Vilaras, 1874). Concerning the perception of the revolution in postrevolutionary texts, see Nikos Rotzokos, “Τα Απομνημονεύματα του ’21 ως υλικό της ιστοριογραφίας” [The Memoirs of ’21 as a theme of historiography], *Dokimes* 2 (1994): 3–11; Eftychia Liata, “Οι αναβαθμοί της απομνημόνευσης και οι πολιτικές στρατηγικές μιας οικογένειας” [The successive grades of memorising and the political strategies of a family], *Ο Ερανιστής* 20 (1995): 163–233; Christina Koulouri and Christos Loukos, *Τα πρόσωπα του Καποδίστρια: Ο πρώτος κυβερνήτης της Ελλάδας και η νεοελληνική ιδεολογία (1831–1996)* [The faces of Kapodistrias: the first governor of Greece and modern Greek ideology (1831–1996)] (Athens: Poreia, 1996); Eleni Andriakaina, “Το νόημα του ’21 στα Απομνημονεύματα του Φωτάκου” [The “meaning of ’21” in Fotakos’ *Memoirs*] (PhD diss., Panteion University, 1999); Vassilis Kremmydas,

Από τον Σπυρίδωνα Τρικούπη στο σήμερα: Το Εικοσιένα στις νέες ιστοριογραφικές προσεγγίσεις [From Spyridon Trikoupis to the present: '21 in the new historiographical approaches] (Athens: Hellenic Parliament Foundation, 2007); Christina Koulouri, “Γιορτάζοντας το έθνος: Εθνικές επέτειοι στην Ελλάδα τον 19ο αιώνα” [Celebrating the nation: national anniversaries in Greece in the 19th century], in *Αθέατες όψεις της ιστορίας: Κείμενα αφιερωμένα στον Γιάννη Γιαννουλόπουλο* [Invisible sides of history: Texts dedicated to Yannis Yannoulopoulos] (Athens: Asini, 2012), 181–210; Nikos Theotokas, *Ο βίος του στρατηγού Μακρυγιάννη: απομνημονεύματα και ιστορία* [The life of General Makriyannis: memoirs and history] (Athens: Vivliorama, 2012); Panagiotis Stathis, “Ανανεώνοντας τη ματιά για το Εικοσιένα: Με αφορμή τον Μακρυγιάννη του Νίκου Θεοτοκά” [Rethinking the 1821 Greek Revolution: A Reading of Nikos Theotokas, *The Life of General Makriyannis: History and Memoirs*], *Mnimon* 33 (2013–2014): 233–56.

¹⁸ Cf. Pavlos Karolidis, *Ιστορία του 19ου αιώνα μετ' εικόνων* [Illustrated history of the 19th century] (Athens: Kasdonis, 1892), 2:98 (dedicated to the 1821 Revolution): “Under Ottoman tutelage, enslaved Hellenism preserved the internal organisation of Byzantine Hellenism. Ottoman despotism had no impact whatsoever on the internal political and moral conscience of the Greeks, who are a free people or rather they are destined to be free. Thus, as I have already said, they were a state within a state.”

¹⁹ Koulouri and Loukos, *Τα πρόσωπα του Καποδίστρια*, 79–87.

²⁰ See, for example, the equal space occupied by the oil paintings of the fighters in the first exhibition to commemorate the 1821 Revolution held in Greece by the Historical and Ethnological Society. *Έκθεσις μνημείων του Ιερού Αγώνος τη επιμελεία του Φιλολογ. Συλλόγου “Παρνασσού” και της Ιστορ. Και Εθνολ. Εταιρίας της Ελλάδος: Κατάλογος* [Exhibition of artefacts from the Holy Struggle, edited by the Parnassos Literary Society and Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece: Catalogue] (Athens: Stavrianou, [1884]), 11–12. Similar attempts to ameliorate conflicts between people or social groups had taken place earlier, but were not widespread. For an early indication, see Filimon, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικών περί της Φιλικής Εταιρείας*, 96.

²¹ See, among others, Dimitrios Vernardakis, “Επιστολιμαία βιβλιοκρισία” [Letterly book review], which was serialised, anonymously, in *Nea Imera Tergestis* in 1875. The first independent edition titled *Καποδίστριας και Όθων* [Kapodistrias and Otto] (Athens: Galaxias, 1962); Spyridon Lambros, *Επισκόπησις της ελληνικής ιστορίας* [Overview of modern Greek history] (Athens: Foinix, 1927); Lambros, *Τα Ελευθέρια: Λόγοι και άρθρα επί τη εθνική εορτή της 25 Μαρτίου (1891–1910)* [The freedoms: speeches and articles upon the national holiday of 25 March (1891–1910)] (Athens: Estia, 1911); Lambros, *Λόγοι και άρθρα 1878–1902* [Speeches and articles, 1878–1902] (Athens: Sakellariou, 1902); Karolidis, *Ιστορία του 19ου αιώνα*; also Karolidis, *Σύγχρονος ιστορία των Ελλήνων και των λοιπών λαών της Ανατολής από 1821 μέχρι 1921* [Modern history of the Greeks and the rest of the Eastern people between 1821 and 1921], vol. 1 (Athens: Vitsikounakis, 1922); Erameinondas Kyriakidis, *Ιστορία του συγχρόνου Ελληνισμού από της ιδρύσεως του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος μέχρι των ημερών μας 1832–1892: Μετά εισαγωγής επί των διαφόρων ιστορικών περιπετειών του έθνους, της μεγάλης επαναστάσεως του 1821 και της διοικήσεως του Καποδιστρίου* [History of modern Hellenism from the founding of the Kingdom of Greece to these days 1832–1892: With introduction on the various historical adventures of the nation, the great 1821 Revolution and the Kapodistrias administration], vol. 1 (Athens: Inglesis, 1892); Tryfon Evangelidis, *Ιστορία του Ιωάννου Καποδιστρίου, Κυβερνήτου της Ελλάδος (1828–1831)* [History of Ioannis Kapodistrias, governor of Greece (1828–1831)] (Athens: Zannoudakis, 1894); Georgios Kremos, *Νεωτάτη γενική ιστορία ως τέταρτος τόμος συμπληρωτικός της Γενικής Ιστορίας του Α. Πολυζωίδου* [Recent general history, fourth volume supplementary to the General History by A. Polyzoidis] (Athens: Vlastos, 1890) (769–1009 are devoted to the 1821 Revolution).

²² On the political context and ideologies of the last third of the nineteenth century, see Gunnar Hering, *Die politischen Parteien in Griechenland 1821–1936*, vol. 1 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1992); Niki Maroniti, *Πολιτική εξουσία και εθνικό ζήτημα στην Ελλάδα, 1880–1910* [Political power and the national question in Greece, 1880–1910] (Athens: Alexandria, 2009); Giorgos Ch. Sotirelis, *Σύνταγμα και εκλογές στην Ελλάδα 1864–1909: Ιδεολογία και πράξη της καθολικής ψηφοφορίας* [Constitution and elections in Greece, 1864–1909: The ideology and practice of universal suffrage] (Athens: Themelio, 1991); Athanasios Bochos, *Η ριζοσπαστική δεξιά: Αντικοινοβουλευτισμός, συντηρητισμός και ανολοκλήρωτος φασισμός στην Ελλάδα, 1864–1911* [The radical right: antiparliamentarism, conservatism and unfulfilled fascism in Greece, 1863–1911] (Athens: Vivliorama, 2003); Giorgos Kokkinos, *Ο πολιτικός ανορθολογισμός στην Ελλάδα: Το έργο και η σκέψη του Νεοκλή Καζάζη (1849–1936)* [Political irrationalism in Greece: the work and thought of Neoklis Kazazis] (Athens: Trochalia, 1996); Eleni Fournaraki, “‘Επί τίνι λόγω αποστερείν αυτήν ψήφου;’: καθολική ανδρική ψηφοφορία και αποκλεισμός των γυναικών από την πολιτική, στην Ελλάδα του 19ου αιώνα”

["Wherefore deprive her of the vote?": Universal male suffrage and the exclusion of women from politics in 19th-century Greece"], *Mnimon* 24 (2002): 179–226.

- ²³ See Georg Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*, rev. ed. (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 90–123; Robert Southard, *Droysen and the Prussian School of History* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 194–215; G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Beacon, 1959), 122–46; Frederick C. Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 307, 317–18; Effi Gazi, *Scientific National History: The Greek Case in Comparative Perspective (1850–1920)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 29–35; H.D.C. Davis, *The Political Thought of Heinrich von Treitschke* (London: Constable, 1914), 117–47; Johnathan Bruce Kilgour, "Heinrich von Treitschke: Creating a German National Mission" (MA diss., University of Montana, 2004); Ioannis Koubourlis, *Οι ιστοριογραφικές οφειλές των Σπ. Ζαμπέλιου και Κ. Παπαρρηγόπουλου: Η συμβολή ελλήνων και ξένων λογίων στη διαμόρφωση του τρίσημου σχήματος του ελληνικού ιστορισμού (1782–1846)* [The historiographical debts of S. Zambelios and K. Paparrigopoulos: The contribution of Greek and foreign scholars in shaping the tripartite scheme of Greek historicism (1782–1846)] (Athens: IHR/NHRF, 2012), 94–95. On Droysen's influence on Paparrigopoulos, see *ibid.*, 24–25.
- ²⁴ See the chapter "The French revolution and Greece: A comparison of the French with the Greek revolution" in Karolidis, *Ιστορία του ΙΘ' αιώνας*. The quotation is on p. 92.
- ²⁵ Filimon, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικών περί της Φιλικής Εταιρείας*, 88. Cf. the moderate formulation of Trikoupis, who tried to distance the Greek Revolution from the rest: "The war of Greece shares both the characteristics of a revolution since it overthrew a regime and the characteristics of defection since Greece defected from the Ottoman Empire to which it was subject." Trikoupis, *Ιστορία*, 1:355.
- ²⁶ Theodoros Kolokotronis, *Διήγησις συμβάντων της ελληνικής φυλής από τα 1770 έως τα 1836* [Narration of the events of the Greek race since 1770 to 1836] (Athens: Nikolaidis Philadelphus, 1846), 49.
- ²⁷ I have identified seven independent editions on the French Revolution, one of which (by François Mignet), was republished. On the contrary, more than 13 works have been dedicated to Napoleon, several of which were republished. See the electronic catalogue of nineteenth-century Greek bibliography compiled by Philippos Iliou and Popi Polemi in <http://www.benaki.gr/bibliology/19.htm>. See also Fridériki Tabaki-Iona, "Η Γαλλική Επανάσταση στην ελληνική ιστοριογραφία του 19ου αιώνα: Ιστορίες, γενικές ιστορίες, μεταφράσεις ιστοριών" [The French Revolution in 19th-century Greek historiography: histories, general histories, translations of histories], in *1789–1989: Διακόσια χρόνια από τη Γαλλική Επανάσταση [1789–1989: 200 years since the French Revolution]* (Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 1991), 101–12; Elisabeth Papageorgίου-Pronata, "Γενική θεώρηση της Γαλλικής Επανάστασης μέσα από τον ελληνικό τύπο" [Overview of the French Revolution through the press], in *1789–1989*, 51–65.
- ²⁸ Anastasios Polyzoidis, *Τα Νεοελληνικά* [The neohellenic] (Athens: Ilissos, 1875), 2:199–201.
- ²⁹ Stefanos Koumanoudis, *Ανέκδοτα: Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [Unpublished: history of Greek nation] (Athens: Ypsilon, 1983), 61–68. As the title suggests, the history was published posthumously.
- ³⁰ Demetrios Vikelas, "La Grèce avant la révolution de 1821," *La Nouvelle Revue* 6, no. 26 (1884): 129–54.
- ³¹ Kremos, *Νεωπάτη γενική ιστορία*.
- ³² From the extensive literature on demoticism, see, among others, Gerasimos Augustinos, *Consciousness and History: Nationalist Critics of Greek Society, 1897–1914* (Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1977); Dimitrios Tziouvas, *The Nationalism of the Demoticists and its Impact on their Literary Theory (1888–1930)* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1986).
- ³³ Argyris Eftaliotis, "Ιστορικά ξεγυμνώματα" [Historical denudements], *Ο Noumas*, no. 298 (1 June 1908): 6.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 291 (13 April 1908): 2; cf. *ibid.*, no. 304 (14 July 1908): 5–6.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 298 (1 June 1908): 5–6; cf. *ibid.*, 2.

³⁶ Ibid., no. 298 (1 June 1908): 6 and no. 304 (14 July 1908): 6.

³⁷ See, among others, Yannis Vlachoyannis, *Κλέφτες του Μοριά* [Klephths of the Morea] (Athens: [Polyviotechnikis], 1935), 196–267 and Vlachoyannis' introductions to the memoirs of Makriyannis and Nikolaos Kasomoulis: Makriyannis, *Αρχείον*; Nikolaos Kasomoulis, *Ενθυμήματα στρατιωτικά της Επανάστασεως των Ελλήνων 1821–1833* [Military recollections of the Revolution of the Greeks, 1821–1833], ed. Yannis Vlachoyannis (Athens: s.n., 1939). See also Vlachoyannis' short stories, *Μεγάλα χρόνια* [Great years] (Athens: Estia, 1913) and *Τα παληκάρια τα παλιά* [The old pallikars] (Athens: Polyviotechnikis, 1931).

³⁸ Academics such as Spyridon Lambros prefer the term “national soul”. See Spyridon Lambros, “Εθνική ψυχή” [National soul], in *Λόγοι και άρθρα*, 376–79. On the term, see Venetia Apostolidou, *Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς ιστορικός της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας* [Kostis Palamas as an historian of modern Greek literature] (Athens: Themelio, 1992), 111–17, 321–29.

³⁹ On the construction of the discipline of folklore studies in Greece, see Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros, *Η θεωρία της ελληνικής λαογραφίας: κριτική ανάλυση* [The theory of Greek folklore studies: a critical analysis] (Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 1978); Michael Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982).

⁴⁰ See also Panagiotis Moullas, “Εισαγωγή” [Introduction], in Alexandros Papadiamantis, *Α. Παπαδιαμάντης: Αυτοβιογραφούμενος* [A. Papadiamantis: Autobiographer] (Athens: Ermis, 1974), κδ' [xxiv].

⁴¹ It is related, for instance, to aspects of urban transformation and, as this urbanisation developed, to an idealising view of the rural space formed by recently urbanised intellectuals, a view which is paternalistic at the same time.

⁴² Demetrios Vikelas, *Λουκής Λάρας* (Athens: Estia, 1879); English translation: *Loukis Laras: Reminiscences of a Chiot Merchant during the War of Independence*, trans. Joannes Gennadius (London: Macmillan, 1881); Alexandros Papadiamantis, “Χρίστος Μηλιόνης” [Christos Milionis], serialised in the *Estia* newspaper in 1885.

⁴³ Christos Dermentzopoulos, *Το ληστρικό μυθιστόρημα στην Ελλάδα: Μύθοι, παραστάσεις, ιδεολογία* [The bandit novel in Greece: myths, representations, ideology] (Athens: Plethron, 1997). Besides, in some banditry novels the main heroes were familiar from the world of bandits and martoloses in the prerevolutionary and revolutionary period, for instance, Katsantonis and Athanasios Diakos, although the literary representation was usually completely imaginary. The same persons were considered central heroes in the same period and in the plays of the folk shadow theatre, karagiozis. For 1821 in karagiozis, see Giulio Caimi, *Karaghiozi: ou la comédie grecque dans l'âme du théâtre d'ombres* (Athens: Ellinikes Technes, 1935); Greek translation: *Καραγκιόζης, ή η αρχαία κωμωδία στην ψυχή του θεάτρου σκιών*, trans. Kostas Mekkas and Takis Miliadis (Athens: Gavriilidis, 1990), 71–78, 87–97; I.T. Pampoukis, “Η Τουρκοκρατία και το Εικοσιένα στο ρεπερτόριο του θεάτρου σκιών” [Turkish Rule and 1821 in the repertoire of shadow theatre], *Parnassos* 10, no. 2 (1968): 241–45.

⁴⁴ Makriyannis, *Αρχείον*.

⁴⁵ The quotation is from Georgios Skliros, *Το κοινωνικόν μας ζήτημα* [Our social question] (Athens: Epikairota, 1971), 49. On Skliros, see Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Ο Γ. Σκληρός στην Αίγυπτο: Σοσιαλισμός, δημοτικισμός και μεταρρύθμιση* [G. Skliros in Egypt: socialism, demoticism and reform] (Athens: Themelio, 1988); Christos Tezas, *Γεώργιος Σκληρός (Γ. Ηλ. Κωνσταντινίδης) (1879–1919): Συμβολή στην ερμηνεία της πρώιμης σκέψης του* [Georgios Skliros (G. Hl. Konstantinidis) (1879–1919): Contribution to the Interpretation of his early thought] (Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis, 2012); Giorgos D. Boubous, “Η ελληνική κοινωνία στην πρώιμη μαρξιστική σκέψη: Γ. Σκληρός – Γ. Κορδάτος (1907–1930)” [Greek society in early Greek Marxist analysis: G. Skliros–Y. Kordatos (1907–1930)] (PhD diss., Panteion University, 1996); Ioannis Koubourlis, “Ο Γ. Σκληρός και ο ελληνικός μαρξισμός” [G. Skliros and Greek Marxism], *Δοκίμες* 1 (January 1994): 32–38; Panagiotis Noutsos, “Εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός και κοινωνική μεταρρύθμιση: από τον Σκληρό στην ιδρυτική γενιά του ΣΕΚΕ” [Educational demoticism and social reform: from Skliros to the founding generation of the SEKE], *Ta Istorika* 10 (June 1989): 186–98. See also Georgios Skliros, “Ο Πλεχάνωφ και η εποχή του” [Plekhanov and his time], *Grammata* 40 (July–September 1919): 69–78.

- ⁴⁶ Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός και κοινωνικό πρόβλημα* [Demoticism and social problem] (Athens: Ermis, 1976).
- ⁴⁷ Yanis Kordatos, *Η κοινωνική σημασία της ελληνικής επανάστασης του 1821* [The social meaning of the 1821 Greek Revolution] (Athens: Vasileiou, 1924).
- ⁴⁸ It is significant that despite his rich and diverse (historiographical, archival, literary) work, as well as the important position of the first director of the General State Archive, Vlachoyannis remained marginal in relation to the dominant academic currents of his time.
- ⁴⁹ See, among others, Koulouri, *Dimensions*, 270–81, 377–80; Theodoros Apostolopoulos, *Η παλιγγενεσία της Ελλάδος ή το 1821 μετά εικόνων κατά την νέαν μέθοδον διά τους μαθητάς των Δημοτικών Σχολείων* [The rebirth of Greece or 1821 illustrated according to the new method for primary school students] (Athens: Anestis Konstantinidis, 1885); Georgios Tsagris, *Επίτομος ιστορία του ελληνικού έθνους μετά των σπουδαιότερων γεγονότων της παγκοσμίου ιστορίας προς χρήσιν των μαθητών της Γ΄ τάξεως του ελληνικού σχολείου και προς ιδιαιτέραν μελέτην* [Concise history of the Greek nation with the most important events of world history for the third grade of early secondary school and private study] (Athens: N.G. Passaris and A. Vergianitis, 1888); Sokratis Tsivanopoulos, *Ιστορία της Ελλάδος από της κτίσεως της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως μέχρι της ιδρύσεως του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος μετά εικόνων κατά το πρόγραμμα του Υπουργείου προς χρήσιν της Γ΄ τάξεως των Ελληνικών σχολείων* [History of Greece from the founding of Constantinople to the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece, illustrated according to the programme of the ministry for the third grade of early secondary schools] (Athens: O Palamidis, 1885); Miltiadis Vratsanos, *Σύντομος ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους από της αλώσεως της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως υπό των Τούρκων μέχρι της εξώσεως του Όθωνος προς χρήσιν των δημοτικών σχολείων κατά τα υπό του Υπουργείου ωρισμένα* [Short history of the Greek nation from the fall of Constantinople to the Turks to the ouster of Otto for primary schools according to the guidelines of the ministry] (Athens: S.K. Vlastos, 1886).
- ⁵⁰ Vangelis Karamanolakis, *Η συγκρότηση της ιστορικής επιστήμης και η διδασκαλία της ιστορίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών (1837–1932)* [The formation of historical science and the teaching of history at the University of Athens (1837–1932)] (Athens: Historical Archive of Greek Youth, 2006).
- ⁵¹ *Έκθεσις μνημείων του Ιερού Αγώνος*. See also Vangelis Karamanolakis, “Εξεικονίζοντας τη συλλογική μνήμη: Η Έκθεσις μνημείων του Ιερού Αγώνος (1884)” [Depicting collective memory: the exhibition of artefacts of the Holy Struggle (1884)], in *Η μνήμη της κοινότητας και η διαχείρισή της: Μελέτες από μια ημερίδα αφιερωμένη στη μνήμη του Τίτου Παπαμαστοράκη* [Communal memory and its management: studies presented at a colloquium in memory of Titos Papamastorakis], ed. Kostas Buraselis, Vangelis Karamanolakis and Stylianos Katakis (Athens: Kardamitsa, 2011), 273–87.