

The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 16 (2019)

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME XVI (2019)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

Myth or history? Ancient Greek mythology in Paparrigopoulos' History of the Hellenic nation: controversies, influences and implications

Michael D. Konaris

doi: [10.12681/hr.22826](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.22826)

Copyright © 2020, Michael D. Konaris



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:

Konaris, M. D. (2020). Myth or history? Ancient Greek mythology in Paparrigopoulos' History of the Hellenic nation: controversies, influences and implications. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 16, 211–234.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.22826>

MYTH OR HISTORY? ANCIENT GREEK MYTHOLOGY
IN PAPARRIGOPOULOS' *HISTORY OF THE HELLENIC NATION*:
CONTROVERSIES, INFLUENCES AND IMPLICATIONS

Michael D. Konaris

ABSTRACT: This article examines the treatment of Greek mythology in Paparrigopoulos' *History of the Hellenic Nation* (1860–1874) in the light of contemporary Western European historiography. The interpretation of Greek myths was highly contested among nineteenth-century scholars: could myths be used as historical sources or were they to be dismissed as figments of imagination devoid of historical value? Did they express in allegorical form sublime religious doctrines that anticipated Christianity, or did they attest to the Greeks' puerile notions about the gods? The article investigates how Paparrigopoulos positioned himself with respect to these questions, which had major consequences for one's view of early Greek history and the relation between ancient Greek culture and Christianity, and his stance towards traditional and novel methods of myth interpretation such as Euhemerism, Symbolism, Indo-European comparative mythology and others. It explores how Paparrigopoulos' approach differs from those encountered in earlier modern Greek historiography, laying stress on his attempt to study Greek myths "scientifically" on the model of Grote and the implications this had. In addition, the article considers Paparrigopoulos' wider account of ancient Greek religion's relation to Christianity and how this affected the thesis of the continuity of Greek history.

The history of modern Greek scholarship on ancient Greek mythology tends to be associated with the towering figure of Nikolaos G. Politis (1852–1921), lecturer and later professor of mythology and Greek archaeology at the University of Athens, and one of the founders of modern Greek ethnography.¹ As major as Politis'

* This article is based on research that I conducted at the National Hellenic Research Foundation as a recipient of an Onassis fellowship. I would like to express my gratitude to the Onassis Foundation for its generous support of my work and the NHRF for its hospitality as host institution. I would also like to thank Dr Sophia Matthaïou, Senior Researcher at the Institute of Historical Research of the NHRF, for supervising my research during the fellowship.

¹ Walter Puchner, *Θεωρητική λαογραφία* [Theoretical ethnography], Athens: Armos, 2009, pp. 137ff; *Ο Νικόλαος Γ. Πολίτης και το Κέντρον Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας: Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου* [Nikolaos G. Politis and the Centre for Research on Greek Ethnography: proceedings of an international scientific conference], 2 vols., Athens: Academy of Athens, 2012; Michael Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982, pp. 97–122.

contributions to the field are, his is but one chapter in a much larger story. This article examines the treatment of ancient Greek myths in Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos' *History of the Hellenic Nation* (1860–1874, henceforth *HHN*),² which has been “characterized without serious risk of exaggeration as the most important intellectual achievement of nineteenth-century Greece”,³ as part of a wider investigation into the history of modern Greek historiography on ancient Greek religion. This aspect of Paparrigopoulos' work has tended to be neglected; yet the *HHN* begins with a discussion of Greek myths which has important implications for one's view of ancient Greek culture and early Greek history. In addition, as Paparrigopoulos considers the various theories of myth interpretation in contemporary Western classical scholarship and sets out his grounds for rejecting or espousing them, his stance is also of interest from the perspective of nineteenth-century cultural transferences between Western European and modern Greek scholarship.

Paparrigopoulos was not a specialist in ancient Greek history, let alone mythology. Nevertheless, his work constitutes one of the first attempts in modern Greek historiography at a “scientific” approach to Greek myths in keeping with the strict demands of nineteenth-century historical science. In this respect, it may be regarded as occupying an intermediate position between the non-academic modern Greek writings on mythology of the Neohellenic Enlightenment and the fuller specialisation which the studies of his contemporaries, the classical scholars Dimitrios Mavrofrydis (1828–1866) and Aristidis Kyprianos (1830–1869), and, even more, of Politis, later in the nineteenth century, exemplify.

Ancient Greek Mythology in Earlier Modern Greek Historiography: A Very Short Background

Although the history of modern Greek historiography on ancient Greek mythology reaches farther back in time, increased interest in the subject is evident in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This development formed part of the

² The article complements an earlier discussion of the portrayal of ancient Greek religion in the work of Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos: Michael D. Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία και εθνικός χαρακτήρας στο έργο του Κωνσταντίνου Παπαρηγόπουλου” [Ancient Greek religion and national character in the work of Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], in *Ελληνικότητα και ετερότητα: Πολιτισμικές διαμεσολαβήσεις και “εθνικός χαρακτήρας” στον 19ο αιώνα* [Greekness and otherness: cultural transferences and “national character” in the 19th century], ed. Anna Tabaki and Ourania Polycandrioti, vol. 2, Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2016, pp. 267–282.

³ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Great Idea”, in *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. David Ricks and Paul Magdalino, London: Ashgate, 1998, pp. 25–33, here 28.

broader attention given to antiquity during the Neohellenic Enlightenment.⁴ In this context, one may point to the appearance of works such as Georgios Sakellarios' *Archaeology* in 1796 or Grigorios Paliouritis' *Archaeology* in 1815, which provided information on many aspects of the ancient Greek world, including religion and mythology,⁵ Charisios Megdanis' *Hellenic Pantheon* (1812), which was dedicated specifically to these topics, and Athanasios Stageiritis' five-volume *Ogygia or Archaeology* (1815), which treated aspects of the religions and the mythical traditions of several peoples, from the Greeks and the Egyptians to the Chinese. Most of the authors of these works tended to be polymaths who wrote on a range of different subjects rather than trained and specialised classical scholars, a category that was gradually beginning to emerge in nineteenth-century Greece,⁶ while Paliouritis and Megdanis were also ordained. Their writings were largely intended for modern Greek students, aiming to help them understand the mythological references in ancient Greek literature and to deepen their general knowledge of antiquity in accordance with the educational objectives of the Neohellenic Enlightenment.⁷

The "Archaeologies" and Megdanis' *Pantheon* drew on eighteenth-century Western European models.⁸ After setting out the various myths, they typically listed the most popular methods of myth interpretation of their times, chiefly Euhemerism and natural allegory, both of which went back to antiquity. According to Euhemerist interpretations, Greek myths described the feats of real historical individuals, while, as its name suggests, natural allegory held that myths constituted veiled descriptions of natural phenomena.⁹ Paliouritis, for example, following

⁴ Anna Tabaki, *Περί νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού: Ρεύματα ιδεών και διάλογοι επικοινωνίας με τη δυτική σκέψη* [On the neohellenic Enlightenment: currents of ideas and channels of communication with western thought], Athens: Ergo, 2004, p. 48; Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Enlightenment and Revolution: The Making of Modern Greece*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013, pp. 71ff.

⁵ On the "Archaeologies", see Kitromilides, *Enlightenment and Revolution*, p. 74; Vasilios N. Makrides, *Hellenic Temples and Christian Churches: A Concise History of the Religious Cultures of Greece from Antiquity to the Present*, New York: New York University Press, 2009, p. 217.

⁶ For the formation of modern Greek classical philology as an organised discipline, see Sophia Matthaïou, "Establishing the Discipline of Classical Philology in Nineteenth-century Greece", *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 8 (2011), pp. 117–148.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

⁸ On the study of ancient mythology in eighteenth-century Europe, see Frank E. Manuel, *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959; Chantal Grell, *Le dix-huitième siècle et l'antiquité en France, 1680–1789*, vol. 2, Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995.

⁹ Fritz Graf, *Greek Mythology: An Introduction*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, pp. 191–198.

the “wise” abbé Banier (1673–1741), the leading advocate of Euhemerism in eighteenth-century France,¹⁰ maintained that Zeus had once been a formidable king, who “having lived gloriously to extreme old age, died in Crete [...] where he was buried”.¹¹ The myth of his rebellion against his father, Kronos, referred to actual battles he had fought in his attempt to establish his power. Megdanis, as well, mentioned similar Euhemerist interpretations of Zeus. However, he also cited the opinions of advocates of allegory, according to whom, Zeus was not to be regarded as a deified mortal, but rather as the personification of the air or of aether.¹²

We should underscore that while these writers maintained that knowledge of ancient Greek myths was necessary in order to understand the masterpieces of ancient Greek literature, at the same time they condemned the erroneous religious views of the ancients. Perhaps the most outspoken in this respect was Megdanis, who, as we have mentioned, was ordained. The contrast between the true God of Christianity and the pseudo-gods of ancient mythology was implicit already in the full title of his *Pantheon: Hellenic Pantheon. Or a Collection of the Mythical History of the Mythological* [μυθολογουμένων] *Gods of the Ancient Greeks*.¹³ Moreover, Megdanis tellingly chose as a motto for his work an extract on idolatry from Paul’s Epistle to the Romans (1:22–23): “Seeming to be wise, they were in fact foolish. And by them the glory of the eternal God was changed and made into the image of man who is not eternal, and of birds and beasts and things which go on the earth.”¹⁴

Of a very different kind is the interpretation of Greek mythology advanced in a work that appeared later during the first half of the nineteenth century and which belonged to another genre of modern Greek historiography, namely Renieris’ essay *Philosophy of History* (1841).¹⁵ Together with Paparrigopoulos and Spyridon Zambelios (1815–1881), Markos Renieris (1815–1897) is considered as one of the main representatives of the “romantic school” of modern Greek historiography,

¹⁰ Grigorios Paliouritis, *Αρχαιολογία ελληνική ήτοι φιλολογική ιστορία* [Hellenic archaeology, i.e. philological history], vol. 1, Venice: N. Glykis, 1815, p. 3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7–12.

¹² Charisios Megdanis, *Ελληνικόν Πάνθεον: ή συλλογή της μυθικής Ιστορίας των παρά τοις αρχαίοις Έλλησι μυθολογουμένων Θεών, και της κατ’ αυτήν αλληγορίας* [Hellenic Pantheon: or collection of the mythical history of the mythological gods of the ancient Greeks and its allegorical meaning], Pest: M. Tratner, 1812, pp. 92–102.

¹³ This recalls the title of a French work, *History of the Mythological* [μυθολογουμένων] *Gods*, translated into Greek from Italian (1795 and 1827).

¹⁴ Megdanis, *Ελληνικόν Πάνθεον* [Hellenic Pantheon], [p. xxv].

¹⁵ Roxane D. Argyropoulou, “Σχόλια στην *Φιλοσοφία της Ιστορίας* του Μάρκου Ρενιέρη” [Comments on Markos Renieris’ *Philosophy of History*], in *Αφιέρωμα στον Κωνσταντίνο Δεσποτόπουλο* [Homage to Konstantinos Despotopoulos], Athens: Papazisis, 1991, pp. 245–254; Konstantinos Th. Dimaras, *Ελληνικός ρωμαντισμός* [Hellenic romanticism], Athens: Ermis, 1982, p. 436.

which sought to demonstrate the continuity of Greek history.¹⁶ Drawing on Vico's *The New Science* (1725), as well as on German idealism and German romantic classical scholarship, Renieris put forward a philosophical interpretation of the mythologies of antiquity. In his view, they attested to the struggle between the "Ich" and the "nicht-Ich" unfolding in the course of human history which was resolved with the advent of Christianity.¹⁷ Ancient Greece played a crucial role in that struggle. Bringing to fruition ideas that had first budded in Egypt, which, under the influence of German romantic ideas, Renieris depicted as the mother-source of Greek civilisation, Greece led the revolt of the "Ich" against the oppression of the "nicht-Ich". According to Renieris, this was reflected in Greek mythology.¹⁸ For example, the battle between the Olympian gods and the Titans pitted the forces of the "Ich" and the "nicht-Ich" against each other. It is notable that in the context of setting out his interpretation of Greek mythology along these lines, Renieris highlighted perceived parallels between Apollo and Christ: he maintained, for example, that both were the sons and prophets of divine fathers and that both were defenders of the principle of the "Ich", although with Christ a resolution of the conflict with the "nicht-Ich" was achieved, something which had remained impossible for the haughty Apollo.¹⁹ To preempt criticism, Renieris emphasised that in claiming that there were analogies between Apollo and Christ his only goal was to prove that "the worship of Apollo was but a feeble dawn heralding the bright day of Christianity and [that] the son of Leto [was] an amorphous and human shadowy drawing of the divine son of Mary".²⁰ In modern Greek writings on ancient Greek mythology of the previous generation, the contrast between the true Christian God and the false gods of the ancients set the tone; with Renieris, the focus shifted to similarities between Apollo and Christ, suiting the broader narrative of continuity favoured by modern Greek Romantic historiography.

Paparrigopoulos' Treatment of Ancient Greek Mythology and his Juxtaposition of Grote with German Scholars

Paparrigopoulos' professed "scientific" approach to Greek mythology differs both from the Euhemerist and allegorical interpretations encountered in

¹⁶ Dimaras, *Ελληνικός ρομαντισμός* [Hellenic romanticism], pp. 460ff; Ioannis Koubourlis, *La formation de l'histoire nationale grecque: l'Apport de Spyridon Zambelios (1815–1881)*, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2005, p. 15.

¹⁷ Markos Renieris, *Φιλοσοφία της Ιστορίας: Δοκίμιον* [Philosophy of history: essay], Athens: Philolaos, 1841, pp. 107, 112, 163–164.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 112–113.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 118, 120–121.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 119; Koubourlis, *La formation de l'histoire nationale grecque*, p. 89.

modern Greek mythological writings of the early nineteenth century and from Renieris' philosophical account, although he shared the latter's objective of illustrating the continuity of Greek history. The first book of the first volume of Paparrigopoulos' *HHN* is entitled "Mythical Times", recalling the beginning of George Grote's *History of Greece*, "Legendary Greece" (vol. 1, 1846).²¹ Paparrigopoulos' discussion of Greek myths was heavily influenced by Grote's, to the point of word-for-word translation from the English, though it was far shorter.²² Paparrigopoulos opened the *HHN* with the observation that there were two types of material concerning the remotest past of the Hellenic nation – mythical traditions and their various interpretations, ancient and modern.²³ He succinctly presented the ancient Greek myths regarding the creation of the world and the gods, as well as the principal heroic mythic cycles, and then turned to an examination of the methods of interpretation of Greek mythology, beginning with Euhemerism. As we saw, in the 1810s Megdanis and Paliouritis set out Euhemerist interpretations of Greek myths; such interpretations continued to appear in some later modern Greek writings on mythology. According to Paparrigopoulos, however, by the middle of the nineteenth century, Euhemerism no longer had supporters.²⁴ He considered it, therefore, unnecessary to argue against an obsolete theory.²⁵

²¹ Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, Athens: Pavlidis, 1860, p. 1.

²² A habit which did not escape contemporary reviewers: Nikolaos Kotzias, *Κρίσεις της Ελληνικής Ιστορίας του Κ. Παπαρρηγοπούλου* [Reviews of K. Paparrigopoulos' *Hellenic History*], Athens: Mellon, 1875, pp. 40–41. On Grote's influence on Paparrigopoulos, see Dimitris J. Kyrtatas, *Κατακτώντας την αρχαιότητα: Ιστοριογραφικές διαδρομές* [Conquering antiquity: historiographical routes], Athens: Polis, 2002, p. 116. On foreign influences on Paparrigopoulos more broadly, see Ioannis Koubourlis, *Οι ιστοριογραφικές οφειλές των Σπ. Ζαμπέλιου και Κ. Παπαρρηγόπουλου: Η συμβολή ελλήνων και ξένων λογίων στη διαμόρφωση του τρισήμιου σχήματος του ελληνικού ιστορισμού (1782–1846)* [The historiographical debts of S. Zambelios and K. Paparrigopoulos: the contribution of Greek and foreign scholars to the formulation of the tripartite model of Greek historicism (1782–1846)], Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2012.

²³ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 1.

²⁴ Euhemerism was in decline during the nineteenth century, yet it was not extinct: see Michael D. Konaris, "'The Sins of Euemeros against Truth and Honesty': Indo-European Comparative Mythology versus Euhemerism in Victorian Britain", in *The Mortal Gods: Euhemerism and its Uses from Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Svirthe Pugh (Routledge, forthcoming).

²⁵ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, pp. 35–36.

Paparrigopoulos gave far greater attention to a version of allegorical interpretation employed by “most wise” German scholars, especially Georg Friedrich Creuzer (1771–1858) and Gottfried Hermann (1772–1848). According to Creuzer, in the distant past priests from the East brought to Greece profound religious doctrines which included a form of monotheism and the concept of the immortality of the soul as well as their knowledge of history and of natural laws. To make intelligible their teachings to the as yet uncouth inhabitants of the country, the priests made use of symbols. In the course of time these became misunderstood, giving rise to myths. Successive generations of priests, however, preserved the knowledge of the original doctrines and instructed in it the initiates of the ancient Greek mysteries.²⁶ It should be noted that, in fundamental respects, Hermann disagreed with Creuzer over the interpretation of Greek mythology;²⁷ Paparrigopoulos’ lumping them together is misleading and suggestive of inadequate first-hand knowledge of German scholarship on myth, a point to which we will come back later. To return to Paparrigopoulos’ reaction to the views that, according to him, Creuzer and Hermann shared, he conceded that they were ingenious; he maintained, however, that they were refuted no less ingeniously by other wise scholars and especially by the “Englishman, George Grote”.²⁸ The way Paparrigopoulos introduces Grote to his readers is revealing as it amounts to nothing short of a tribute. Paparrigopoulos emphasised that Grote’s *History* had become a classic of European historiography within few years of its publication. In his judgment, Grote “applied the rules of modern historical science more correctly, grasped the spirit of ancient Hellenism more accurately and interpreted its institutions more practically than anybody else”.²⁹ We may observe how the non-professional historian Grote was elevated above all other contemporary scholars, including, by implication, the leading representatives of nineteenth-century German *Altertumswissenschaft*. It should be stressed, however, that, for all his admiration, Paparrigopoulos was no uncritical follower of Grote: he did not agree, for example, with the English historian’s views on key issues such as the vindication of Cleon and Athenian radical democracy or with

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 36–37.

²⁷ On their views concerning mythology, see Sotera Fornaro, “Die Mythologie übersetzen: Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Creuzer und Gottfried Hermann”, in *Translating Antiquity: Antikebilder im europäischen Kulturtransfer*, ed. Stefan Rebenich, Barbara von Reibnitz and Thomas Späth, Basel: Schwabe, 2010, pp. 75–97.

²⁸ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, pp. 36–37.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 37–38.

his negative assessment of the Hellenistic period.³⁰ Nevertheless, the parts of the *HHN* that deal with Greek antiquity remain profoundly indebted to Grote's *History of Greece*, constituting an important medium through which the latter became influential in modern Greek historiography.

To go back to the refutation of Creuzer and Hermann, Paparrigopoulos remarked that Grote rightly objected that the ancient Greek mysteries did not antedate Homer, as their theory presupposed. Moreover, he underscored that, according to the conclusive verdict of contemporary scholarship, the mysteries did not entail any esoteric teachings and that the allegorical interpretations of Greek mythology that were advanced in antiquity did not derive from them, but were later inventions.³¹

This debate, which Paparrigopoulos portrayed as being chiefly conducted between the Germans, Creuzer and Hermann, on the one side, and the Englishman, Grote, on the other, constituted one of the most notorious episodes in the history of nineteenth-century German classical scholarship – the clash over the interpretation of ancient Greek religion and mythology between Romantic Catholic or allegedly Catholic scholars like Joseph Görres (1776–1848) and Creuzer, and Protestant rationalists like Hermann (conventionally regarded as one of Creuzer's critics rather than an ally), Johann Heinrich Voss (1751–1826) and Christian August Lobeck (1781–1860).³² The controversy was exacerbated by Protestant anxiety that Görres' and Creuzer's portrayal of ancient priests as guardians of religious truths served as Catholic propaganda.³³ It is no accident that, as the debate spread outside Germany, Creuzer's views found a more favourable reception among French Catholic scholars while in Britain scholars such as Thomas Keightley (1789–1872) and Grote sided with Creuzer's Protestant detractors.³⁴ In Greece, Creuzerian influences are discernible in the work of

³⁰ Ibid., p. 667; Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 2, 2nd ed., Athens: Konstantinidis, 1886, p. vii.

³¹ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 38.

³² On Creuzer and the debate on his views on mythology, see Sotera Fornaro, "Friedrich Creuzer und die Diskussion über Philologie und Mythologie zu Beginn des 19. Jhs.," in *Pontes I: Akten der ersten Innsbrucker Tagung zur Rezeption der klassischen Antike*, ed. Martin Korenjak and Karlheinz Töchterle, Innsbruck: Studien, 2001, pp. 28–42.

³³ George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004, pp. 140–141.

³⁴ For Keightley's and Grote's opposition to Creuzer, see Michael D. Konaris, *The Greek Gods in Modern Scholarship: Interpretation and Belief in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Germany and Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 44–45. For Creuzer's reception in France, see Werner P. Sohnle, *Georg Friedrich Creuzers "Symbolik*

Renieris and Georgios Kozakis Typaldos (1790–1867). The latter, for example, in his *Philosophical Essay on the Progress and Fall of Old Greece* (1839), espoused Creuzer’s theory that colonists from the East had founded the Greek mysteries and expounded in their secrecy sublime religious doctrines.³⁵ As he stated, “the book of the Symbols, of the Myths, of the Allegories and of the Doctrines was opened to the initiates”, who learned about the immortality of the soul and the existence of a single, supreme God.³⁶ Crucially, however, Kozakis Typaldos’ essay did not turn into a panegyric of priests in Greek antiquity – far from it. For, in addition to Creuzer, Kozakis Typaldos also drew on a work by liberal thinker Benjamin Constant on ancient religion, *De la religion considérée dans sa source, ses formes et son développement* (1824–1831). Thus he stressed that the ancient Greeks managed early in their history to free themselves from the dominance of priests, which was regarded as one of the hallmarks of Asian civilisations.³⁷ As we shall see, this is a point which Paparrigopoulos would also emphasise.

Paparrigopoulos made no mention of the Catholic–Protestant dimension of the debate; however, the rejection of a theory that placed priests in the foreground is consistent with a broader tendency in his work to criticise the concentration of power in the hands of priests when this proved contrary to national interests.³⁸ With his adoption of Grote’s stance, Paparrigopoulos then resoundingly opposed the acceptance of Creuzer’s views in modern Greek scholarship. We should note, however, that Grote’s case against Creuzer was largely dependent on the argumentation of Creuzer’s German critics: in pronouncing that Creuzer’s portrayal of the ancient mysteries was not reliable, Grote referred his readers to Voss’ *Anti-Symbolik* (1824–1826) and especially to Lobeck’s *Aglaophamus* (1829), which, as he stated, were “full of instruction on the subject of this supposed interior doctrine, and on the ancient mysteries in general”.³⁹ Therefore, the impression that emerges from Paparrigopoulos’ account of the debate as a

und Mythologie” in *Frankreich: Eine Untersuchung ihres Einflusses auf Victor Cousin, Edgar Quinet, Jules Michelet und Gustave Flaubert*, Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1972.

³⁵ Georgios Kozakis Typaldos, *Φιλοσοφικόν δοκίμιον περί της προόδου και της πτώσεως της παλαιάς Ελλάδος* [Philosophical essay on the progress and fall of old Greece], Athens: Mantzarakis, 1839, pp. 202–204 and 214ff.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 217–218.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 206, 213.

³⁸ Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 3, Athens: Passaris, 1867, p. 27; Konstantinos Th. Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος: Η εποχή του, η ζωή του, το έργο του* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos: his time, his life, his work], Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 1986, p. 371; Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 271–272.

³⁹ George Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., London: John Murray, 1849, p. 588, n. 1.

clash between the speculative German and the allegedly more scientific English scholarship is partial and ill-informed.

Grote further dismissed allegorical interpretations of Greek mythology in general,⁴⁰ and so did Paparrigopoulos.⁴¹ We saw that Megdanis mentioned allegorical explanations, according to which Zeus represented the element of the air or of aether. Like Grote, Paparrigopoulos argued that the contradictory opinions of the advocates of allegory suggested that they were little more than arbitrary guesswork. More importantly, Paparrigopoulos espoused Grote's thesis that allegorical interpretations did not do justice to the way the ancient Greeks themselves viewed their myths and their gods.⁴² Grote emphatically asserted that Greek myths expressed "the divine and heroic faith of the people". By way of comment on the philosophical interpretations of the gods as allegories, he remarked that "many pious pagans seem to have perceived that allegory pushed to this extent was fatal to all living religious faith, inasmuch as it divested the gods of their character of Persons, sympathising with mankind and modifiable in their dispositions according to the conduct and prayers of the believer".⁴³ Paparrigopoulos took a similar position. He underlined that myths contained what he called "the positive doctrines of Greek religion", such as the notion that the gods were anthropomorphic persons each with his/her sphere of influence, or that they intervened in human affairs. However childish such ideas might appear to modern eyes, argued Paparrigopoulos, they were part of Greek faith. Scholars who were bent on discovering profound natural, philosophical or moral truths behind myths, were, therefore, in his view, preoccupied with issues that were of little concern to the majority of the Greek people.⁴⁴ The use of terms such as "doctrines" or "faith" is indicative of a Christianising conception of Greek religion long influential in scholarship. One of its strongest and most consequential critics was William Robertson Smith (1846–1894) who, towards the end of the nineteenth century, stressed that belief in myths was not mandatory in the religions of antiquity and that their focus lay on the performance of rituals.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 568. Cf. Kyrtatas, *Κατακτώντας την αρχαιότητα* [Conquering antiquity], p. 115.

⁴¹ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 41.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Grote, *History of Greece*, pp. 569, 598. Cf. Frank M. Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981, p. 89.

⁴⁴ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, pp. 41–43.

⁴⁵ William Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: First Series; The Fundamental Institutions*, Edinburgh: Black, 1889, pp. 18–19. Cf. Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 122.

In his *History of Greece* Grote argued at length against another highly influential approach, according to which, myths, especially those narrating the deeds of Greek heroes, were based on historical facts and could, therefore, after the removal of their mythical embellishments, be used as sources for the early history of Greece. As Turner stresses, the implication of this issue extended beyond the study of Greek history since in the same way one cast doubt on the historical foundations of Greek myths, one could cast doubt on the historical foundations of aspects of the Christian tradition.⁴⁶ Already in an article in 1843 Grote had expressed strong opposition to regarding myths as having historical basis: in the context of reviewing Niebuhr's *Griechische Heroen-Geschichten* (1842), Grote praised him for not squeezing legends into "authentic history".⁴⁷ Directing his criticism especially at Henry Fynes Clinton (1781–1852), who in his *Fasti Hellenici* (1834) had treated figures appearing in Greek myths as real historical individuals almost up to a millennium before the first Olympiad,⁴⁸ Grote emphasised that "all authentic evidence of Grecian chronology [...] ceases with B.C. 776". What lay before was "the empire of mythus or legend [...] neither entitled to the authority, nor amenable to the laws, of historical reality".⁴⁹ Grote called this distinction between legend and history Niebuhrian, "because we believe that the first volume of the history of Rome originally enforced it with fulness and efficiency on the literary world".⁵⁰ Professing to be unable to determine when myths contained reliable historical information and when not, Grote refused to reconstruct Greek history before the first Olympiad on the "evidence" of mythology.⁵¹ In his *History of Greece*, he

⁴⁶ Frank M. Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 332, 334.

⁴⁷ George Grote, "Grecian Legends and Early History", review of *Griechische Heroen-Geschichten*, by B.G. Niebuhr, *The Westminster Review* (American edition) 39, no. 77 (May 1843), pp. 151–174, here 152.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*; Henry F. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici: The Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece*, vol. 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1834, p. vi.

⁴⁹ Grote, "Grecian Legends and Early History", p. 173.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 152; Ulrich Muhlack, "Die deutschen Einwirkungen auf die englische Altertumswissenschaft am Beispiel George Grotes", in *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Mayotte Bollack, vol. 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1983, pp. 376–393, here 384. On Niebuhr's influence on Grote, see further Oswyn Murray, "Niebuhr in Britain", in *Historiographie de l'antiquité et transferts culturels: Les histoires anciennes dans l'Europe des XVIIIe et XIXe siècles*, ed. Chryssanthi Avlami, Jaime Alvar and Mirella Romero Recio, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010, pp. 239–254, here 252.

⁵¹ Grote, "Grecian Legends and Early History", p. 174; Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 88; Kyrtatas, *Κατακτώντας την αρχαιότητα* [Conquering antiquity], p. 115.

reiterated that mythical events occurred in “a past which never was present, – a region essentially mythical, neither approachable by the critic nor measurable by the chronologer”.⁵² Turner observes that in this manner Grote “broke the link between Greek myths and Greek history that his most learned British and European predecessors had been unwilling to sever”.⁵³

Paparrigopoulos followed Grote in the crucial dissociation of myth from history and the view that genuine Greek history started only in 776 BC. To illustrate the problems with using myths as historical sources, Paparrigopoulos drew attention to Thucydides’ account of the Trojan War: Thucydides discarded all supernatural elements, but otherwise treated the Trojan War as a real historical event. Like Grote, Paparrigopoulos maintained that even if the ancient Greeks themselves believed in the historicity of the Trojan War, modern historical science could not accept it as an indisputable historical fact since the Homeric poems were posterior to the events they described and independent contemporary evidence to confirm them was lacking.⁵⁴ At that time, Heinrich Schliemann had not yet made his discoveries at Troy and Mycenae, which would appear to furnish the evidence that Paparrigopoulos demanded and which would give fresh support to the theory that myths preserved historical elements.⁵⁵

In addition, Paparrigopoulos was critical of another approach to Greek mythology that he claimed predominated in Germany. As its leading representative he named Karl Otfried Müller (1797–1840), according to whom myths contained both imaginary and real elements.⁵⁶ In Müller’s eyes, heroic myths could yield insights especially into the early movements of the various Greek peoples. As Paparrigopoulos observed, in Müller’s opinion, for example, the myth of Jason and the Argonautic expedition alluded to the maritime operations and colonial expansion of the Minyans.⁵⁷ Paparrigopoulos again

⁵² Grote, *History of Greece*, p. 59; Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 88.

⁵³ Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 87. Cf. George Huxley, “George Grote on Early Greece”, in *George Grote Reconsidered*, ed. William M. Calder III and Stephen Trzaskoma, Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1996, pp. 23–42, here 25.

⁵⁴ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 45; Grote, *History of Greece*, pp. 434–435; Huxley, *George Grote*, p. 26.

⁵⁵ Martin P. Nilsson, “État actuel des études sur la mythologie grecque”, *Scientia* 51 (1932), pp. 144–152, here 146–147.

⁵⁶ Karl O. Müller, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1825, p. 68; Graf, *Greek Mythology*, pp. 22–24.

⁵⁷ Karl O. Müller, *Geschichten Hellenischer Stämme und Städte*, vol. 1, *Orchomenos und die Minyer*, Breslau: J. Max, 1820, pp. 285ff. On Müller, see William M. Calder III and Renate Schlesier (eds.), *Zwischen Rationalismus und Romantik: Karl Otfried Müller und die antike Kultur*, Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1998.

highlighted the lack of corroborating evidence and rejected such interpretations as well as unprovable conjectures.⁵⁸

Paparrigopoulos reiterated with the greatest emphasis that it was not possible to extract reliable historical information from myths. It is notable that his dismissal of such attempts turned into a broader attack on German scholarship. Paparrigopoulos recognised that the study of ancient Greek history was profoundly indebted to German classicists. He underscored, however, that, for all their erudition and brilliance, German scholars could not achieve the impossible, namely create history out of myths.⁵⁹ For this reason, Paparrigopoulos argued, Grote's treatment of Greek mythology was preferable: Grote declined to be dragged into making speculations about the remote past of Greek antiquity on the basis of myths; indeed, he refrained from offering any kind of interpretation of Greek mythology altogether. He confined himself, instead, to setting out the myths as they were believed and understood by the Greeks.⁶⁰ Paparrigopoulos acknowledged that readers who expected that historians would lift for them the veil of mythology and help them perceive the supposed historical elements of myths would be disappointed. He gave them the same answer Grote had given his readers: the "veil" was all there was, there was nothing hidden to be seen behind it.⁶¹ Paparrigopoulos thus became a transmitter to modern Greek historiography of Grote's approach to Greek myths. Because, as mentioned, it offered a model for challenging the historicity of Christian traditions, Grote's stance on myths came to be associated in Britain with sceptics and radicals.⁶² Paparrigopoulos, however, does not seem to have pressed the analogy and, as we shall see, his critics in Greece were primarily concerned about the implications that his views had for Greek history rather for their potential to undermine Christianity, although in some cases objections tending to that direction were raised.

⁵⁸ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, pp. 50–51. In his discussion of the myth of the Argonautic expedition Grote argued against "so many able men [who] have treated it as an undisputed reality" that there was no way to ascertain whether the story of the expedition was completely made up or had some historical basis. Unlike Paparrigopoulos, however, Grote referred to German scholars who held that it was pointless to scrutinise the myth in the hope of finding some historical foundation: Grote, *History of Greece*, pp. 332–333.

⁵⁹ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 53.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*; Grote, *History of Greece*, pp. xii–xiii.

⁶² Turner, *Greek Heritage*, pp. 142–143.

To return to the contrast that Paparrigopoulos drew between the standpoint of Grote and of German scholars, it did not do justice to the diversity of opinion in contemporary German scholarship on myth and, as mentioned, it further overlooked the German influences on Grote.⁶³ As we have seen, Paparrigopoulos' knowledge of German classical scholarship appears superficial. It should be remembered that, unlike other contemporary modern Greek classical scholars, Paparrigopoulos had not studied in Germany.⁶⁴ His claim that the non-professional historian Grote was more insightful than the learned German specialists may be construed as a vindication of himself as well: although Paparrigopoulos became a university professor and was not an outsider like Grote, he lacked formal training and his *HHN* was addressed not to the academic community, but to the general public; he was thus vulnerable to the criticism of insufficient expertise by contemporary German-trained modern Greek classicists.⁶⁵

Reactions

We should note that Grote's approach to Greek myths, the soundness of which Paparrigopoulos defended to his modern Greek audience, met with opposition from a wide range of scholars in Britain and the German-speaking world.⁶⁶ One of his most vocal critics was Friedrich Max Müller (1823–1900), who would become the most prominent exponent of Indo-European comparative mythology in Victorian Britain. In his essay on *Comparative Mythology* (1856), Max Müller took aim at Grote for “leav[ing] the whole of

⁶³ On the diverse foreign influences on Grote, see *ibid.*, p. 87.

⁶⁴ Paparrigopoulos does not appear to have completed university studies in his youth and the doctorate he later received from the University of Munich was obtained through correspondence: Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], pp. 111, 138.

⁶⁵ Paparrigopoulos was attacked by contemporary critics for not having the knowledge required for a satisfactory treatment of mythology: Kotzias, *Κρίσεις της Ελληνικής Ιστορίας* [Reviews of *Hellenic History*], p. 43. For modern Greek scholars who studied in German universities during the nineteenth century, see Sophia Matthaïou, “Transferts culturels et spécialistes de philologie classique: L'oeuvre de traduction des professeurs de l'Université Othonienne au cours du XIXe siècle”, *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 12 (2015), pp. 75–100, here 76; Matthaïou, “Establishing the Discipline”; Giorgos Veloudis, *Germanograecia: Deutsche Einflüsse auf die neugriechische Literatur (1750–1944)*, vol. 1, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1983, pp. 38ff.

⁶⁶ Grote, *History of Greece*, p. 548, n. 1. For favourable reactions in Britain, see Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 94ff.; for negative reactions, see Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority*, pp. 339ff.

mythology as a riddle, that cannot and ought not to be solved, as something irrational".⁶⁷ This was perceived as an unacceptable blemish on the image of the Indo-Europeans. In contrast to Grote, Max Müller argued that the "riddle" of Indo-European mythology could be solved in a scientific manner. In his eyes, the tool for its solution consisted in the etymological analysis of the names of the persons mentioned in myths. According to Max Müller, etymology revealed that these names originally referred to the elements of nature. The stories told about them were to be explained as initially perfectly intelligible, innocuous descriptions of natural phenomena which became misunderstood when the original meaning of the names used was forgotten. This method of interpretation of Indo-European mythology minimised the offense which the frequently violent, "immoral" and sexually explicit myths of the ancients caused to nineteenth-century sensibilities and became highly popular especially during the third quarter of the century.⁶⁸ It is revealing that Max Müller considered as the most significant result of Indo-European comparative mythology "the conviction which it leaves in our minds that the ancestors of the Aryan races were not mere drivelling idiots".⁶⁹ As we shall see, Paparrigopoulos accepted the Indo-European hypothesis and highlighted the similarities especially between Greek and German mythology. However, although he was acquainted with Max Müller's work, he did not follow the method of myth interpretation of the advocates of Indo-European comparative mythology. We can thus speak of a selective incorporation of elements of the Indo-European theory in his work, a point to which we shall return.

Paparrigopoulos' treatment of Greek mythology received both criticism and praise from modern Greek reviewers of the *HHN*.⁷⁰ It seems that some accused him of coming up with his own startling ideas regarding myths while others recognised that the source was Grote.⁷¹ Paparrigopoulos' espousal of the English historian's

⁶⁷ Friedrich Max Müller, "Comparative Mythology" (1856), in *Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. 2, London: Longmans, Green, 1867, pp. 1–143, here 86. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 14, 16; Turner, *Greek Heritage*, pp. 104ff.

⁶⁸ Turner, *Greek Heritage*, pp. 110–111.

⁶⁹ Friedrich Max Müller, *Contributions to the Science of Mythology*, vol. 1, London: Longmans, Green, 1897, p. 21; Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 109.

⁷⁰ For reviews of the *HHN*, see Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], pp. 296ff.

⁷¹ Anonymous review of the first volume of Paparrigopoulos' *HHN*, *Κλειώ* (ed. Theagenis Livadas), no. 48, 19/31 May 1862; cf. Georgios A. Christodoulou, "Η εφημερίδα *Κλειώ* της Τεργέστης (1861–1863)" [The journal *Kleio* of Trieste (1861–1863)], *Παρουσία* 2 (1984), pp. 139–196, here 157. For *Kleio*, see Lucia Marcheselli Loukas, "Η *Κλειώ*" [Kleio], in *Εγκυκλοπαίδεια του Ελληνικού τύπου 1784–1974* [Encyclopaedia of the Greek press, 1784–

views on mythology was variously judged. An anonymous reviewer in *Κλειώ* hit back at Paparrigopoulos' unconventional renunciation of German scholarship in favour of Grote. He maintained that, as a practical Englishman, Grote loathed myths and regarded it a waste of time to try to find their historical core. The reviewer emphasised, however, that, in the eyes of German scholars, Grote's stance showed unduly timidity on the part of the historian. He added that the Germans had succeeded in making historical discoveries on the basis of myths.⁷² What the reviewer considered to be at stake in the disagreement between Grote and "the Germans" over the treatment of myths is illustrated by his comments regarding Hesiod's account of the five generations of humankind. For Grote, the story was an invention of Hesiod, and Paparrigopoulos followed suit. The reviewer, however, claimed that German scholars like Karl Friedrich Hermann (1804–1855) had proved that, far from being made up by Hesiod, the story derived from an ancient *logos* which constituted the essential foundation of ancient Greek history. Just as the Book of Genesis was the oldest monument of the primitive history of humankind, the reviewer underscored, so the account of the five generations of humankind in Hesiod could be considered as the most genuine popular creation of the earliest Greek history.⁷³ The parallel between the Book of Genesis and the Greek myth of the five ages was drawn here with a view to defending the latter against the claims of Grote and Paparrigopoulos that it was a comparatively late fabrication; conversely, however, as has been mentioned, the questioning of the historical basis of Greek myths could also lead to a questioning of the historical basis of aspects of the Bible.

In another review in *Φιλίστωρ* Dimitrios Mavrofydis criticised Grote's and Paparrigopoulos' standpoint on Greek myths. He maintained that myths did express theological, natural, moral and historical truths. Their discovery was undoubtedly difficult, but it should not be given up as a futile endeavour.⁷⁴ It appears that also in his course on historiography at the University of Athens, Mavrofydis, in stark contrast to the position of Grote and Paparrigopoulos, told students that Greek myths had a historical core which historians had a duty to recover by removing all superimposed elements.⁷⁵

1974], ed. Loukia Droulia and Gioula Koutsopanagou, vol. 2, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 567–568.

⁷² Anonymous review of the first volume of Paparrigopoulos' *HHN*, *Κλειώ*.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Dimitris I. Mavrofydis, "Βιβλιογραφία" [Bibliography], *Φιλίστωρ* 1 (1861), pp. 101–104 and 140–151, here 141. On Mavrofydis, see Sophia Matthaiou, "Intellectuels et originalité au cours du XIXe siècle grec: L'œuvre des philologues classiques", *Rives Méditerranéennes* 50 (2015), pp. 27–39, here 30–31.

⁷⁵ Aristeidis Tatarakis, notes from D. Mavrofydis' courses on ancient Greek historiography at the University of Athens in 1863–1864 and 1864–1865: University Lectures, no. 158,

On the other hand, Paparrigopoulos also had his defenders. In *Πανδώρα* an anonymous reviewer responded to Mavrofydis' criticism: he contended that Paparrigopoulos was to be commended for siding with Grote in not regarding the contents of mythical narratives as fitting material for "scientific history".⁷⁶ In yet another later anonymous review in *Κλειώ* the writer stated that the international academic community appeared to be evenly divided between scholars who held that myths had to be explained and those who were in favour of taking them as they were and, in effect, justified Paparrigopoulos for joining ranks with the latter.⁷⁷ Despite the voices in support of Paparrigopoulos' Grotean account of Greek mythology, criticism seems to have prevailed. As we saw, modern Greek critics appear to have taken offence, chiefly, at the great "shrinking" of the extent of ancient Greek history that, in their eyes, Paparrigopoulos' adoption of Grote's views signified.

The Indo-European Origins of the Greeks

Like Grote, Paparrigopoulos maintained that the "secure" history of ancient Greece began only at the point when the ancient traditions ceased to mention gods and demigods.⁷⁸ He emphasised, however, that this did not mean that there was nothing that historians could safely say about previous periods. Rather than having recourse to mythology for the earliest history of the Greeks, however, Paparrigopoulos pointed to the latest scientific finds of international scholarship: similarities in terms of language, religion and socio-political institutions conclusively established that the Greeks were a people of Indo-European origins who had come to Greece from Asia.⁷⁹ It followed that the claim that the ancient Greeks were autochthonous

Department of Manuscripts and Facsimiles, National Library of Greece. I am thankful to Dr. Sophia Matthaïou for helping me consult Tatarakis' notes. Cf. Kotzias, *Κρίσεις της Ελληνικής Ιστορίας* [Reviews of Hellenic history], p. 43. For Mavrofydis' reviews of *HHN*, see Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], pp. 296–297.

⁷⁶ Β, "Βιβλιογραφική Αντεπίκρισις" [Bibliographical countercriticism], *Πανδώρα* 265 (1861), pp. 17–22, here 20. For *Πανδώρα*, see Kostas Karpozilos, "Πανδώρα" [Pandora], in *Εγκυκλοπαίδεια του Ελληνικού τύπου 1784–1974* [Encyclopaedia of the Greek press, 1784–1974], ed. Loukia Droulia and Gioula Koutsopanagou, vol. 3, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 415–417.

⁷⁷ 26 March/7 April 1865 and 2/14 April 1865, *Κλειώ* (ed. Dionysios Therianos), quoted in Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], pp. 304–305.

⁷⁸ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 56.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 56–57; Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, "Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν του ελληνικού έθνους" [Introduction to the entire history of the Hellenic nation], *Ιστορικάί*

could not be regarded as historically accurate.⁸⁰ Ioannis Koumbourlis has astutely observed that “there is hardly any historical issue in the pages of Paparrigopoulos’ five-volume history that is not invested with political significance”.⁸¹ In view of the division of the modern Greeks into autochthonous and heterochthonous after the foundation of the modern Greek state, the rejection of ancient Greek autochthony by Paparrigopoulos, who himself was born outside Greece, may be seen as having contemporary political implications.⁸²

In addition, the novel “scientific” Indo-European theory appeared to disprove the view found in earlier modern Greek historiography that the ancient Greeks were descendants of biblical figures. This revision of established opinions concerning the origins of the Greek people in the light of new evidence discovered by nineteenth-century science forms part of the wider transition in contemporary modern Greek historiography from the tradition of sacred history to secular “scientific” history.⁸³

Paparrigopoulos further underlined that Indo-European comparative studies shed light on the common traits of the members of the Indo-European family and, especially, of the Greeks and the Germans, “the two foremost Indo-European nations of ancient and modern times”.⁸⁴ Reproducing a conventional theme in contemporary international scholarship, Paparrigopoulos maintained that the ancient Greek and German cultures were sharply distinct from the cultures of Asian nations as they were pervaded by the spirit of freedom. Their differences extended from the sphere of mythology to politics. As we saw, Paparrigopoulos

πραγματεΐαι [Historical treatises], vol. 1, Athens: Vilaras, 1858, pp. 1–19, here 1–2. Cf. Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 269–270.

⁸⁰ Paparrigopoulos, “Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν” [Introduction to the entire history], pp. 1–2, 4.

⁸¹ Ioannis Koumbourlis, “Όταν οι ιστορικοί μιλούν για τον εαυτό τους: ο ρόλος του εθνικού ιστορικού στους πρωτοπόρους της ελληνικής εθνικής σχολής” [When the historians talk about themselves: the role of the national historian in the pioneers of the Greek national school], in *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece], ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides and Triantaphyllos E. Sklavenitis, vol. 1, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2004, pp. 81–100, here 95.

⁸² Dimaras discusses how the law on autochthony affected Paparrigopoulos, who was born in Constantinople: Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], pp. 74–75. Cf. Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Το Βυζάντιο μετά το Έθνος: Το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας στις βαλκανικές ιστοριογραφίες* [Byzantium after the nation: the problem of continuity in Balkan historiographies], Athens: Alexandria, 2009, p. 63.

⁸³ For “the emergence of a secular historical consciousness” in Greece, see chap. 2 on “The Formation of Modern Greek Historical Consciousness” in Kitromilides, *Enlightenment and Revolution*, pp. 63–88, here 64.

⁸⁴ Paparrigopoulos, “Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν” [Introduction to the entire history], p. 2.

did not make use of the preferred method of myth interpretation of advocates of Indo-European comparative mythology. However, he did briefly refer to certain parallels between the mythologies of the Greeks and the Germans, mentioned in Grote's *History of Greece*, but ultimately deriving from Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* (1835).⁸⁵ Thus Paparrigopoulos stated that both Greek and German mythology originated in the deification of the forces of nature that was supposedly typical of the religions of Asia. However, in the course of time the mythologies of the Greeks and the Germans were substantially modified in similar ways. The Greek and German gods became conceived as persons (*πρόσωπα*) and the phenomena of the natural world were accordingly explained in terms of the will and activity of personified divinities.⁸⁶ The use of the word *πρόσωπον* with the Christian connotations it carried arguably created a basic sense of kinship with Christianity, a point to which I shall come back.

The distinction between Asian nature-worship and the more spiritual and human-oriented religions of the ancestors of the modern Europeans was a common motif in nineteenth-century scholarship. For some scholars of the time, nature-worship had negative resonances: it was considered too materialistic and was associated with mysticism. As such, it was regarded as unbecoming for the religions of European peoples, and, conversely, as a characteristic of Asian religions.⁸⁷ The contrast between Asian nature-worship and the Greek and German worship of personified deities may not necessarily have the same associations in the work of Paparrigopoulos; in its case, too, however, it reinforced the notion that Asian cultures were stagnant and attached to matter as opposed to the more progressive European cultures which emphasised the human element.

In addition, Paparrigopoulos stressed that, in contrast to Asia, where absolute monarchy tended to prevail, ancient Greek and German monarchs ruled over free citizens whose views they were expected to take into account in their decision-making.⁸⁸ As Greece had in Othon of the House of Wittelsbach a German king who had been forced to grant a constitution, this point too arguably

⁸⁵ cf. Turner, *Greek Heritage*, p. 90.

⁸⁶ Paparrigopoulos, "Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν" [Introduction to the entire history], p. 2. Cf. "The notion of natural and moral force is generally secondary in the Greek conception of the divine; the primary notion is that of the person [*η του προσώπου έννοια*]." Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 42; Cf. Konaris, "Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία" [Ancient Greek religion], p. 272.

⁸⁷ Konaris, *Greek Gods in Modern Scholarship*, pp. 42–43.

⁸⁸ Paparrigopoulos, "Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν" [Introduction to the entire history], p. 3; Cf. Konaris, "Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία" [Ancient Greek religion], p. 271.

had contemporary political significance. What is more, Paparrigopoulos maintained that the spirit of freedom which distinguished the Greeks and the Germans from the “Asiatics” was also observable in the different position of priests in their cultures. Whereas the dominance of priests or *hierokratia* was endemic in Asia, Greek and German priests never formed a centrally organised ruling class. As a result, while in India, Egypt and other cultures with mighty priesthoods, the energy of the individual was curtailed, in the Greek and German world its vigour was preserved intact.⁸⁹ As we have mentioned, the criticism of priests wielding power is a recurrent motif in the *HHN* and is a stance which Paparrigopoulos shares with scholars influenced by the anti-clerical spirit of the Enlightenment.⁹⁰ Again, in the light of issues such as the autocephaly of the Church of Greece and the Bavarian administration’s policy towards monasteries, the assertion that *hierokratia* was a phenomenon that was alien to the Greek and the German sense of freedom likely had contemporary resonances.

It is notable that while Paparrigopoulos professed to be calling attention to the differences between the Greeks and the Germans, on the one hand, and the “Asiatics”, on the other, as insights emerging from the comparative study of Indo-European cultures, in the case of the role of priests, he listed India on the side of Asiatic cultures. One strand in nineteenth-century Western Indo-European scholarship exalted India as the oldest Indo-European civilisation. Paparrigopoulos did not partake in the idealisation of ancient India nor did he dwell on the linguistic, religious and cultural ties between the Greeks and all the other Indo-European nations. Rather he invoked the Indo-European theory to highlight the close ties between the Greeks and the Germans and their intellectual and cultural superiority as European nations over the nations of Asia, including major Indo-European civilisations such as India and Persia.⁹¹ As mentioned, we may, therefore, speak of a selective use of Indo-European theory on the part of Paparrigopoulos adapted to the priorities and agendas of his work.

Continuity or Rupture?

To turn to the question of the continuity of Greek history, as we have seen, for Renieris, ancient Greek mythology did not belie, but rather corroborated,

⁸⁹ Paparrigopoulos, “Εισαγωγή εις την όλην ιστορίαν” [Introduction to the entire history], p. 4; Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 91; Cf. Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], p. 271.

⁹⁰ Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos], p. 371; Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], p. 272.

⁹¹ Cf. Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 270–271.

it, since, in his view, certain of its elements foreshadowed Christianity. Paparrigopoulos used the word *πρόσωπον* to describe the dominant Greek and German tendency to personification, which, as we have suggested, may have forged a link with Christianity. However, his categorical rejection of allegorical interpretations ruled out the possibility that Greek mythology could fulfil in his work a function similar to that in Renieris' *Philosophy of History*. For Paparrigopoulos, Greek myths did not contain disguised philosophical truths or lofty religious conceptions; on the contrary, they showed how childish the "average" Greek notions about the gods were. The most that could be said in their favour was that they were aesthetically pleasing.⁹²

Paparrigopoulos' dismissive attitude towards ancient Greek mythology was part of his broader condemnation of ancient Greek polytheism, which he regarded as incomparably inferior to the monotheism of Judaism and Christianity.⁹³ Moreover, by way of comment on the religious persecutions of late antiquity, Paparrigopoulos stated: "unfortunately the peaceful co-existence of two so contrasting worlds, and especially of two so contrasting religions as idolatry and Christianity was in the end impossible".⁹⁴ The pejorative references to ancient Greek religion and its characterisation as contrasting with Christianity suggest that at least in some parts of the *HHN* the transition from the ancient Greek to the Christian world was conceived as entailing a major rupture on the religious plane, culminating in the outbreak of violence, which appears out of harmony with Paparrigopoulos' general thesis about the felicitous alliance of Hellenism and Christianity and the continuity and unity of Greek history.⁹⁵

It should be stressed, however, that in other parts of the *HHN*, including of the same edition, this apparent rupture is mitigated in various ways. For example,

⁹² Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 1, p. 119.

⁹³ Konaris, "Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία" [Ancient Greek religion], p. 275.

⁹⁴ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 3, p. 17; George D. Metallinos, *Παγανιστικός ελληνισμός ή ελληνορθοδοξία; [Pagan Hellenism or Greek Orthodox Christianity?]*, Athens: Armos, 2003, p. 62.

⁹⁵ Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 2, 2nd ed., Athens: Konstantinidis, 1886, pp. xiv–xv; Makrides, *Hellenic Temples*, pp. 179–180; George D. Metallinos, "Ο Χριστιανισμός στο Έργο του Κων. Παπαρρηγόπουλου" [Christianity in the work of Kon. Paparrigopoulos], *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα Θεολογικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* [Scientific yearbook of the Theological Department of the University of Athens] 33 (1998), pp. 229–244, here 229–231; Konaris, "Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία" [Ancient Greek religion], p. 278. Zambelios likewise argued for an alliance between ancient Hellenism and Christianity: Koubourlis, *La formation de l'histoire nationale grecque*, pp. 176, 188. For other advocates of such ideas in nineteenth-century Greece, see Nikos Sigalas, "Ιστοριογραφία και

Paparrigopoulos contended that by the time of Christianity's appearance, ancient Greek religion was anyway moribund, dying of its own internal weaknesses.⁹⁶ Christianity, therefore, did not cause the annihilation of a thriving religious culture, but arrived opportunely to replace what was turning into a corpse. Paparrigopoulos, however, did not confine himself to such negative aspects; the thesis that in some respects ancient Greek religion anticipated Christianity, and that it even positively contributed to the preparation of the ancient world for it, was commonly advanced in Western scholarship of the times and it also appears in Paparrigopoulos' work. For example, he espoused the theory that the phenomenon of religious syncretism observable in the Hellenistic period paved the ground for the acceptance of the one and true God of Christianity.⁹⁷ More strikingly, Paparrigopoulos claimed that there was a fundamental kinship between the two most emblematic monuments of classical Greece and the Byzantine Empire: the Parthenon on the Athenian Acropolis and Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Paparrigopoulos maintained that, as a temple dedicated to Athena, the goddess of wisdom, the Parthenon was, in essence, dedicated to the same concept as the Christian Church – the holy wisdom of God, though the ancient Greeks had not been able to give expression to it in such an abstract and perfected manner as their Christianised descendants. Paparrigopoulos emphasised that, their differences notwithstanding, “the Parthenon of Pericles, Ictinus and Pheidias was nothing else than the heathen shrine of Holy Wisdom; and likewise the Hagia Sophia of Justinian, Anthemios and Isidoros was nothing else than the Parthenon of the Christian faith”.⁹⁸ In this manner Paparrigopoulos

ιστορία των πρακτικών της γραφής: Ένα προοίμιο στην ιστορία του σχηματισμού της έννοιας ελληνισμός και στην παραγωγή της νεοελληνικής εθνικής ιστοριογραφίας” [Historiography and history of the practices of writing: a prelude to the history of the formation of the concept of hellenism and the production of Modern Greek national historiography], in Kitromilides and Sklavenitis, *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece], pp. 103–148.

⁹⁶ For example, Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 2, 2nd ed., pp. 449, 473; Metallinos, “Ο Χριστιανισμός στο έργο του Κων. Παπαρρηγόπουλου” [Christianity in the work of Kon. Paparrigopoulos], p. 238. Cf. Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], p. 277.

⁹⁷ Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 2, Athens: Passaris and Kanariotis, 1862, pp. 174, 420; Metallinos, “Ο Χριστιανισμός στο έργο του Κων. Παπαρρηγόπουλου” [Christianity in the work of Kon. Paparrigopoulos], p. 230; Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 278–279.

⁹⁸ Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 3, p. 180. In the second edition of the *HHN* Paparrigopoulos referred to Hagia Sophia as the

defended, on the one hand, the Parthenon from Christian charges that, whatever its artistic merits, it was a pagan monument, and, on the other, Hagia Sophia from contemporary modern Greek scholars who, influenced by the Western idealisation of ancient Greek art and by negative views of Byzantium, disdained it as a piece of architecture.⁹⁹ That Paparrigopoulos was primarily concerned with reclaiming *specifically* the Parthenon for the thesis of the continuity between classical Greece and Christianity rather than its patron goddess is suggested by the fact that elsewhere in his work he did not really exploit the aforementioned interpretation of Athena in order to make the point that she embodied a concept that foreshadowed Christianity. To return to Paparrigopoulos' account of the Parthenon and Hagia Sophia, the conceptualisation of the relation of the two monuments in such terms illustrated that the notion that modern Greeks had to make a choice between classical Greece and Christian Byzantium was mistaken – the Parthenon and Hagia Sophia attested not to the opposition, but to the essential connection, of the two constituent elements of modern Greek identity.¹⁰⁰

The stress that Paparrigopoulos placed on the alliance between Hellenism and Christianity has tended to overshadow the comments that one finds scattered in his work that are suggestive of tensions between them and the fact that major aspects of ancient Greek culture such as its mythology were not included in its celebrated union with Christianity.¹⁰¹ It is notable that close in time to the publication of the first volume of Paparrigopoulos' *HHN* an article on Greek mythology appeared in *Φιλίστωρ* (January 1861).¹⁰² The author was Kyprianos and its goal “to show that so many things similar or analogous to ancient

“stepsister” of the Parthenon: Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation], vol. 3, 2nd ed., Athens: Konstantinidis, 1886, p. xiii; Cf. Eleana Yalouri, *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim*, Oxford: Berg, 2001, p. 37; Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 280–281.

⁹⁹ Stephanos Koumanoudis (1818–1899) may be mentioned in this context: Sophia Matthaïou, “Στ. Α. Κουμανούδης – Αλ. Ρ. Ραγκαβής: μια συγκριτική προσέγγιση” [St. A. Koumanoudis – Al. R. Rangavis: a comparative approach], *Μνήμων* 28 (2006–2007), pp. 169–208, here 184; Kyrtatas, *Κατακτώντας την αρχαιότητα* [Conquering antiquity], p. 112.

¹⁰⁰ The rehabilitation of Byzantium, which had been fiercely criticised by advocates of the Enlightenment, was one of the chief aims of modern Greek romantic historiography: Dimaras, *Ελληνικός ρωμαντισμός* [Hellenic romanticism], p. 461. On Paparrigopoulos' account of Byzantium, see Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism”, pp. 25–33; Stamatopoulos, *Το Βυζάντιο μετά το έθνος* [Byzantium after the nation], pp. 73ff.

¹⁰¹ See Konaris, “Αρχαία ελληνική θρησκεία” [Ancient Greek religion], pp. 279–280.

¹⁰² Aristeidis Kyprianos, “Μυθολογικά” [On myths], *Φιλίστωρ* 1 (1861), pp. 236–248. On Kyprianos, see Matthaïou, “Intellectuels et originalité”, p. 31.

mythology have been preserved by us”.¹⁰³ To that end, Kyprianos examined the ways of speaking of modern Greek sailors and fishermen and suggested that in many respects they recalled the language of ancient Greek myths.¹⁰⁴ Kyprianos expressed the hope “that if many scholars turn to the collection of the similarities, ancient mythology will be illuminated also from [modern] Greece”.¹⁰⁵ Not long afterwards, Politis undertook an extensive search for ancient Greek survivals or parallels in modern Greek folklore such as the one Kyprianos had envisaged.¹⁰⁶ This approach, which, on the one hand, conformed to the latest trends in international scholarship, and, on the other, provided a further way of demonstrating continuity in Greek history, exercised a massive influence on later modern Greek scholarship on ancient Greek mythology. By contrast, although successive generations of modern Greeks kept turning to Paparrigopoulos’ *HHN* as the definitive version of Greek history, Paparrigopoulos’ portrayal of Greek myths does not appear to have had a commensurate impact. It is arguable that the apparent lack of appeal of Paparrigopoulos’ Grotean treatment of Greek mythology in the eyes of modern Greek readers had not only to do with potential objections on scholarly grounds, but also with the fact that it was at dissonance with the prevalent idealising tendency of the ancient Greeks and the narrative of the continuity of Greek history.

Research Centre for the Humanities

¹⁰³ Kyprianos, “Μυθολογικά” [On myths], p. 237.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 239–241.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

¹⁰⁶ Herzfeld, *Ours Once More*. To approach, however, Politis’ work on mythology exclusively from this angle would not do it justice: Chrysoula Chatzitaki-Kapsomenou, “Η μυθολογία του Νικόλαου Πολίτη υπό το πρίσμα της νεότερης έρευνας” [Nikolaos Politis’ writings on mythology from the perspective of modern research], in *Ο Νικόλαος Γ. Πολίτης και το Κέντρον Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας* [Nikolaos G. Politis and the Centre for Research on Greek Ethnography], vol. 2, Athens: Academy of Athens, 2012, pp. 1009–1027.